

Platform

January 2024 No.8

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 flag aloft with her right arm. The background is a solid red color. The illustration is positioned in the lower right quadrant of the cover.





Contents

Work	The Socialist Revolution and the Right of Nations to Self-Determination ····· 2 V.I. Lenin
Article	Zionism—A Racist, Anti-semitic and reactionary tool of imperialism ····· 10 Chapter 5. Nazi-Zionist collaboration Harpal Brar Communist Party of Great Britain (Marxist-Leninist)
	Comments on the article “Still on the World Anti-Imperialist Platform” by Ivan Pinheiro ····· 26 Gabriel Martinez (Brazilian communist living in China)
	The political stance of the Communist Party of Greece... a communist stance? · 29 Chilean Communist Party (Proletarian Action)
	Aspects of the national question and anti-imperialism during WWII ····· 35 Dimitrios Patelis Revolutionary Unification (Greece)
	On the current state and problems of the communist movement ····· 46 Joti Brar Communist Party of Great Britain (Marxist-Leninist)
	On the “New Cold War” ····· 61 Stephen Cho Coordinator of the Korean International Forum

The Socialist Revolution and the Right of Nations to Self-Determination

V.I. Lenin

January-February 1916

1. Imperialism, Socialism, and the Liberation of Oppressed Nations

Imperialism is the highest stage of development of capitalism. Capital in the advanced countries has outgrown the boundaries of national states. It has established monopoly in place of competition, thus creating all the objective prerequisites for the achievement of socialism. Hence, in Western Europe and in the United States of America, the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat for the overthrow of the capitalist governments, for the expropriation of the bourgeoisie, is on the order of the day. Imperialism is forcing the masses into this struggle by sharpening class antagonisms to an immense degree, by worsening the conditions of the masses both economically—trusts and high cost of living, and politically—growth of militarism, frequent wars, increase of reaction, strengthening and extension of national oppression and colonial plunder. Victorious socialism must achieve complete democracy and, consequently, not only bring about the complete equality of nations, but also give effect to the right of oppressed nations to self-determination, i.e., the right to free political secession. Socialist Parties which fail to prove by all their activities now, as well as during the revolution and after its victory, that they will free the enslaved nations and establish relations with them on the basis of a free union and a free union is a lying phrase without right to secession—such parties would be committing treachery to socialism.

Of course, democracy is also a form of state which must disappear when the state disappears, but this will take place only in the process of transition from completely victorious and consolidated socialism to complete communism.

2. The Socialist Revolution and the Struggle for Democracy

The socialist revolution is not one single act, not one single battle on a single front; but a whole epoch of intensified class conflicts, a long series of battles on all fronts, i.e., battles around all the problems of economics and politics, which can culminate only in the expropriation of the bourgeoisie. It would be a fundamental mistake to suppose that the struggle for democracy can divert the proletariat from the socialist revolution, or obscure, or overshadow it, etc. On the contrary, just as socialism cannot be victorious unless it introduces complete democracy, so the proletariat will be unable to prepare for victory over the bourgeoisie unless it wages a many-sided, consistent and revolutionary struggle for democracy.

It would be no less mistaken to delete any of the points of the democratic programme, for example, the point of self-determination of nations, on the ground that it is “infeasible,” or that it is “illusory” under imperialism. The assertion that the right of nations to self-determination cannot be achieved within the framework of capitalism may be understood either in its absolute, economic sense, or in the conventional, political sense.

In the first case, the assertion is fundamentally wrong in theory. First, in this sense, it is impossible to achieve such things as labour money, or the abolition of crises, etc., under capitalism. But it is entirely incorrect to argue that the self-determination of nations is likewise infeasible. Secondly, even the one example of the secession of Norway from Sweden in 1905 is sufficient to refute the argument that it is “infeasible” in this sense. Thirdly, it would be ridiculous to deny that, with a slight change in political and strategical

relationships, for example, between Germany and England, the formation of new states, Polish, Indian, etc, would be quite “feasible” very soon. Fourthly, finance capital, in its striving towards expansion, will “freely” buy and bribe the freest, most democratic and republican government and the elected officials of any country, however “independent” it may be. The domination of finance capital, as of capital in general, cannot be abolished by any kind of reforms in the realm of political democracy, and self-determination belongs wholly and exclusively to this realm. The domination of finance capital, however, does not in the least destroy the significance of political democracy as the freer, wider and more distinct form of class oppression and class struggle. Hence, all arguments about the “impossibility of achieving” economically one of the demands of political democracy under capitalism reduce themselves to a theoretically incorrect definition of the general and fundamental relations of capitalism and of political democracy in general.

In the second case, this assertion is incomplete and inaccurate, for not only the right of nations to self-determination, but all the fundamental demands of political democracy are “possible of achievement” under imperialism, only in an incomplete, in a mutilated form and as a rare exception (for example, the secession of Norway from Sweden in 1905). The demand for the immediate liberation of the colonies, as advanced by all revolutionary Social-Democrats, is also “impossible of achievement” under capitalism without a series of revolutions. This does not imply, however, that Social Democracy must refrain from conducting an immediate and most determined struggle for all these demands—to refrain would merely be to the advantage of the bourgeoisie and reaction. On the contrary, it implies that it is necessary to formulate and put forward all these demands, not in a reformist, but in a revolutionary way; not by keeping within the framework of bourgeois legality, but by breaking through it; not by confining oneself to parliamentary speeches and

verbal protests, but by drawing the masses into real action, by widening and fomenting the struggle for every kind of fundamental, democratic demand, right up to and including the direct onslaught of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie, i.e., to the socialist revolution, which will expropriate the bourgeoisie. The socialist revolution may break out not only in consequence of a great strike, a street demonstration, a hunger riot, a mutiny in the forces, or a colonial rebellion, but also in consequence of any political crisis, like the Dreyfus affair, the Zabern incident, or in connection with a referendum on the secession of an oppressed nation, etc.

The intensification of national oppression under imperialism makes it necessary for Social-Democracy not to renounce what the bourgeoisie describes as the “utopian” struggle for the freedom of nations to secede, but, on the contrary, to take more advantage than ever before of conflicts arising also on this ground for the purpose of rousing mass action and revolutionary attacks upon the bourgeoisie.

3. The Meaning of the Right to Self-Determination and its Relation to Federation

The right of nations to self-determination means only the right to independence in a political sense, the right to free, political secession from the oppressing nation. Concretely, this political, democratic demand implies complete freedom to carry on agitation in favour of secession, and freedom to settle the question of secession by means of a referendum of the nation that desires to secede. Consequently, this demand is by no means identical with the demand for secession, for partition, for the formation of small states. It is merely the logical expression of the struggle against national oppression in every form. The more closely the democratic system of state approximates to complete freedom of secession, the rarer and weaker will the striving for secession be in practice; for the advantages of large states, both from the point of view of economic progress and from the

point of view of the interests of the masses, are beyond doubt, and these advantages increase with the growth of capitalism. The recognition of self-determination is not the same as making federation a principle. One may be a determined opponent of this principle and a partisan of democratic centralism and yet prefer federation to national inequality as the only path towards complete democratic centralism. It was precisely from this point of view that Marx, although a centralist, preferred even the federation of Ireland with England to the forcible subjection of Ireland to the English.

The aim of socialism is not only to abolish the present division of mankind into small states and all national isolation; not only to bring the nations closer to each other, but also to merge them. And in order to achieve this aim, we must, on the one hand, explain to the masses the reactionary nature of the ideas of Renner and Otto Bauer concerning so-called “cultural national autonomy” and, on the other hand, demand the liberation of the oppressed nations, not only in general, nebulous phrases, not in empty declamations, not by “postponing” the question until socialism is established, but in a clearly and precisely formulated political programme which shall particularly take into account the hypocrisy and cowardice of the Socialists in the oppressing nations. Just as mankind can achieve the abolition of classes only by passing through the transition period of the dictatorship of the oppressed class, so mankind can achieve the inevitable merging of nations only by passing through the transition period of complete liberation of all the oppressed nations, i.e., their freedom to secede.

4. The Proletarian-Revolutionary Presentation of the Question of the Self-Determination of Nations

Not only the demand for the self-determination of nations but all the items of our democratic minimum programme were advanced before us, as far back as the seventeenth and eighteenth

centuries, by the petty bourgeoisie. And the petty bourgeoisie, believing in “peaceful” capitalism, continues to this day to advance all these demands in a utopian way, without seeing the class struggle and the fact that it has become intensified under democracy. The idea of a peaceful union of equal nations under imperialism, which deceives the people, and which the Kautskyists advocate, is precisely of this nature. As against this philistine, opportunist utopia, the programme of Social-Democracy must point out that under imperialism the division of nations into oppressing and oppressed ones is a fundamental, most important and inevitable fact.

The proletariat of the oppressing nations cannot confine itself to the general hackneyed phrases against annexations and for the equal rights of nations in general, that may be repeated by any pacifist bourgeois. The proletariat cannot evade the question that is particularly “unpleasant” for the imperialist bourgeoisie, namely, the question of the frontiers of a state that is based on national oppression. The proletariat cannot but fight against the forcible retention of the oppressed nations within the boundaries of a given state, and this is exactly what the struggle for the right of self-determination means. The proletariat must demand the right of political secession for the colonies and for the nations that “its own” nation oppresses. Unless it does this, proletarian internationalism will remain a meaningless phrase; mutual confidence and class solidarity between the workers of the oppressing and oppressed nations will be impossible; the hypocrisy of the reformist and Kautskyan advocates of self-determination who maintain silence about the nations which are oppressed by “their” nation and forcibly retained within “their” state will remain unexposed.

The Socialists of the oppressed nations, on the other hand, must particularly fight for and maintain complete, absolute unity (also organizational) between the workers of the oppressed nation and the workers of the oppressing nation. Without such unity it will be impossible to maintain an

independent proletarian policy and class solidarity with the proletariat of other countries in the face of all the subterfuge, treachery and trickery of the bourgeoisie; for the bourgeoisie of the oppressed nations always converts the slogan of national liberation into a means for deceiving the workers; in internal politics it utilizes these slogans as a means for concluding reactionary agreements with the bourgeoisie of the ruling nation (for instance, the Poles in Austria and Russia, who entered into pacts with reaction in order to oppress the Jews and the Ukrainians); in the realm of foreign politics it strives to enter into pacts with one of the rival imperialist powers for the purpose of achieving its own predatory aims (the policies of the small states in the Balkans, etc.).

The fact that the struggle for national liberation against one imperialist power may, under certain circumstances, be utilized by another “Great” Power in its equally imperialist interests should have no more weight in inducing Social Democracy to renounce its recognition of the right of nations to self-determination than the numerous case of the bourgeoisie utilizing republican slogans for the purpose of political deception and financial robbery, for example, in the Latin countries, have had in inducing them to renounce republicanism.¹⁾

5. Marxism and Proudhonism on the National Question

In contrast to the petty-bourgeois democrats, Marx regarded all democratic demands without exception not as an absolute, but as a historical expression of the struggle of the masses of the people, led by the bourgeoisie, against feudalism. There is not a single democratic demand which could not serve, and has not served, under certain conditions, as an instrument of the bourgeoisie for deceiving the workers. To single out one of the demands of political democracy, namely, the self-determination of nations, and to oppose it to all the rest, is fundamentally wrong in theory. In practice, the proletariat will be able to retain its independence only if it subordinates its struggle

for all the democratic demands, not excluding the demand for a republic, to its revolutionary struggle for the overthrow of the bourgeoisie.

On the other hand, in contrast to the Proudhonists, who “repudiated” the national problem “in the name of the social revolution,” Marx, having in mind mainly the interests of the proletarian class struggle in the advanced countries, put into the forefront the fundamental principle of internationalism and socialism, viz., that no nation can be free if it oppresses other nations. It was precisely from the standpoint of the interests of the revolutionary movement of the German workers that Marx in 1898 demanded that victorious democracy in Germany should proclaim and grant freedom to the nations that the Germans were oppressing. It was precisely from the standpoint of the revolutionary struggle of the English workers that Marx in 1869 demanded the separation of Ireland from England, and added: “...although after the separation there may come federation”. Only by putting forward this demand did Marx really educate the English workers in the spirit of internationalism. Only in this way was he able to oppose the revolutionary solution of a given historical problem to the opportunists and bourgeois reformism, which even now, half a century later, has failed to achieve the Irish “reform”. Only in this way was Marx able—unlike the apologists of capital who shout about the right of small nations to secession being utopian and impossible, and about the progressive nature not only of economic but also of political concentration—to urge the progressive nature of this concentration in a non-imperialist manner, to urge the bringing together of the nations, not by force, but on the basis of a free union of the proletarians of all countries. Only in this way was Marx able, also in the sphere of the solution of national problems, to oppose the revolutionary action of the masses to verbal and often hypocritical recognition of the equality and the self-determination of nations. The imperialist war of 1914-16 and the Augean stables of hypocrisy of

the opportunists and Kautskyists it exposed have strikingly confirmed the correctness of Marx's policy, which must serve as the model for all the advanced countries; for all of them now oppress other nations.

6. Three Types of Countries in Relation to Self-Determination of Nations

In this respect, countries must be divided into three main types:

First, the advanced capitalist countries of Western Europe and the United States of America. In these countries the bourgeois, progressive, national movements came to an end long ago. Every one of these "great" nations oppresses other nations in the colonies and within its own country. The tasks of the proletariat of these ruling nations are the same as those of the proletariat in England in the nineteenth century in relation to Ireland.

Secondly, Eastern Europe: Austria, the Balkans and particularly Russia. Here it was the twentieth century that particularly developed the bourgeois-democratic national movements and intensified the national struggle. The tasks of the proletariat in these countries—in regard to the consummation of their bourgeois-democratic reformation, as well as in regard to assisting the socialist revolution in other countries—cannot be achieved unless it champions the right of nations to self-determination. In this connection the most difficult but most important task is to merge the class struggle of the workers in the oppressing nations with the class struggle of the workers in the oppressed nations.

Thirdly, the semi-colonial countries, like China, Persia, Turkey, and all the colonies, which have a combined population amounting to a billion. In these countries the bourgeois-democratic movements have either hardly begun, or are far from having been completed. Socialists must not only demand the unconditional and immediate liberation of the colonies without compensation—and this demand in its political expression signifies nothing more nor less than the recognition of the right to self-determination—but must render

determined support to the more revolutionary elements in the bourgeois-democratic movements for national liberation in these countries and assist their rebellion—and if need be, their revolutionary war—against the imperialist powers that oppress them.

7. Social-Chauvinism and Self Determination of Nations

The imperialist epoch and the war of 1914-16 have particularly brought to the forefront the task of fighting against chauvinism and nationalism in the advanced countries. On the question of the self-determination of nations, there are two main shades of opinion among the social-chauvinists, i.e., the opportunists and the Kautskyists, who embellish the reactionary, imperialist war by declaring it to be a war in "defence of the fatherland".

On the one hand, we see the rather avowed servants of the bourgeoisie who defend annexations on the ground that imperialism and political concentration are progressive and who repudiate the right to self-determination on the ground that it is utopian, illusory, petty-bourgeois, etc. Among these may be included Cunow, Parvus and the extreme opportunists in Germany, a section of the Fabians and the trade union leaders in England, and the opportunists, Semkovsky, Liebman, Yurkevich, etc., in Russia.

On the other hand, we see the Kautskyists, including Vandervelde, Renaudel, and many of the pacifists in England, France, etc. These stand for unity with the first-mentioned group, and in practice their conduct is the same in that they advocate the right to self-determination in a purely verbal and hypocritical way. They regard the demand for the freedom of political secession as being "excessive" ("zu viel verlangt"—Kautsky, in the *Neue Zeit*, May 21, 1915); they do not advocate the need for revolutionary tactics, especially for the Socialists in the oppressing nations, but, on the contrary, they gloss over their revolutionary duties, they justify their opportunism, they make it easier to deceive the people, they evade precisely the

question of the frontiers of a state which forcibly retains subject nations, etc.

Both groups are opportunists who prostitute Marxism and who have lost all capacity to understand the theoretical significance and the practical urgency of Marx's tactics, an example of which he gave in relation to Ireland.

The specific question of annexations has become a particularly urgent one owing to the war. But what is annexation! Clearly, to protest against annexations implies either the recognition of the right of self-determination of nations, or that the protest is based on a pacifist phrase which defends the status quo and opposes all violence including revolutionary violence. Such a phrase is radically wrong, and incompatible with Marxism.

8. The Concrete Tasks of the Proletariat in the Immediate Future

The socialist revolution may begin in the very near future. In that event the proletariat will be faced with the immediate task of capturing power, of expropriating the banks and of introducing other dictatorial measures. In such a situation, the bourgeoisie, and particularly intellectuals like the Fabians and the Kautskyists, will strive to disrupt and to hinder the revolution, to restrict it to limited democratic aims. While all purely democratic demands may—at a time when the proletarians have already begun to storm the bulwarks of bourgeois power—serve, in a certain sense, as a hindrance to the revolution, nevertheless, the necessity of proclaiming and granting freedom to all oppressed nations (i.e., their right to self-determination) will be as urgent in the socialist revolution as it was urgent for the victory of the bourgeois-democratic revolution, for example, in Germany in 1848, or in Russia in 1905.

However, five, ten and even more years may pass before the socialist revolution begins. In that case, the task will be to educate the masses in a revolutionary spirit so as to make it impossible for Socialist chauvinists and opportunists to belong to the workers' party and to achieve a victory

similar to that of 1914-16. It will be the duty of the Socialists to explain to the masses that English Socialists who fail to demand the freedom of secession for the colonies and for Ireland; that German Socialists who fail to demand the freedom of secession for the colonies, for the Alsatians, for the Danes and for the Poles, and who fail to carry direct revolutionary propaganda and revolutionary mass action to the field of struggle against national oppression, who fail to take advantage of cases like the Zabern incident to conduct widespread underground propaganda among the proletariat of the oppressing nation, to organize street demonstrations and revolutionary mass actions; that Russian Socialists who fail to demand freedom of secession for Finland, Poland, the Ukraine, etc., etc.—are behaving like chauvinists, like lackeys of the blood-and-mud-stained imperialist monarchies and the imperialist bourgeoisie.

9. The Attitude of Russian and Polish Social-Democracy and of the Second International to Self-Determination

The difference between the revolutionary Social-Democrats of Russia and the Polish Social-Democrats on the question of self-determination came to the surface as early as 1903 at the congress which adopted the programme of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party, and which, despite the protest of the Polish Social-Democratic delegation, inserted in that programme point 9, which recognizes the right of nations to self-determination. Since then the Polish Social Democrats have never repeated, in the name of their Party, the proposal to delete point 9 from our programme, or to substitute some other formulation for it.

In Russia—where no less than 57%, i.e., over 100,000,000 of the population, belong to oppressed nations, where those nations mainly inhabit the border provinces, where some of those nations are more cultured than the Great Russians, where the political system is distinguished by its particularly barbarous and mediaeval character, where the

bourgeois-democratic revolution has not yet been completed—the recognition of the right of the nations oppressed by tsarism to free secession from Russia is absolutely obligatory for Social-Democracy in the interests of its democratic and socialist tasks. Our Party, which was re-established in January 1912, adopted a resolution in 1913 reiterating the right to self-determination and explaining it in the concrete sense outlined above. The orgy of Great-Russian chauvinism raging in 1914-16 among the bourgeoisie and the opportunist Socialists (Rubanovich, Plekhanov, Nashe Dyelo, etc.) prompts us to insist on this demand more strongly than ever and to declare that those who reject it serve, in practice, as a bulwark of Great-Russian chauvinism and tsarism. Our party declares that it emphatically repudiates all responsibility for such opposition to the right of self-determination.

The latest formulation of the position of Polish Social-Democracy on the national question (the declaration made by Polish Social-Democracy at the Zimmerwald Conference) contains the following ideas:

This declaration condemns the German and other governments which regard the “Polish provinces” as a hostage in the forthcoming game of compensations and thus “deprive the Polish people of the opportunity to decide its own fate”. The declaration says: “Polish Social-Democracy emphatically and solemnly protests against the recarving and partition of a whole country”... It condemns the Socialists who left to the Hohenzollerns “the task of liberating the oppressed nations”. It expresses the conviction that only participation in the impending struggle of the revolutionary international proletariat, in the struggle for socialism, “will break the fetters of national oppression and abolish all forms of foreign domination, and secure for the Polish people the possibility of all-sided, free development as an equal member in a League of Nations”. The declaration also recognizes the present war to be “doubly fratricidal” “for the Poles”. (Bulletin of the International Socialist Committee, No. 2,

September 27, 1915, p. 15.)

There is no difference in substance between these postulates and the recognition of the right of nations to self-determination except that their political formulation is still more diffuse and vague than the majority of the programmes and resolutions of the Second International. Any attempt to express these ideas in precise political formulae and to determine whether they apply to the capitalist system or only to the socialist system will prove still more strikingly the error committed by the Polish Social-Democrats in repudiating the self-determination of nations.

The decision of the International Socialist Congress held in London in 1896, which recognized the self-determination of nations, must, on the basis of the above-mentioned postulates, be supplemented by references to: (1) the particular urgency of this demand under imperialism; (2) the politically conditional nature and the class content of all the demands of political democracy, including this demand; (3) the necessity of drawing a distinction between the concrete tasks of the Social-Democrats in the oppressing nations and those in oppressed nations; (4) the inconsistent, purely verbal, and, therefore, as far as its political significance is concerned, hypocritical recognition of self-determination by the opportunists and Kautskyists; (5) the actual identity of the chauvinists and those Social-Democrats, particularly the Social-Democrats of the Great Powers (Great Russians, Anglo-Americans, Germans, French, Italians, Japanese, etc.) who fail to champion the freedom of secession for the colonies and nations oppressed by “their own” nations; (6) the necessity of subordinating the struggle for this demand, as well as for all the fundamental demands of political democracy, to the immediate revolutionary mass struggle for the overthrow of the bourgeois governments and for the achievement of socialism.

To transplant to the International the point of view of some of the small nations—particularly the point of view of the Polish Social-Democrats, who, in

their struggle against the Polish bourgeoisie which is deceiving the people with nationalist slogans, were misled into repudiating self-determination—would be a theoretical error. It would be the substitution of Proudhonism for Marxism and, in practice, would result in rendering involuntary support to the most dangerous chauvinism and opportunism of the Great Power nations.

Editorial Board of Sotsial-Demokrat, the Central Organ of the R.S.D.L.P.

Postscript. In Die Neue Zeit for March 3, 1916, which has just appeared, Kautsky openly holds out the hand of Christian reconciliation to Austerlitz, a representative of the foulest German chauvinism, rejecting freedom of separation for the oppressed nations of Hapsburg Austria but recognising it for Russian Poland, as a menial service to Hindenburg and Wilhelm II. One could not have wished for a better self-exposure of Kautskyism!

Notes

1) Needless to say, to repudiate the right of self-determination on the ground that logically it means “defence of the fatherland” would be quite ridiculous. With equal logic, i.e., with equal shallowness, the social-chauvinists of 1914-16 apply this argument to every one of the demands of democracy (for instance, to republicanism), and to every formulation of the struggle against national oppression, in order to justify “defence of the fatherland”. Marxism arrives at the recognition of defence of the fatherland, for example, in the wars of the Great French Revolution and the Garibaldi wars in Europe, and at the repudiation of defence of the fatherland in the imperialist war of 1914-16, from the analysis of the specific historical circumstances of each separate war, and not from some “general principle,” or some separate item of a programme.—Lenin

Zionism—A Racist, Anti-semitic and reactionary tool of imperialism

Chapter 5. Nazi-Zionist collaboration

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

published in the July/August 2017 issue of LALKAR

(It is an extracted version from the “Zionism—A Racist, Anti-semitic and reactionary tool of imperialism”.)

Claims of Nazi-Zionist collaboration are not anti-semitic fantasies, as Zionists will have everyone believe. They are based on historical facts and material long accepted as an integral part of serious literature on this question, and which has been legally available in the state of Israel. Crucially, most of the English language literature on this question was written by Jews, including prominent Zionists.

No serious student of history can be in doubt that some Zionists, including the top leaders of the Zionist movement, collaborated with the Nazis and went to the extent of rendering assistance to them to exterminate huge numbers of Jewish people.

Israel has on its statute book a special law to deal with exactly these types of people, which uniquely applies to crimes committed beyond the territory of Israel and to crimes committed prior to the establishment of the Israeli state. This law provides for the death penalty and is exempt from the statute of limitations. In all fairness, many high-ranking Israeli leaders, being proven collaborators with the Nazis, ought to have been tried under this law and executed on conviction.

Dr Hannah Arendt, who was by no means either left wing or pro-Palestinian but was a supporter of the existence of Israel as a Jewish state, dealt with some of the issues involved in her book

Eichmann in Jerusalem. She wrote that during the early years of the Nazi regime, Hitler’s rise to power was regarded by the Zionists mainly as “the decisive defeat of assimilationism”. Hence they could, argued the Zionists, cooperate with the Nazi authorities because they too, like the Nazis, believed in “dissimilation ... combined with emigration to Palestine of Jewish youngsters and, they hoped, Jewish capitalists”; such a policy could be the basis of a “mutually fair solution”. All leading posts in the Nazi-appointed Reichsvereinigung (Reich Association of Jews in Germany) were held by Zionists, as opposed to the authentically Jewish Reichsvertretung, which included Zionists as well as non-Zionists, for “Zionists, according to the Nazis, were ‘the decent’ Jews since they too thought in ‘national terms’”. In those years there existed “a mutually highly satisfactory agreement between the Nazi authorities and the Jewish Agency for Palestine—a ‘Ha’avarah’, or transfer agreement”. As a result, in the Thirties, when American Jews tried to organise a boycott of German merchandise, Palestine of all places was swamped with all kinds of goods ‘made in Germany’.

Arendt goes on to say: “Of greater importance for Eichmann were the emissaries from Palestine” who came in order to “enlist help for the illegal immigration of Jews into British-ruled Palestine, and both the Gestapo and the SS were helpful... They negotiated with Eichmann in Vienna, and they reported that he was ‘polite’, and that he even provided them with farms and facilities for setting

up vocational training camps for prospective immigrants.” For these emissaries from Palestine, their main enemy “...was not those who made life impossible for Jews in the old countries, Germany or Austria, but those who barred access to the new homeland: that enemy was definitely Britain, not Germany”.

And further: “... they were probably among the first Jews to talk openly about mutual interests and were certainly the first to be given permission to pick young Jewish prisoners from among the Jews in concentration camps ...; ... they too somehow believed that if it was a question of selecting Jews for survival, the Jews should do the selecting themselves. It was this ... that eventually led to a situation in which the non-selected majority of Jews inevitably found themselves confronted with two enemies—the Nazi authorities and the Jewish authorities”¹⁾.

Dr Arendt gives a heart-wrenching account of the officials of Judenrat (Jewish Councils—a widely used administrative agency imposed by the Nazis during World War II, predominantly within the ghettos in Nazi-occupied Europe and the Jewish ghettos in German-occupied Poland), the cruelty they displayed towards fellow Jews in their collaboration with the murderous Nazi machine. “To a Jew”, she wrote, “this role of the Jewish leaders in the destruction of their own people is undoubtedly the darkest chapter of the whole dark story”²⁾.

Dr Arendt concluded that without this collaboration many lives could have been saved:

“But the whole truth was that there existed Jewish community organisations and Jewish party and welfare organisations on both the local and international level. Wherever Jews lived, there were recognised Jewish leaders and this leadership, almost without exception, cooperated in one way or another, for one reason or another, with the Nazis. The whole truth was that if the Jewish

people had really been unorganised and leaderless, there would have been chaos and plenty of misery but the total number of victims would hardly have been between four and a half and six million people”³⁾.

Dr Arendt’s book initially received sympathetic response from the Israeli press. However, almost immediately the Zionist propaganda machine went into overdrive to attack it savagely as the “concept about Jewish participation in the Nazi holocaust ... may plague the Jews for years to come”⁴⁾.

On 11 March 1963, the B’nai Brith Anti-Defamation League released a ‘summary’ guideline to “book reviewers and others when the volume appears” which accused Dr Arendt of saying, inter alia: “That Europe’s Jewish organisations in the main, played a ‘disastrous role’ by cooperating with the Nazi extermination machine. As a result the Jews, themselves, bear a large share of the blame” (our emphasis). In essence Dr Arendt was accused of putting forward the thesis “that the Jews had murdered themselves”⁵⁾.

This line of attack was repeated by nearly every reviewer of Arendt’s book. The response of the Zionist establishment to Arendt’s book is typical of its reaction whenever questions about Nazi-Zionist cooperation crop up. This is how Dr Arendt, in *The Jew as Pariah*, describes the campaign against her.

“No one will doubt the effectiveness of modern image-making and no one acquainted with Jewish organisations and their countless channels of communication outside their immediate range will underestimate their possibilities in influencing public opinion. For greater than their direct power of control is the voluntary outside help upon which they can draw from Jews who, though they may not be at all interested in Jewish affairs, will flock home, as it were, out of age-old fears (no longer justified, let us hope, but still very much alive) when their people or its leaders are criticised. What I had done according to their lights was the

crime of crimes. I had told 'the truth in a hostile environment,' as an Israeli official told me, and what the ADL and all the other organisations did was to hoist the danger signal..."⁶⁾.

The campaign, said Dr Arendt, though farcical, was "effective".

"Or was it? After all, the denunciation of book and author, with which they achieved great, though by no means total, success, was not their goal. It was only the means with which to prevent the discussion of an issue 'which may plague Jews for years to come'. And as far as this goal was concerned, they achieved the precise opposite. If they had left well enough alone, this issue, which I had touched upon only marginally, would not have been trumpeted all over the world. In their efforts to prevent people from reading what I had written, or, in case such misfortune had already happened, to provide the necessary reading glasses, they blew it up out of all proportion, not only with reference to my book but with reference to what had actually happened. They forgot that they were mass organisations, using all the means of mass communication, so that every issue they touched at all, pro or contra, was liable to attract the attention of masses whom they then no longer could control. So what happened after a while in these meaningless and mindless debates was that people began to think that all the nonsense the image-makers had made me say was the actual historical truth.

"Thus, with the unerring precision with which a bicyclist on his first ride will collide with the obstacle he is most afraid of, Mr. Robinson's [Jacob Robinson, one of Dr Arendt's critics] formidable supporters have put their whole power at the service of propagating what they were most anxious to avoid. So that now, as a result of their folly, literally everybody feels the need for a 'major work' on Jewish conduct in the face of catastrophe"⁷⁾.

The Kastner case

Zionist cooperation with the Nazis, and the assistance furnished by the Zionists in the extermination of several hundreds of thousands of Jews, were a logical culmination of their shared aims and nationalist, anti- assimilationist beliefs and theories.

This can be clearly demonstrated by reference to the most notorious case of Nazi-Zionist collaboration—that involving Rudolf Kastner. Not much is publicly known about this, thanks to the thorough suppression of information regarding it by the Zionist establishment and its backers in the imperialist countries.

The accusations against Kastner can be summarised as follows: Dr Rudolf Verba, a Doctor of Science then serving at the British Medical Research Council, was one of the few fortunate escapees from Auschwitz. In February 1961, he published his memoirs in the London Daily Herald, in which he wrote:

"I am a Jew. In spite of that, indeed because of that, I accuse certain Jewish leaders of one of the most ghastly deeds of the war.

"This small group of quislings knew what was happening to their brethren in Hitler's gas chambers and bought their own lives with the price of silence. Among them was Dr Kastner, leader of the council which spoke for all Jews in Hungary. While I was prisoner number 44070 at Auschwitz—the number is still on my arm—I compiled careful statistics of the exterminations ... I took these terrible statistics with me when I escaped in 1944 and I was able to give Hungarian Zionist leaders three weeks' notice that Eichmann planned to send a million of their Jews to his gas chambers ... Kastner went to Eichmann and told him, 'I know of your plans; spare some Jews of my choice and I shall keep quiet.'

"Eichmann not only agreed, but dressed Kastner up in SS uniform and took him to Belsen to trace

some of his friends. Nor did the sordid bargaining end there.

“Kastner paid Eichmann several thousand dollars. With this little fortune, Eichmann was able to buy his way to freedom when Germany collapsed, to set himself up in the Argentine...”⁸⁾

Verba’s accusations are fully corroborated by the ‘Eichmann Confessions’ produced in the 28 November and 5 December 1960 issues of Life magazine:

“By shipping the Jews off in a lightning operation, I wanted to set an example for future campaigns elsewhere.... In obedience to Himmler’s directive, I now concentrated on negotiations with the Jewish political officials in Budapest ... among them Dr Rudolf Kastner, authorized representative of the Zionist Movement. This Dr Kastner was a young man about my age, an ice-cold lawyer and a fanatical Zionist. He agreed to help keep the Jews from resisting deportation—and even keep order in the collection camps—if I would close my eyes and let a few hundred or a few thousand young Jews emigrate illegally to Palestine. It was a good bargain. For keeping order in the camps, the price ... was not too high for me....

“We trusted each other perfectly. When he was with me, Kastner smoked cigarettes as though he were in a coffeehouse. While we talked he would smoke one aromatic cigarette after another, taking them from a silver case and lighting them with a silver lighter. With his great polish and reserve he would have made an ideal Gestapo officer himself.

“Dr. Kastner’s main concern was to make it possible for a select group of Hungarian Jews to emigrate to Israel....

“As a matter of fact, there was a very strong similarity between our attitudes in the SS and the viewpoint of these immensely idealistic Zionist leaders.... I believe that Kastner would have sacrificed a thousand or a hundred thousand of his blood to achieve his political goal.... ‘You can

have the others,’ he would say, ‘but let me have this group here.’ And because Kastner rendered us a great service by helping to keep the deportation camps peaceful, I would let his group escape. After all, I was not concerned with small groups of a thousand or so Jews.... That was the ‘gentleman’s agreement’ I had with Kastner”⁹⁾.

It is worth remembering in this context that Nazi Zionist Adolf Eichmann stated in 1960, “[H]ad I been a Jew, I would have been a fanatical Zionist. I could not imagine being anything else. In fact, I would have been the most ardent Zionist imaginable”¹⁰⁾.

The government of Israel characterised these accusations of Verba’s as a lie. When Michael Greenwald, a fiercely pro-Zionist Israeli citizen, published these accusations against Kastner, the government did more than demand that Greenwald’s views be not broadcast. Since a prominent Zionist official was involved, Israel’s Attorney-General prosecuted Greenwald for criminal libel.

The judgment

The verdict in the case given by Judge Benjamin Halevi in Israel’s District Court of Jerusalem is self-explanatory. We reproduce here excerpts from the verdict of Judge Halevi, who was later to be part of the panel of three judges who tried Eichmann:

“The masses of Jews from Hungary’s ghettos obediently boarded the deportation trains without knowing their fate. They were full of confidence in the false information that they were being transferred to Kenyermeze [a model camp where they would be comfortable and well looked after].

“The Nazis could not have misled the masses of Jews so conclusively had they not spread their false information through Jewish channels.

“The Jews of the ghettos would not have trusted the Nazi or Hungarian rulers. But they had trust in their Jewish leaders. Eichmann and others used

this known fact as part of their calculated plan to mislead the Jews. They were able to deport the Jews to their extermination by the help of Jewish leaders.

“The false information was spread by the Jewish leaders. The local leaders of the Jews of Kluj and Nodvarod knew that other leaders were spreading such false information and did not protest.

“Those of the Jews who tried to warn their friends of the truth were persecuted by the Jewish leaders in charge of the local ‘rescue work’.

“The trust of the Jews in the misleading information and their lack of knowledge that their wives, children and themselves were about to be deported to the gas chambers of Auschwitz led the victims to remain quiescent in their ghettos. It seduced them into not resisting or hampering the deportation orders.

“Dozens of thousands of Jews were guarded in their ghettos by a few dozen police. Yet even vigorous young Jews made no attempt to overpower these few guards and escape to nearby Rumania. No resistance activities to the deportations were organized in these ghettos.

“And the Jewish leaders did everything in their power to soothe the Jews in the ghettos and to prevent such resistance activities.

“The same Jews who spread in Kluj and Nodvarod the false rumour of Kenyermeze, or confirmed it, the same public leaders who did not warn their own people against the misleading statements, the same Jewish leaders who did not organize any resistance or any sabotage of deportations ... these same leaders did not join the people of their community in their ride to Auschwitz, but were all included in the Rescue train.

“The Nazi organizers of extermination and the perpetrators of extermination permitted Rudolf Kastner and the members of the Jewish Council in Budapest to save themselves, their relatives, and friends. The Nazis did this as a means of making

the local Jewish leaders, whom they favoured, dependent on the Nazi regime, dependent on its good will during the time of its fatal deportation schedule. In short, the Nazis succeeded in bringing the Jewish leaders into collaboration with the Nazis at the time of the catastrophe.

“The Nazi chiefs knew that the Zionists were a most vital element in Jewry and the most trusted by the Jews.

“The Nazis drew a lesson from the Warsaw ghetto and other belligerent ghettos. They learned that Jews were able to sell their lives very expensively if honourably guided.

“Eichmann did not want a second Warsaw. For this reason, the Nazis exerted themselves to mislead and bribe the Jewish leaders.

“The personality of Rudolph Kastner made him a convenient catspaw for Eichmann and his clique, to draw into collaboration and make their task easier .

“The question here is not, as stated by the Attorney General in his summation, whether members of the Jewish Rescue Committee were or were not capable of fulfilling their duty without the patronage of the SS chiefs. It is obvious that without such SS Nazi patronage the Jewish Rescue Committee could not have existed, and could have acted only as an underground.

“The question is, as put by the lawyer for the defence, why were the Nazis interested in the existence of the Rescue Committee? Why did the SS chiefs make every effort to encourage the existence of the Jewish Rescue Committee? Did the exterminators turn into rescuers?

“The same question rises concerning the rescue of prominent Jews by these German killers of Jews. Was the rescue of such Jews a part of the extermination plan of the killers?

“The support given by the extermination leaders to Kastner’s Rescue Committee proves that indeed there was a place for Kastner and his friends in

their Final Solution for the Jews of Hungary—their total annihilation.

“The Nazi’s patronage of Kastner, and their agreement to let him save six hundred prominent Jews, were part of the plan to exterminate the Jews. Kastner was given a chance to add a few more to that number. The bait attracted him. The opportunity of rescuing prominent people appealed to him greatly. He considered the rescue of the most important Jews as a great personal success and a success for Zionism. It was a success that would also justify his conduct—his political negotiation with Nazis and the Nazi patronage of his committee.

“When Kastner received this present from the Nazis, Kastner sold his soul to the German Satan.

“The sacrifice of the vital interests of the majority of the Jews, in order to rescue the prominents, was the basic element in the agreement between Kastner and the Nazis. This agreement fixed the division of the nation into two unequal camps: a small fragment of prominents, whom the Nazis promised Kastner to save, on the one hand, and the great majority or Hungarian Jews whom the Nazis designated for death, on the other hand. An imperative condition for the rescue of the first camp by the Nazis was that Kastner will not interfere in the action of the Nazis against the other camp and will not hamper them in its extermination. Kastner fulfilled this condition. He concentrated his efforts in the rescue of the prominents and treated the camp of the doomed as if they had already been wiped out from the book of the living.

“One cannot estimate the damage caused by Kastner’s collaboration and put down the number of victims which it cost Hungarian Jews. These are not only the thousands of Jews in Nodvarod or any other community in the border area, Jews who could escape through the border, had the chief of their rescue committee fulfilled his duty toward them.

“All of Kastner’s answers in his final testimony were a constant effort to evade this truth.

“Kastner has tried to escape through every crack he could find in the wall of evidence. When one crack was sealed in his face, he darted quickly to another”¹¹⁾.

Referring to the meeting of Kastner with SS officers Becher and Rudolf Hoess, Commandant of Auschwitz at the time when the ‘new line’ of ‘rescuing’ Jews was disclosed by Hoess, Judge Halevi observed:

“From this gathering in Budapest, it is obvious that the ‘new line’ stretched from Himmler to Hoess, from Jutner to Becher and Krumej”, adding that this meeting not only exposed the ‘rescue work’ of Becher ‘in its true light’, but also ‘the extent of Kastner’s involvement in the inner circle of the chief German war criminals’”. Continued Judge Halevi:

“Collaboration between the Jewish Agency Rescue Committee and the Exterminators of the Jews was solidified in Budapest and Vienna. Kastner’s duties were part and parcel of the general duties of the SS.

“In addition to its Extermination Department and Looting Department, the Nazi SS opened a Rescue Department headed by Kastner.

“All these extermination, robbery and rescue activities of the SS were coordinated under the management of Heinrich Himmler”¹²⁾.

As if all this were not enough, Kastner furnished a false affidavit in support of Becher, in his own name as well as that of the Jewish Agency and the Jewish World Congress. This wilfully false affidavit was given in favour of a war criminal to save him from trial and punishment in Nuremberg.

In view of the foregoing, Judge Halevi found Greenwald mainly innocent of libel against Kastner, but fined him one Israeli pound for one unproven accusation, namely, that Kastner had received money from the Nazis for assisting the latter in

their extermination programme. He also awarded the court costs in favour of Greenwald, ordering the Israeli state to pay 200 Israeli pounds towards them.

But the story, which proved beyond doubt that Kastner was a collaborator, whom the Israeli government had attempted to defend, did not end there.

Public reaction to the trial

Israeli public opinion was near-unanimous in demanding that Kastner and his associates in the 'Rescue committee' be put on trial as Nazi collaborators. Here lies the rub. Kastner's associates were the government of Israel. As the Israeli evening paper *Yedi'ot Aharonot* put it:

"If Kastner is brought to trial the entire government faces a total political and national collapse—as a result of what such a trial may disclose"¹³⁾.

Not surprisingly then, the Israeli government, instead of putting Kastner on trial, lodged an appeal against Greenwald's acquittal for criminal libel. In launching this appeal, the government showed "exemplary expediency", as someone writing in the Israeli paper *Ma'ariv* put it:

"At 11 PM the verdict was given. At 11 AM next morning the government announces the defence of Kastner will be renewed—an appeal filed. What exemplary expediency! Since when does this government possess such lawyer-genius who can weigh in one night the legal chances of an appeal on a detailed, complex verdict of three hundred pages?!"¹⁴⁾.

The motivation for the Israeli government's defence of Kastner was made crystal clear at the appeal hearing in the Supreme Court by the following words of Chaim Cohen, Israel's Attorney-General:

"The man Kastner does not stand here as a private individual. He was a recognized representative, official or non-official of the Jewish National Institutes in Palestine and of the Zionist Executive;

and I come here in this court to defend the representative of our national institutions"¹⁵⁾.

This perfectly true statement constitutes the crux of the matter. Kastner's collaboration with Nazi war criminals was not an individual isolated case. It represented the collaboration of the echelons of the Zionist leadership.

The Supreme Court's unanimous verdict was that Becher was a Nazi war criminal, whom Kastner, in his own as well as the Jewish Agency's name, had without justification helped escape justice. Therefore Greenwald was acquitted of libel on this point.

The Supreme Court also accepted the finding of the lower court that Kastner had deliberately concealed the truth about Auschwitz from the masses of Hungarian Jewry in exchange for the Nazis allowing a paltry thousand or so to be taken to Palestine.

Thus Kastner can hardly have been rehabilitated, let alone "fully rehabilitated".

The Supreme Court's judgment

Yet, after unanimously accepting the above facts, shockingly the Supreme Court decided, by a majority of 3 to 2, that Kastner's conduct was morally justifiable and found Greenwald guilty of criminal libel for characterising it as 'collaboration'. With their defence of Kastner, the Nazi collaborator, the government of Israel and the Supreme Court furnished conclusive proof that Zionism fully stood for collaboration with the Nazis.

That the court majority, far from rehabilitating Kastner, joined him is clearly revealed from the following excerpts taken from the majority judgment of Judge Shalomo Chesin, which reveal an attitude of extreme cynicism and callousness, at variance with the compassion, decency and moral concern for the fate of hundreds of thousands of Hungarian Jews exterminated by the Nazis with the collaboration—yes, COLLABORATION—of

Kastner. Let Judge Chesin speak for himself:

“...What point was there in telling the people boarding the trains in Kluj, people struck by fate and persecuted, as to what awaits them at the end of their journey...Kastner spoke in detail of the situation, saying, ‘The Hungarian Jew was a branch which long ago dried up on the tree’. This vivid description coincides with the testimony of another witness about the Hungarian Jews, ‘This was a big Jewish community in Hungary, without any ideological Jewish backbone’”¹⁶⁾.

In other words, if they were not Zionists (“without any ideological Jewish backbone”, if it pleases the Zionists), or willing or fit for travel to Palestine, they were not worth bothering about.

Judge Chesin goes on to assert, without foundation, that the Jews of Hungary were not capable, physically or mentally to offer forcible resistance to the Nazi deportation scheme. As such, no rescue could have flowed from the disclosure of the news about Auschwitz.

Even though Kastner’s silence when he arrived in Kluj was “premeditated and calculated”, even though his omissions made the Nazi extermination plans “easier” to execute, it could still not be regarded as collaboration! Continued Judge Chesin:

“And as to the moral issue, the question is not whether a man is allowed to kill many in order to save a few, or vice-versa. The question is altogether in another sphere and should be defined as follows: A man is aware that a whole community is awaiting its doom. He is allowed to make efforts to save a few, although part of his efforts involve concealment of truth from the many or should he disclose the truth to many though it is his best opinion that this way everybody will perish. I think that the answer is clear. What good will the blood of the few bring if everybody is to perish?... As I said, I am not arguing with the basic factual findings of the learned President of the Jewish District Court (Judge Halevi) but it seems to me,

with all due respect, that his findings do not, as of necessity, demand the conclusion he has arrived at. That is to say, collaboration on the part of Kastner in the extermination of the Jews. And that they better coincide with bad leadership both from a moral and public point of view...

“In my opinion, one can say outright that if you find out that Kastner collaborated with the enemy because he did not disclose to the people who boarded the trains in Kluj that they were being led to extermination, one has to put on trial today ... many more leaders and half-leaders who gagged themselves in an hour of crisis and did not inform others of what was known to them and did not warn and did not cry out of the coming danger...

“Because of all this I cannot confirm the conclusion of the District Court with regard to the accusation that Greenwald has thrown on Kastner of collaboration with the Nazis in exterminating the Jewish people in Hungary during the last war”¹⁷⁾.

“In other words, the Court approved of Kastner’s contempt for the Hungarian Jews and could not allow him to be condemned for doing exactly what many other Zionist leaders and half-leaders did—concealing their knowledge of the Nazi extermination plans so that Jews would board the trains to Auschwitz peacefully while their Zionist ‘leaders’ boarded a different train for Palestine”. These words taken from page 25 of the excellent pamphlet on the subject, Nazi-Zionist collaboration produced by the Jews Against Zionism and Anti-Semitism (JAZA) group in Australia and reproduced by the British Anti-Zionist Organisation/Palestine Solidarity (BAZO-PS) in 1981 sum up the Zionist contempt for vast layers of the Jewish people. Anyone who is interested in this subject can read this pamphlet at <http://www.iahushua.com/Zion/zionhol03.html>.

A fitting refutation of Judge Chesin’s sickeningly revolting judgment is to be found in the minority

judgment of Supreme Court Judge Moshe Silberg, in which he tears to shreds the majority verdict. What right, asked Judge Silberg, did Kastner have to decide the fate of 800,000 Hungarian Jews? He went on:

“...The charge emanating from the testimony of the witnesses against Kastner is that had they known of the Auschwitz secret, then thousands or tens of thousands would have been able to save their lives by local, partial, specific or indirect rescue operations like local revolts, resistance, escapes, hidings, concealment of children with Gentiles, forging of documents, ransom money, bribery, etc.—and when this is the case and when one deals with many hundreds of thousands, how does a human being, a mortal, reject with complete certainty and with an extreme ‘no’ the efficiency of all the many and varied rescue ways? How can he examine the tens of thousands of possibilities? Does he decide instead of God? Indeed, he who can act with such a usurpation of the last hope of hundreds of thousands is not entitled to claim good faith as his defence. The penetrating question quo warranto [a writ requiring to show by what authority an office is held or exercised] is a good answer to a claim of such good faith...”

“And if all this is not enough to annul the claim of good faith which was put before us on behalf of Kastner by the Attorney General, then Kastner himself comes and annuls it altogether. Not only did he never make this claim, but his own words prove the contrary. He writes in his report to the Jewish Agency that the Committee sent emissaries to many ghettos in the countryside and pleaded with them to organize escapes and to refuse to board the trains. And though the story of these pleadings is untrue, and the silence of Kastner in Kluj is proven, the very uttering of these statements entirely contradicts the claim that Kastner had concealed the news about the fate of the ghetto inmates in good faith and only as a result of his

complete despairing of the chances of escaping or resisting the Germans. You cannot claim at the same time helplessness and activity. Anyway, such a claim is not convincing...

“We can sum up with three facts:

“A. That the Nazis didn’t want to have a great revolt—‘Second Warsaw’—nor small revolts, and their passion was to have the extermination machine working smoothly without resistance. This fact was known to Kastner from the best source—from Eichmann himself—And he had additional proofs of that when he witnessed all the illusionary and misleading tactics which were being taken by the Nazis from the first moment of occupation.

“B. That the most efficient means to paralyse the resistance with—or the escape of a victim—is to conceal from him the plot of the coming murder. This fact is known to every man and one does not need any proof of evidence for this.

“C. That he, Kastner, in order to carry out the rescue plan for the few prominents, fulfilled knowingly and without good faith the said desire of the Nazis, thus expediting the work of exterminating the masses.

“And also the rescue of Becher by Kastner... He who is capable of rescuing this Becher from hanging proves that the atrocities of this great war criminal were not so horrifying or despicable in his eyes... I couldn’t base the main guilt of Kastner on this fact had it been alone, but when it is attached even from afar to the whole scene of events it throws retroactive light on the whole affair and serves as a dozen proofs of our conclusion”¹⁸⁾.

In the Kastner case the top Zionist leadership of Israel was shown to be continuing publicly to defend collaboration with the Nazi mass murderers in the extermination of hundreds of thousands of Jews.

Although the Supreme Court concluded that Kurt Becher was a war criminal, the Jewish Agency

(World Zionist Organisation) declined to withdraw the false certificate given to him by Kastner on their behalf, thus sparing Becher from hanging, to remain free in West Germany at the head of several corporations with a personal wealth of \$30 million at the time. Becher even used his certificate as a 'good' SS officer in order to give evidence in favour of his fellow criminals at several war crimes trials in West Germany. The Israeli government never attempted to bring him to trial, presumably out of fear of what such a trial might reveal.

Similarly, none of Kastner's colleagues on the Zionist Relief and Rescue Committee nor his superiors in the Jewish Agency were ever brought to trial as demanded by the Israeli public, let alone the several hundred 'prominents' who assisted Kastner in reassuring the Hungarian Jews that they were destined for Kenyerméze and not Auschwitz, in return for tickets on the train that eventually took them to Palestine.

Kastner, with his undisputed claims that he did everything with the blessing of the Jewish Agency, was a source of huge continuing embarrassment to the Zionist leadership. He had to be got rid of. He was got rid of in the immediate aftermath of the conclusion of the appeal hearing, but before the judgment 'rehabilitating' him had been delivered. He was shot dead by Zeer Eckstein who was not a Hungarian aching to avenge the mass murder of Hungarian Jews but a paid undercover agent of the secret service of Israel¹⁹.

The Kastner case, in addition to refuting Zionism's cynical use of the holocaust as a propaganda tool, also reveals that the very existence of the Jewish Agency, far from being an instrument for the protection of the Jewish masses, was a source of real assistance to the Nazis in their extermination plans. Lots of Jewish lives could have been saved but for the existence of the Jewish Agency.

Zionism is no answer to the problem of anti-semitism, but a dreadful and cowardly way of

avoiding participation in the struggle against discrimination, repression and extermination.

A sick and warped ideology

We have to go beyond documenting what Kastner did, and the approval of his conduct by the Supreme Court of Israel and the Israeli government. We have to ask: why did Kastner consider it correct actively to assist the Nazis by leading several hundred thousand Jews to extermination in return for the lives of fewer than 2,000? Further, why did the top Zionist leadership feel obliged to come to his defence after his crime had been proved?

The answer is that before, as well as during the war, Zionism considered itself as a political movement concerned only with those Jews who were desirous of colonising Palestine, while the vast majority of the Jews were opposed to it. Rescuing the Jews in general from the Nazis was not the aim and function of Zionism. Zionism is not, neither then nor today, a movement for the protection of Jews but a movement for establishing a Jewish state in Palestine—its rhetoric to the contrary notwithstanding.

During the dreadful years of Nazi rule, millions of Jews desperately wanted to leave Europe, but the last place they wanted to go was Palestine. Contrary to popular myth, there was no historical or cultural affinity between the Jewish masses and Palestine. Most Jews were urban people, and the United States, which had between the 1880s and 1914 absorbed nearly 2 million Jews from Eastern Europe, would have been their preferred destination. Failing that, any other country away from the blood-drenched claws of the Nazis, would have been eagerly welcomed.

For the Zionists, however, the establishment of the Jewish state was the *raison d'être* of their existence. Guided by this warped outlook, the majority of mainstream Zionists sat out the war trying to construct the 'national homeland' in Palestine

and conducting campaigns for unhindered Jewish immigration into Palestine and for a Jewish army, whereas the majority of Jews, like everyone else during the 2nd World War, had more important things to worry about, including participation in partisan anti-Nazi resistance movements and enlisting in large numbers in the Allied armies. The World Zionist Organisation neither publicised nor participated in the anti-Nazi resistance; it neither publicised the holocaust nor supported resistance to it; instead it participated in covering it up until the Allies publicised it.

Vast numbers of Jews organised and participated in the partisan underground throughout Europe—generally under communist leadership, often under the direct command of the Red Army, thus making a sizeable contribution to the Allied war effort.

Even in the Warsaw ghetto, where the Zionist contribution was greatest, the majority of the fighters were communist, Bundist or unaffiliated, although from the Zionist propaganda the unwary may be forgiven for getting the impression that the Warsaw ghetto rebellion was all a Zionist effort.

Yitzhak Greenbaum, while speaking on ‘The diaspora and the redemption’ in February 1943 at a Tel Aviv gathering, succinctly, not to say cold-bloodedly, explained the Zionist policy during the holocaust in the following words:

“...When they come to us with two pleas—the rescue of the masses of Jews in Europe or the redemption of the land - I vote without a second thought for the redemption of the land”²⁰⁾.

He restated this stance in his post-war book *In days of holocaust and destruction*:

“... when they asked me, couldn't you give money out of the United Jewish appeal funds for the rescue of Jews in Europe, I said 'NO' and I say 'NO' again ... one should resist this wave which pushes the Zionist activities to secondary importance”²¹⁾.

This buying of land from the Arabs of Palestine

took priority over rescuing European Jews threatened with extermination. More than that. He called for a conspiracy of silence over the mass murder of Jews so as not to distract attention from purchasing land. In his words: “The more said about the slaughter of our people, the greater the minimisation of our efforts to strengthen and promote Hebraisation of the land”²²⁾.

Let it be noted that Greenbaum was not some minor Zionist official. He was the immediate superior of Kastner in the Jewish Agency, in his position of the head of the Rescue Committee for European Jewry, and occupied the position of a cabinet minister in Israel's first government. Although in a minority in the Zionist leadership on this question, damningly he was left in charge of the ‘Rescue Committee’ after blatantly making clear his opposition to using Zionist funds for the rescue of Jews. Clearly, Greenbaum's policy was also the policy of the Zionist movement—an agreed policy that Kastner was merely implementing.

This policy was succinctly captured in the cold-blooded slogan: “One goat in Eretz Israel is worth an entire community in the diaspora”.

To the Zionist leadership, the most important question was the building of the ‘Jewish homeland’. If this involved sacrificing a million or more Jews, that was for them a price worth paying.

Contrary to popular belief, Zionist leaders did not seriously question that they were silent during the holocaust. Dr Nahum Goldman, President of the World Jewish Congress, speaking on 4 March 1962 at a commemorative meeting frankly stated:

“If there is a basis to the historical ‘I accuse’, let us have the courage now to direct it against that part of the generation which was lucky enough to be outside of Nazi domination and did not fulfil its obligations toward the 80 millions killed”²³⁾.

While admitting responsibility for the deaths of those who could have been, but were not, rescued, Goldman rather slyly attempted to spread the

blame so as to accuse everyone not actually a victim of the holocaust, instead of laying the blame where it belongs, namely, on the Zionist leadership.

The Zionist leadership ignored heart-wrenching pleas from beleaguered Jews threatened with deportation to, and extermination at, Auschwitz. One such request was sent from a cave near Lublin (Poland) on 15 May 1944 by Rabbi Michael Dov Weissmandel. The author of this appeal wrote passionately that the Zionist leadership put pressure on the allies to bomb the crematorium at Auschwitz and the roads and bridges leading to it. No such bombing took place. The heart-wrenching messages were ignored. One can only conclude that the Zionist leadership could not initiate 'strong protests' against Nazi extermination without imperilling the sordid deals their representative Kastner was negotiating for the rescue of a few hundred Jews and their transportation to Palestine²⁴⁾.

The revisionist Zionists, for their own political reasons, were responsible for bringing to light the collaboration between the Nazis and the mainstream Zionist leadership. One of these revisionists was lawyer Shmuel Tanir, who was Greenwald's defence counsel in the Kastner case, who later on was to become Israel's Minister of Justice.

Even Ben Hecht, another supporter of the revisionists, in his book *Perfidy*, concludes that had the mainstream Zionists organised to rescue the Jewish masses "... by any measure, such honourable human behaviour would have been of deeper worth to the world than a dozen states of Israel"²⁵⁾.

The Zionist thinking during the holocaust is correctly outlined by Mapai (predecessor of the present-day Israeli Labour Party) leader Eliezer Livetz, who expressed his regrets in the following words in *Yediot Aharonot* in an article entitled 'Thoughts on the holocaust':

"Our Zionist orientation educated us to see the

growing land of Israel as the prime goal and the Jewish nation only in relation to its building the land. With each tragedy befalling the Jews in the Diaspora, we saw the state as the evident solution. We continued employing this principle even during the holocaust, saving only those who could be brought to Israel. The mandate's limitation on immigration served as a political factor in our battle to open the doors to aliya (immigration) and to establishing the state. Our programs were geared to this aim and for this we were prepared to sacrifice or endanger lives. Everything outside of this goal, including the rescue of European Jewry for its own sake, was a secondary goal. 'If there can be no people without a country', Rabbi Weissmandel exclaimed, 'then surely there can be no country without a people. And where are the living Jewish people, if not in Europe?'"²⁶⁾.

The revisionist paper, *Herut*, correctly stated that the leaders of the Jewish Agency and leaders of the Zionist movement in Palestine, could have appealed in the "broadcasts of their 'secret' Haganah radio station to Jews in ghettos, camps and villages to flee to the woods, to mutiny and fight, to try to save themselves." By their silence "they collaborated with the German to no less extent than the scoundrels who provided the Germans with the death lists. History will yet pronounce its verdict against them. Was not the very existence of the Jewish Agency a help for the Nazis? When history tries the so-called Judenrat and the Jewish police, she will also condemn the leaders of the Agency and the leaders of the Zionist movement"²⁷⁾.

That surely is the verdict of history.

Just as Judge Benjamin Halevi concluded that the Budapest 'Relief and Rescue Committee' of the Zionist Jewish Agency was a department of the Nazi SS, along with the departments for extermination and looting, so we must conclude that the very existence of the Jewish Agency was of assistance to the Nazis in carrying out and covering

up unspeakable crimes.

When the news about Auschwitz eventually found its way into the Swiss, NOT Palestinian, press, notwithstanding attempts at suppression by Zionist officials in Geneva, it caused a furore throughout the world, causing the Hungarian government to suspend deportations consequent upon threats from the Allies. The deportations were only resumed after the German occupation of Hungary. It is most unlikely that the destruction of Hungarian Jewry could have been achieved in the little time available without Zionist collaboration in luring the Jews to board the Auschwitz-bound trains in a lightning operation that took them out of Hungary just in time before the arrival of the Red Army.

The Zionist leaders were opposed to publicising the news about the ongoing murder of Jews because they believed that such publicity would have served to distract attention from ‘Hebraisation’ of the land of Palestine, that is, clearing the land of the Arabs.

Keeping doors shut to Jews

For the same twisted reason, during this time there were Zionists furiously busy organising to keep the doors shut to Jews fleeing Nazi persecution in every country except Palestine. In Britain they were instrumental in defeating a Parliamentary motion in January 1943 aimed at rescuing the threatened Jews. The argument of the Zionist leadership was: “Every nation has its dead in the fight for its homeland—the sufferers under Hitler are our dead in our fight”!

Persecuted Jews were barred from entering the US during this time by a combination of anti-semitism of State Department officials (Assistant Secretary of State Breckeridge Long was a notorious anti-semite), supported by Lawrence Steinhardt, one of very few Jews who at the time were in an important position in the US Foreign Service. A director of the American Federation of Zionists and

afterwards of the American Zionist Commonwealth in the 1920s, Steinhardt achieved notoriety for his unrelenting support for the State Department’s anti-refugee stance. He opposed large-scale immigration of Eastern European Jews, declaring them as totally unfit to become American citizens, characterising them as lawless, scheming, defiant and unassimilable.

Selective immigration

Even as regards Jewish immigration into Palestine, the Zionists aimed for selective immigration to build a Jewish state, not at rescuing Jews fleeing extermination. And the policy of selective immigration had been firmly in place long before the war, with German awareness of what this policy meant for those not selected. Not for nothing did Chaim Weizmann, first President of Israel, speaking at the 20th Zionist Congress in 1937, make this nauseating statement:

“...the hopes of six million Jews are centred on emigration...I was asked, ‘But can you bring six million Jews to Palestine? I replied, ‘No’ ...In the depth of the Jewish tragedy—I want to save two million of youth...The old ones will pass, they will bear their fate or they will not. They are dust, economic and moral dust in a cruel world...Only a remnant shall survive...we have to accept it”²⁸⁾.

It is this heartless tradition which provides the explanation for Kastner’s actions, as well as their defence by the Supreme Court and the government of Israel. In his defence of Kastner, the Attorney General of Israel, Chaim Cohen, appealed to this tradition:

“...It has always been our Zionist tradition to select the few out of many in arranging the immigration to Palestine...Are we therefore to be called traitors?”²⁹⁾.

“The answer to Chaim Cohen’s question is ‘YES!’—for continuing to ‘select’ the few out of many in arranging the Immigration to Palestine’, during

the Holocaust, when the problem was how to get the many to any haven that would have them—Zionists are ‘therefore to be called traitors’.

“It was not a great jump from Weizmann’s description of the masses of European Jews as ‘economic and moral dust in a cruel world’, to the Supreme Court of Israel’s majority Judgment that Kastner was entitled to mislead the Hungarian Jews about Auschwitz, because:

“‘The Hungarian Jew was a branch which long ago dried up on the tree’.

“And:

“‘This was a big Jewish community in Hungary without any ideological Jewish backbone’ (i.e. not much Zionism)³⁰.

“As Ben Hecht remarks, it was not a much greater jump from there to Dr. Goebbels diary entry in 1943:

“‘In our Nazi attitude, toward the Jews, there must be no squeamish sentimentalism’.

“Indeed, as Ben Hecht also remarks, the sneer and belittlement of Dr. Goebbels who wrote ‘The Jews deserve the catastrophe that has now overtaken them’, seems to echo in the voice of the Attorney General of the State of Israel who says:

“‘For those and millions of Jews like them there came true the old curse. ‘And, lo, they were meant to be taken like sheep for slaughter, for killing, for destruction, for crushing and shame.’ There was no spirit in them. The Jewish masses in Warsaw were in the same condition’³¹.

“This basically Nazi philosophy, displayed here towards Jews instead of Arabs, helps explain how the concept of saving the few at the expense of the many led Zionists to become the most suitable collaborators for the Nazis in administering the Jewish Councils or Judenrat in the ghettos...”³².

A shared racist philosophy

The Nazi-Zionist collaboration was not accidental, nor a matter of isolated individual actions. It arose

logically from shared aims. The Nazis wanted a Jewish-free Germany and Europe. The Zionists wanted to get them to Palestine. When confronted with the choice between saving the masses of European Jews from persecution and extinction, on the one hand, and building the so-called national home, on the other, the Zionist leadership unflinching chose the latter. This is made perfectly clear in a letter from David Ben Gurion, Israel’s first prime minister, to the Zionist Executive on 7 December 1938, in which he stated that saving Jewish lives from Hitler was a potential threat to Zionism unless the Jews thus saved were brought to Palestine.

“When Zionism had to choose between the Jews and the Jewish state, it unhesitatingly preferred the latter”³³.

No decent person, Jew or non-Jew, can shut their eyes to the collaboration of the Zionist leadership. In his book *Perfidy*, written principally to expose the Israeli government’s support and defence of Kastner, Ben Hecht, an extreme revisionist Zionist of the Menachem Begin variety, and hardly a friend of the Palestinians, felt obliged to say:

“Such a book was not easy for me to write. For the heart of a Jew must be filled with astonishment as well as outrage ... that a brother should be so 91 perfidious”³⁴.

Elie Wiesel, who reviewed the manuscript for *Yediot Aharonot* of 4 April 1959, cited Ben Hecht as saying: “the best known, most respected leaders of Zionism—were actually criminals”. Wiesel went on:

“Somehow, my typewriter refuses to write about Weizmann and about the heads of the Jewish Agency who helped the Germans to destroy European Jewry”³⁵.

Anyone, even a Zionist, with an open mind and a tinge of decency would have to agree with Ben Hecht’s conclusion: honourable human behaviour would have been of deeper worth to the world than a dozen States of Israel³⁶.

The state of Israel is often talked about as some

entity “for which six million Jews died”. Although a lot of Jews died, they were not martyrs who died for the Zionist ‘cause’. Apart from being simply untrue, the propaganda of Zionists, as well as their imperialist backers, on the question of the holocaust, it is unbearably offensive to anti-Zionist Jews, for, in the words of Isaac Deutscher:

“It should be realised that the great majority of Eastern European Jews were, up to the outbreak of the second world war, opposed to Zionism. This is a fact of which most Jews and non-Jews in the West are seldom aware. The Zionists in our part of the world were a significant minority, but they never succeeded in attracting a majority of their co-religionists. The most fanatical enemies of Zionism were precisely the workers, those who spoke Yiddish, those who considered themselves Jews; they were the most determined opponents of the idea of an emigration from Eastern Europe to Palestine”³⁷⁾.

Fight against imperialism

These were the folk who were exterminated by the Nazis on an industrial scale. The holocaust victims perished not in order that a ‘Jewish state’ be established. They were simply murdered in cold blood by the Nazis acting on their sick racist theories. The Nazis murdered millions of Jews, communists, Soviets, Poles, gypsies and others in one of the greatest crimes against humanity. The Nazi ideology was the product of crisis-ridden imperialism. And the most important lesson for humanity to learn from the holocaust, which claimed the lives of 6 million Jews, and of the far greater holocaust with its 50 million dead, an even greater number maimed, and colossal destruction of wealth, namely, the Second World War, was that it too was a product of imperialism. The only way to prevent the recurrence of such tragedies is to overthrow imperialism, for war and genocide cannot be put to an end while this system lasts.

Nazism, far from leading to the “rejuvenation of the Jewry”, as is often claimed by the Zionists and their apologists, led to the mass murder of Jews. “The shock and demoralisation, and also amoralisation suffered by the survivors of the holocaust goes far to explain how a poisonous ideology like Zionism could, for the first time in history, gain a real mass following among Jews.

“But to call the mass murder of Jews followed by the decline and decadence of traditional universalist Jewish values and the takeover of Jewish community institutions by narrow nationalist zealots, a ‘rejuvenation of Jewry’, takes real gall”³⁸⁾.

In the words of Rabbi Moshe Shonfield: “The first and foremost action [of the Zionists] was to establish the ‘state’ and the masses of Jews merely served as convenient means. And wherever there existed a contradiction between the two, the needs of the masses, and even their salvation, were subordinated to the needs of the state-information”³⁹⁾.

“The author accuses the Zionists of having collaborated in the murder of six million Jews”, stated the orthodox Torah Jews of the ‘Neturei Karta’ in advertising Shonfield’s book The holocaust victims accuse in the New York Times. Whenever the Zionists, or the Zionist state of Israel, are criticised, the Zionist movement has a knee-jerk reaction. If the criticism emanates from non-Jews, they are dubbed anti-semites; if such criticism comes from Jews, they are dismissed as ‘self-hating Jews’. The Zionist movement is busy, with the help of the leading imperialist states, attempting to criminalise every public expression of support for the Palestinian people, any criticism of Israel’s brutal policies and the conditions of apartheid imposed on the Palestinians in their own land. If Zionism collaborated with the German fascists in the 1930s and 1940s, helping the latter in the murder of hundreds of thousands of Jewish people,

it has since the establishment of the state of Israel served as a faithful servant of US imperialism—a dagger pointed at the heart of the Arab democratic and socialist movement. As such, just like its chief patron US imperialism, it has become an enemy of all progressive humanity including especially the Jewish masses. It needs to be fought against and shall be fought against and defeated, however long and arduous the struggle.

Notes

- 1) Dr Hannah Arendt, *Eichmann in Jerusalem*, Viking Press, New York, 1963, pp.59-61
- 2) *ibid.* pp.117-119.
- 3) *ibid.* p.125.
- 4) Hannah Arendt, *The Jew as Pariah*, Grove Press, New York, 1978.
- 5) see Dr Arendt's comments 'The formidable Dr. Robinson - a reply' in the *New York Review of Books* of 26 January 1966.
- 6) *The Jew as Pariah*, p.275.
- 7) *Ibid.*
- 8) cited in Ben Hecht, *Perfidy*, Julian Messner Inc., New York, 1961, pp.261-2.
- 9) Rudolf Verba, cited in Ben Hecht, *Perfidy*, Julian Messner Inc., New York, 1961, pp.260-1.
- 10) A. Eichmann, 'Eichmann tells his own damning story', *Life Magazine*, Volume 49, Number 22, (28 November 1960), pp. 19-25, 101-112; at 22.
- 11) Judgment of Judge Benjamin Halevi, Criminal Case 124/53; Attorney General v. Malchiel Greenwald, District Court, Jerusalem, June 22, 1955.
- 12) *Ibid.*
- 13) 23 June 1955
- 14) 24 June 1955.
- 15) Hecht, p. 268.
- 16) Moshe Shweiger, a Kastner aide in Budapest, protocol 465.
- 17) Hecht, *ibid.*, pp.270-2
- 18) from the minority judgment of Supreme Court Judge, Moshe Silberg, 1957, pp. 273-5.
- 19) Arendt, *The Jew as Pariah*, p.208.
- 20) quoted by Rabbi Moshe Shonfield, *The Holocaust victims accuse*, Neturei Karta, New York, 1977, p.26.
- 21) Yitzhak Greenbaum, *In days of holocaust and destruction* quoted by Rabbi Moshe Shonfield, *The Holocaust victims accuse*, p.26.

- 22) *Ibid.*
- 23) *ibid.* p.70.
- 24) see pp.40-43 of the JAZA pamphlet *Nazi-Zionist collaboration*.
- 25) p.193.
- 26) Shonfeld, *op.cit.* pp.24-25
- 27) 25 May 1964, cited in V Bolshakov, *Anti-communism, the main line of Zionism*, Novosti Press Agency Publishing House, Moscow, 1972, p.40
- 28) *Nazi-Zionist collaboration*, p.54.
- 29) quoted in Ben Hecht, *op.cit.*, pp.194-5.
- 30) Hecht p.271.
- 31) *ibid.* p.149. (Court records, CC124/53 Jerusalem District Court.
- 32) *Zionist-Nazi collaboration*, p.55.
- 33) see Arie Bober (ed.), *The other Israel: the radical case against Zionism*, Anchor Books, New York, 1972, p.171.
- 34) Hecht, *op.cit.*, p.vi.
- 35) Shonfeld, *op.cit.* pp. 105-6.
- 36) see Hecht, p.193.
- 37) Isaac Deutscher, *The non-Jewish Jew and other essays*, Oxford University Press, London, 1968.
- 38) *Nazi-Zionist collaboration*, p.79.
- 39) *I accuse from the depths*, cited in *Nazi-Zionist collaboration*, p.81.

Comments on the article “Still on the World Anti-Imperialist Platform” by Ivan Pinheiro

Gabriel Martinez (Brazilian communist living in China)

Ivan Pinheiro, a Brazilian communist leader and former secretary-general of the Brazilian Communist Party (PCB), recently published an article in which he expressed his concern about his party’s participation in meetings of the World Anti-imperialist Platform. In his words, Pinheiro fears that this participation “will drive us further and further away from the revolutionary camp of the communist parties”. I will not go into the internal contradictions that exist within the PCB—now exposed by its former secretary general—but I will make some comments on the position of Pinheiro and a significant portion of the international communist movement in relation to the conflict between Russia and Nato.

Contrary to what Pinheiro advocates, moving away from the revolutionary camp means, precisely, refusing to create an anti-imperialist bloc that openly condemns the siege and containment campaign promoted by US imperialism against Russia and China.

At the beginning of his article, Ivan Pinheiro seeks to assess the composition of the parties that participate in the Platform. According to him, these would be “organisations, including communist, social-democratic and nationalist parties, collectives and movements, some also recently established”. Pinheiro observes that few of the communist parties have “some connection with the international communist movement”.¹⁾

From this excerpt, it is possible to identify an interesting logic underlying Pinheiro’s argument. For him, the criterion for determining whether a party is part of the international communist movement is whether or not it participates in the International Meeting of Communist and

Workers Parties, an initiative initially convened by the Communist Party of Greece (KKE). In other words, for Pinheiro, communist parties that do not participate in this movement cannot be considered members of the international communist movement. An overly formalist conception of the “international communist movement”.

Pinheiro continues his argument revealing a question that he raised in debates within his party:

“There is a demand for an unavoidable collective debate for communists: what is imperialism today? And it can only be resolved successfully if preceded by another decisive debate: what has become of the so-called Chinese ‘market socialism’? Without it, we could not understand, as a collective, the war in Ukraine or Lula’s spectacular visit to China.”²⁾

For a good understanding, it is clear what Pinheiro is trying to take forward with such questioning. Under the pretext of the need to analyse China and “market socialism”, Pinheiro seeks to covertly suggest that it is necessary to begin to characterise China as an imperialist country, like the communist parties with which the former secretary-general identifies himself (Communist Party of Mexico and Communist Party of Greece).

These parties began to characterise China as an imperialist country, based on the revisionist and reactionary theory created by the Communist Party of Greece of the so-called “imperialist pyramid”. Being a ‘left’ opportunist revision of the Leninist theory of imperialism, this theory advocates that the essential element of imperialism would no longer be the division of the world between a handful of oppressing countries and the oppressed countries, but rather that the world is organised in a kind of “pyramid”, where the difference between

the various countries would be the role played by each country within that pyramid (strong and weak capitalism), however, all of them being imperialist.

In practice, what the Communist Party of Greece does by sponsoring the propagation of this type of reactionary theory is to divert the focus and attention of the communist and revolutionary parties from organising the fight against US and European imperialism, creating false polemics inside of the international communist movement, seeking to distance the parties from the decisive support of the remaining socialist countries, objectively strengthening the argument of the true imperialists who seek to sell the theory of the “new yellow peril” and condemning China’s supposed attempts to dominate the world.

In this sense, anyone who has closely followed the controversies that have been raging within the international communist movement for more than a decade knows that when Pinheiro raises this type of question (debating what has become of Chinese market socialism), his intention is not really to debate the problems and challenges posed to the construction of socialism in China, but rather to introduce within his organisation the idea that China is an imperialist country.

At another point in his article, Pinheiro discusses the nature of the war in Ukraine. Without going into the question in depth, Pinheiro repeats an excerpt from a note published by his party, which states that the war in Ukraine should be seen as a “divisional war” that “does not interest the workers”. I will not go into the merits of analysing the content of the PCB note, but rather the controversy that Pinheiro seeks to wage with an excerpt from one of the declarations of the World Anti-imperialist Platform, which correctly states that “Russia and China are not aggressive imperialist powers, on the contrary, they are the target of our enemies because they stand in the way of complete US global domination.”³⁾

For Pinheiro, this would be a wrong decision, since “the form, the struggle against imperialism boils down to the form of its exercise and not to its nature, thus bringing the illusion that the peaceful side of the powers in dispute will never resort to the force of their weapons, except for their own defensive purposes or out of mere humanitarian solidarity with weaker countries.”²⁾

The issue that may have gone unnoticed by Pinheiro is not the need to support one imperialism to fight another, but the fact that, contrary to what the neo-Trotskyists claim, Russia and China are not imperialist countries.

Obviously, the comrades of the parties that subscribe to the theses of the Communist Party of Greece will not be able to accept this statement. Pinheiro still finds time to argue, stating that the main contradiction in the world today is between “capital and labour” and not between the imperialist bloc led by Nato (the only existing imperialism in the world) and the “mass of suffering humanity” (classes exploited and oppressed of all countries), as defined by the Platform.⁴⁾

How to resolve the contradiction between capital and labour without first seeking to defeat US imperialism and all its allies (main pillars of imperialist domination at a global level) is something that Pinheiro, evidently, does not seek to answer in his text. Instead of approaching the problem of the struggle against imperialism from a concrete analysis of reality, dealing with a fundamental problem that faces every revolutionary movement—namely, that an eventual military defeat of the western imperialist bloc would impose an important defeat to the capitalist system as a whole—Pinheiro prefers to resort to a formulation that does not concretely deal with the dilemmas faced by the working masses and cannot mobilise them in the fight against imperialism.

One last comment made by Ivan Pinheiro that

deserves to be examined is his statement that the creation of the World Anti-imperialist Platform could end up resulting in the “division of the international communist movement”.

First of all, it is necessary to point out that the international communist movement, in practice, is already divided. The fact that not all the world’s communist parties participated in such a meeting proves this. Secondly, how can Pinheiro be concerned here with the “unity of the international communist movement” while he himself affirms in passages of his text to support a so-called “revolutionary camp” that operates within the scope of IMCWP?

Can some parties create parallel organisations, with their publications and specific meetings, while others cannot? Wasn’t that precisely what the KKE did when it decided to create the so-called European Communist Initiative and the International Communist Magazine? Why would there be a danger of “splitting” the IMCWP in one initiative and not in the other? Here again is something that Pinheiro’s article does not answer.

In conclusion, it is crucial to emphasise the importance of unity in the international communist movement. However, we face an increasing challenge in achieving this unity, as hegemonist and exclusivist currents gain ground. Furthermore, obtaining unity in the international communist movement also becomes quite complicated when theories and conceptions alien to Marxism-Leninism predominate, as is the case of the so-called ‘imperialist pyramid theory’.

Notes

1) Contrary to what Ivan Pinheiro claims, most of the parties that participated in the meetings of the Platform also participate in the International Meeting of Communist and Workers’ Parties (the only international communist movement, in Pinheiro’s opinion). Examples: Communist Party of Bohemia and Moravia, Socialist Workers Party of Croatia, Communist Party of Poland, Communist Party (Italy), Italian Communist Party, New Communist Party of Yugoslavia, Russian Communist Workers Party, Hungarian Workers’ Party, Communist

Party (Switzerland), Communist Party of the Peoples of Spain, Peruvian Communist Party, Communist Party of Brazil, Communist Party of Bolivia, Lebanese Communist Party, People’s Party of Panama, Communist Party of Argentina.

2) ‘Still on the so-called Anti-Imperialist Platform’ by Ivan Pinheiro, 3 June 2023.

3) Caracas International Conference, ‘La Marea Creciente Global De La Guerra’, March 2023; Caracas International Conference ‘The rising tide of global war’, March 2023.

4) Seoul declaration: ‘The rising tide of global war in east Asia’, May 2023.

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

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

The "big" Russian banking

Although the CPG does not see very capable of delving into the background of facts and actual data and, therefore, as we have seen in the previous sections, of thus applying theoretical thought to concrete practice, it seems to us that it does manage to grasp certain theoretical aspects of Leninist thought on imperialism, such as, for example, that finance capital was a product of the process of monopolization of social production in the countries that had an early development of the capitalist mode of production to such an extent that banking monopoly capital ended up merging with industrial and commercial monopoly capital, or that this process became evident at the beginning of the last century, or also that the amounts of capital which were and still are concentrated in fewer and fewer owners due to this process of monopolization allow them (the owners of this capital) to invest it abroad, or also that from this fact emanates the imperialist character of the countries which export such capitals abroad in immeasurable amounts.

*"By far the most important economic factor," said Hobson, "in Imperialism is the influence relating to investments. The growing cosmopolitanism of capital is the greatest economic change of this generation. Every advanced industrial nations is tending to place a larger share of its capital outside the limits of its own political area, in foreign countries, or in colonies, and to draw a growing income from this sources."*¹⁾

However, well the CPG seems to understand these aspects, in our opinion it does not seem to have adequately grasped the importance that Lenin's theory of imperialism attaches to banking.

In this sense, i.e., in terms of a correct understanding of the imperialist phase of capitalism, it is important to understand that the fusion of banking, commercial and industrial monopoly capital does not represent a fusion in which these three central spheres of the economy have acquired the same degree of importance in national and world economic activity. Hilferding pointed out that the concentration of production transformed the role of banking, which was previously small and dependent on the industrial sector and focused on intermediating payments between industry and commerce, into a monopoly which now directs economic activity. The merger of monopoly banking capital with monopoly industrial and commercial capital gave rise to finance capital, which was not only the result of this unification, but placed the guiding axis of national economies in the banking sector, or more precisely in the financial sector.

Hilferding, in his meticulous words, pointed out:

*“Finance capital means the unification of capital. The formerly separate spheres of industrial, commercial and banking capital are now placed under the common direction of high finance, in which the lords of industry and banking have unified in intimate personal union. This union has as its basis the superseding of the free competition of the individual capitalist by the great monopolistic associations. With it naturally changes the relation of the capitalist class to the power of the State.”*²⁾

And:

“The dependence of industry on the banks is then a consequence of property relations. An ever-increasing part of the capital of industry does not belong to the industrialists, who use it. They

*receive the disposal of the capital only through the bank, which represents the owner vis-à-vis them. On the other hand, the bank must fix an ever-increasing part of its capital in the industry. It thus becomes industrial capitalist to an ever-increasing degree. I name bank capital, i.e. capital in the form of money, which is thus transformed into industrial capital, finance capital. In the eyes of its owners it always retains the form of money, is placed by them in the form of money capital, in interest-bearing capital, and can always again be withdrawn in the form of money. In truth, however, the greater part of the capital thus placed in the banks is transformed into industrial capital, into productive capital (means of production and labor power) and fixed in the process of production. An ever increasing part of the capital used in industry is financial capital, capital at the disposal of the banks and in use by the industrialists.”*³⁾

Or in Lenin's illuminating words:

“The principal and primary function of banks is to serve as middlemen in the making of payments. In so doing they transform inactive money capital into active, that is, into capital yielding a profit; they collect all kinds of money revenues and place them at the disposal of the capitalist class.

*As banking develops and becomes concentrated in a small number of establishments, the banks grow from modest middlemen into powerful monopolies having at their command almost the whole of the money capital of all the capitalists and small businessmen and also the larger part of the means of production and sources of raw materials in any one country and in a number of countries. This transformation of numerous modest middlemen into a handful of monopolists is one of the fundamental processes in the growth of capitalism into capitalist imperialism; for this reason we must first of all examine the concentration of banking.”*⁴⁾

Therefore, the study of the imperialist character of a country and the understanding of finance capital

pass inescapably through the study of the banking or financial sector.

Today it is the bank, or rather the financial institution, which controls the greater part (or even the totality) of national and international commerce and industry. But not all capital circulating in and between today's economies is finance capital, even if it is the dominant capital and forms the backbone of capitalism today. If this sector falters, i.e., goes into crisis, national economies are threatened by a real systemic collapse. This is why governments around the world have carried out dozens of multi-billion dollar bank bailouts over the past two or three decades, in which nation states have used the entire population's money to save their countries' big banks from total collapse.⁵⁾

Now, not all capital circulating nationally and globally is financial capital, just as not every country that has a banking sector possesses financial capital, and therefore not every country fulfills one of the conditions necessary to become an imperialist country.

The CPG and its non-dialectical method of analysis, which elevates the capitalist mode of production to imperialism, errs again in supposing that every country with a banking sector is imperialist.

Most, if not all countries have a national banking sector that is a driver of the economy, but not financial capital. This is, as we have seen, that capital which arises from the fusion of gigantic monopoly capitals of the banking, commercial and industrial sectors, which, because of its capacity to accumulate all the monetary capital and even the wages of the workers, organizes the economy around itself, that is, around the financial or banking sector, and which, because of its enormous size, can be exported abroad in colossal quantities.

The only thing of all this understanding of Lenin on finance capital that the CPG is able to take into account, either for lack of understanding of

this theory or because it wants to underhandedly “adapt” Lenin’s theory to its “theory” of “the imperialist pyramid”, is the fact that a country possesses a bank. According to the CPG, and faithful to its linear and somewhat myopic analytical capacity, the fact that a country possesses a bank makes it directly an imperialist country.

Russia owns a banking sector. Therefore, it would be imperialist.

To verify the CPG assessment of Russia let us take a look at the Russian banking system and compare it with the banking systems of the imperialist countries:

Banki.ru 2022 Russia		
Pos.	Bank	Assets in Billion USD
	All 359 Russian banks	1234.1
1	Sberbank	413.4
2	VTB	64.9
3	Gazprombank	209.6
4	NCC (National Clearing Center)	209.6
5	Alfa Bank	209.6
6	Credit Bank of Moscow (MKB)	209.6
7	Otkritie Bank	209.6

Table 1: Assets of the 7 largest banks in Russia according to Banki.ru 2022 plus the total value of assets of the 359 Russian banks

In Russia there are a total of 359 banks⁶⁾ with total assets in rubles of RUB 116,745,701,314,000, which corresponds to about USD 1,234,700 millions⁷⁾. The largest Russian bank, Sberbank, has assets of about USD 413,410 billions. Alfa-Bank in turn has assets of USD 64,920 thousand and VTB has assets of approximately USD 209,5700 thousand. These values seem enormous.

What is the reality of banks in imperialist countries?

Let us begin by looking at the magnitudes of US banks. For this purpose we have selected from the Forbes 2023 list the 7 largest banks in the United

States:

Forbes 2023 USA		
Pos.	Banco	Assets in Billion USD
1	JPMorgan Chase	3,744.3
2	Bank of America	3,194.7
24	Citigroup	2,455.1
17	Wells Fargo	1,886.4
33	Goldman Sachs Group	1,538.4
30	Morgan Stanley	1,199.9
132	US Bancorp	682.4

Table 2: Assets of the 7 largest U.S. banks according to the Forbes 2023 list

Since Forbes 2023 data excludes Russia and Banki.ru data is only published until 2022, we are forced to compare Russia's 2022 data with the other countries' 2023 data. But, for the purposes of this article, this is more than sufficient due to the sheer magnitude of the values analyzed. On such a scale, variations and inaccuracies are negligible.

The table on the left side shows that JPMorgan Chase Bank has assets totaling about USD 3,744.3 billion, i.e., it is a whopping 300% (i.e., 3(!) times larger) than all Russian banks combined! Or to put it differently, the combined assets of all Russian banks make just 30% of JPMorgan Chase bank, including the three largest Russian banks, Sberbank, Alfa-Bank and VTB. What "gigantic monopolies"! And so we can continue with the figures. Bank of America accounts for 250% of all Russian banks, Citigroup for about 190%, Wells Fargo for 150%, Goldman Sachs Group for 120%, Morgan Stanley for 90% and US Bancorp for 50% of all Russian banks.

Another factor to consider is that the total assets of Russian banks amounted to USD 3,347.72 billion in 2017. In that year, the total number of Russian banks was 614. Today, in 2023, the total assets of all

Russian banks combined have shrunk by about a third (to about USD 1,234.7 billion). The difference between the total of Russian banks and the largest US banks was in 2017 smaller. The combined or total assets of Russian banks still exceeded the US monopoly banks, also the largest ones, i.e. JP Morgan Chase and Bank of America. This is no longer the case in 2023 which means that the gap between Russian banking and US banking has been on the rise.

Let us now compare Russian banks with the other imperialist banks.

The following table lists the assets of the largest banks of the imperialist countries and compares them with the assets of Russian banks as a whole. The results do not match the CPG valuations.

For example, for the case of Germany we note that Deutsche Bank's assets account for more than 110% of the assets of the 359 Russian banks. In 2017, Russian banks still exceeded Deutsche Bank's total assets, indicating that the gap between "big" Russian banking and (really) big German banking has widened here as well. Commerzbank's total assets represent about 40% of the total assets of all Russian banks. The assets of EnBW Energie Baden-Württemberg⁸⁾ 7%, Wüstenrot & Württembergische 5%, Deutsche Pfandbriefbank almost 5% and Aareal Bank 4% of all assets of the 359 Russian banks. Although these figures are small compared to U.S. banks or Deutsche Bank, it is remarkable that a single bank can be compared to more than 300 banks of a country, which shows that the German banking system is powerful compared to the Russian one. If we compare the largest bank in Russia with the largest bank in Germany, i.e. the "giant" Sberbank (of which we already know that 50% is state-owned) and Deutsche Bank, we see that the latter is more than three times larger than Sberbank. Commerzbank also exceeds Sberbank and represents 120% of Sberbank.

Forbes 2023 Germany				Forbes 2023 USA				Forbes 2023 Japan						
Pos.	Banco	Activos en Mil Millones de USD	Rus/AI	AI/Rus	Pos.	Banco	Activos en Mil Millones de USD	Rus/EEUU	EEUU/Rus	Pos.	Banco	Activos en Mil Millones de USD	Rus/Jap	Jap/Rus
188.	Deutsche Bank	1,419.8	86.9	115.0	1	JPMorgan Chase	3,744.3	33.0	303.4	91	Mitsubishi UFJ Financial	2,966.3	41.6	240.4
474.	Commerzbank	525.0	235.1	42.5	2	Bank of America	3,194.7	38.6	258.9	143	Japan Post Holdings	2,228.1	55.4	180.5
293.	EnBW-Energie Baden	87.9	1,403.5	7.1	24	Citigroup	2,455.1	50.3	198.9	85	Sumitomo Mitsui Financial	2,005.7	61.5	162.5
1587.	Wuestenrot & Wueritem	70.3	1,754.4	5.7	17	Wells Fargo	1,886.4	65.4	152.9	152	Mizuho Financial	1,908.3	64.7	154.6
1833.	Deutsche Pfandbriefba	56.6	2,181.5	4.6	33	Goldman Sachs Group	1,538.4	80.2	124.7	656	Nomura	358.9	343.8	29.1
1893.	Aareal Bank	50.5	2,443.2	4.1	30	Morgan Stanley	1,199.9	102.8	97.2	442	Sotbank	320.9	384.5	26.0
					132	US Bancorp	682.4	180.8	55.3	1529	Concordia Financial Group	187.0	660.0	15.2
										1517	Chibaank	146.3		

Forbes 2023 France				Forbes 2023 Canada				Forbes 2023 Italy						
Pos.	Banco	Activos en Mil Millones de USD	Rus/Fra	Fra/Rus	Pos.	Banco	Activos en Mil Millones de USD	Rus/Can	Can/Rus	Pos.	Banco	Activos en Mil Millones de USD	Rus/Ita	Ita/Rus
33	BNP Paribas	2,845.7	43.4	230.6	38	RBC	1,448.7	85.2	117.4	112	Intesa Sanpaolo	1,037.8	118.9	84.1
129	Credit Agricole	2,313.4	53.3	187.5	43	TD Bank Group	1,445.1	85.4	117.1	176	UniCredit	915.5	134.8	74.2
314	Société Générale	1,586.8	77.8	128.6	88	Bank of Nova Scotia	1,030.0	119.8	83.5	1010	BPER Banca	162.5	759.2	13.2
314	Société Générale	1,586.8	77.8	128.6	84	Bank of Montreal	858.6	143.7	69.6	1010	BPER Banca	162.5	759.2	13.2
48	AXA Group	701.3	176.0	56.8	183	Canadian Imperial Bank	691.0	178.6	56.0	1585	Banca MPS	128.4	961.3	10.4
129	VINCI	119.5	1,032.5	9.7	373	National Bank of Canada	313.5	393.6	25.4	1028	Mediobanca	100.0	1,233.6	8.1
1066	Financiere de l'Odé	57.6	2,141.0	4.7	250	Sun Life Financial	240.7	512.7	19.5	917	Unipol Gruppo	78.7	1,567.3	6.4
					449	Fairfax Financial	79.0	1,561.9	6.4	1747	Credito Emiliano	69.4	1,777.7	5.6
					498	Intact Financial	43.7	2,822.0	3.5	1799	Banca Popolare di Sondrio	61.7	1,998.8	5.0

Forbes 2023 United Kingdom				
Pos.	Banco	Activos en Mil Millones de USD	Rus/RU	RU/Rus
20	HSBC Holdings	2,989.7	41.3	242.3
164	Barclays	1,903.0	64.8	154.2
147	Lloyds Banking Group	1,095.2	112.7	88.7
255	Standard Chartered	820.7	150.4	66.5
1109	Aviva	363.6	339.4	29.5
1357	St. James's Place	182.4	676.5	14.8
660	Prudential	163.1	756.5	13.2

Table 3: Assets of the biggest banks of the seven imperialist countries according to the Forbes 2023 list.

The largest UK bank, HSBC Holdings, has total assets equal to 240% of the total assets of the 359 Russian banks. The same data is 150% for Barclays Bank, just over 80% for Lloyds Bankin Group, around 60% for Standard Chartered, around 10% for Prudential, over 20% for Aviva and just over 10% for St James's Place.

If you compare the UK's largest bank, HSBC Holdings, with Sberbank, the largest Russian bank, the figure is no less than just over 700%. In the case of Barclays, this data is over 400%. Lloyds Bankin Group's assets is over 200% and Standard Chartered's is almost 200% of the assets of all the Russian banks. The differences are gigantic. In the United Kingdom, too, the gap between Russian and British banks has widened.

The same trend is true for Japan, Canada, the United Kingdom and Italy... Sorry, in the case of Italy, as can be seen from the table above, this is not true. This is the only case in which the total assets of the 359 Russian banks manage to exceed an imperialist bank (see highlighted in red in the table).

What Russian "imperialism"!

The truth is that the CPG's blunder about the Russian banking system is no longer so surprising. What is really shocking is the terrible fact that a single bank of an imperialist country is capable of outperforming the entire banking system of another country.

Is a weak banking system bad?

From the perspective of a country's striving to be imperialist, it is certainly so. An imperialist country must have a strong banking system and a strong financial system in general because monopoly capital establishes itself in this sector to control the whole economy of the country. When the monopoly sector of the economy has under its control the reins of production and distribution of the country, the function of the State is reduced to its natural function: that of protecting private property and securing and maintaining the domination of one class over another. On the other hand, a weak banking system is a sign of three possible situations:

- of an economically weak country dependent on and colonized by finance capital (i.e. by imperialist monopoly capital),

- of a State which, despite the capitalist character of the country's mode of production, is more or less able to intervene in the economy in accordance with the national interest,

- of both situations simultaneously.

The latter is the case in Russia.

However, from the point of view of a state's ability to cope with the growing systemic crises currently rooted in the financial system, a weak banking system is highly desirable, unless it is controlled by the state (as is the case in Russia). However, a "weak" financial system needs to be "compensated" by a strong industry, at least if the country's claim is to achieve increasing degrees of national independence from imperialism. In this sense, we believe that the Russian government has partly succeeded in strengthening the country's productive capacities. Nonetheless, we would like to see this tendency much more accentuated, because in the present circumstances, in which imperialism seeks to unleash a war against Russia and China, a war that from there will spread to all the peoples of the world, Russia's (re)industrialization efforts do not yet seem to us to be sufficient. A Russia with a strong productive base, a bank at the service of national industrial development under strong state control, is in the interest of all the peoples of the world, because a Russia capable of opposing imperialism is the greatest support that the peoples can receive in their own struggle against imperialism. It is for this reason that we find the ideas spread by the CPG extremely harmful.

Whoever has understood the above, will not be astonished by the statements of the Russian president at the XXI Congress of the United Russia party in which he pointed out that Russia will not give up its sovereignty in exchange for "sausages". Russia will be a sovereign and autarkic power or it will not exist. Western "recipes" will not work against Russia. Russia, he also pointed out, will make all decisions on its own, without being

pushed into it by the outside. Russia has the right and the vital need to be strong. The magnitude of the historical tasks facing Russia requires the unity of all patriotic forces in the country.

What kind of imperialism is that which seeks to develop a sovereign and autarkic economy and not to allow itself to be dictated by Western "recipes"?

An imperialism that is not.

In the next section we will analyze the distribution of military bases in the world.

Notes

1) Hobson, J. A., "Imperialism, a study (1902)", James Pott & Company, 1902, p. 56 and 57.

2) Hilferding, Rudolf, "Das Finanzkapital. Eine Studie über die jüngste Entwicklung des Kapitalismus" (in English: "Finance Capital: A Study in the Latest Phase of Capitalist Development"), Dietz Verlag, Berlin, 1955, p. 445, own translation into English.

3) Hilferding, Rudolf, op. cit. "Das Finanzkapital. Eine Studie..." p. 335

4) Lenin, V. I., "Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism, a popular outline".

5) The latest case: According to Bloomberg and the Wall Street Journal, following the closure and receivership of Silicon Valley Bank (US) and Signature Bank (US) and the bailout of Credit Suisse (Switzerland), the US financial authorities (Fed and FDIC) provided dollars to central banks in other countries: the Bank of England, the Bank of Japan, the ECB, the Bank of Canada and the Swiss National Bank. These banks will have access to hundreds of billions of dollars by the end of April to help cushion 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 highly toxic (derivatives). Credit Suisse exemplifies the whole unhealthy structure of finance in the NATO-dominated world.

6) Banki.ru, as of February 2022.

"The rating (ranking) of Russian banks by key performance indicators is calculated according to Banki.ru's methodology using the reports of Russian credit institutions published on the Bank of Russia's website.

The latest rating update date is February 1, 2022. According to the Bank of Russia's decision of March 6, 2022, from February 2022 banks will not be required to publish accounting (financial) statements according to Russian standards."

7) <https://es.investing.com/currencies/usd-rub-historical-data>

8) At BW Energie Baden Württemberg AG, he is responsible for managing the corporate functions of human resources, finance and liquidity, corporate communications and group development.

Aspects of the national question and anti-imperialism during WWII

Dimitrios Patelis | Revolutionary Unification (Greece)

Contents

- Introduction
- Nationalities, nations, classes and the logic of history
- Nation and capitalism. Imperialism and the national question
- Socialist revolutions, the national question and anti-imperialism
- The national question and anti-imperialism: from WWII to WWII
- From formal to actual independence and sovereignty
- Opportunism working consistently at the service of the imperialist axis
- In conclusion

Introduction

As the ongoing Third World War is escalating, the interconnection between the national, the transnational and the global is being brought to the surface in an increasingly dramatic way. States and coalitions of states are involved in this conflict. Some states are primarily comprised of a single nation, while others are multinational. The causes or pretexts of the tensions and fronts of the war are presented as national claims, irredentism, aspirations and claims for national independence and sovereignty or voluntary submission to dependent relations of subordination, confrontations for the imposition of whichever 'order of things' is beneficial to imperialism.

In this context, the imperialist dominators either ignore some nations altogether, or even treat them in the most cynical way, as objects for manipulation, instrumentalisation (in proxy wars) and genocide. In dominant narratives, nationalist

and racist ideologies of the 'superiority' of a certain nation or nations over the 'inferiority' of others are also emerging in view.

Suddenly, nations, peoples and states are 'discovered', 'invented', 'constructed', 'reconstructed' or deconstructed, dismantled and annihilated en masse, depending on the circumstances, in accordance to the dominant interests, objectives and balance of forces.

Several questions therefore arise: what is a nation? When and from where did the nation emerge historically? How is it related to the whole of economic, social, political, ideological, cultural, etc. determinants of the totality of society? How is the national question related to class struggle? How is the national question transformed by the socialist revolutions and the anti-colonial struggle? What is the position and role of the nation and the national question today? How is the rapid change in the global balance of power portrayed at the level of vulgar social psychology and ideological constructions? Does the demand for self-determination of nations constitute an absolute ahistorical principle? Is every national movement worthy of internationalist solidarity?

These questions, the degree and manner of their realisation, dictate the need for some remarks from the point of view of Marxist-Leninist theory and practice, in awareness of the difficulty of the issues at hand and the necessity of vigilance and discourse.

Nationalities, nations, classes and the logic of history

History is an objective process governed by laws. The emergence of the logic of history allows us to

view the historical process as a contradictory course of gradual transformation of predominantly natural (biological, geographical, ecological, climatological, etc.) ties and conditions into purely social ones, during which the former are dialectically ‘sublated’ by the latter (see V.A. Vaziulin: *The Logic of History*). In this process, various formations and categorisations of the population are constituted, reconstructed, transformed, interact, or are even eradicated (especially in pre-Capitalist formations) where relations of natural origin initially predominate: blood ties, relations to the community (tribal—clan, territorial and agricultural) that is gradually transformed by the rise of private property.

It is absolutely essential to identify the general direction of ethnogenesis through the prism of dialectical laws, the logic of history.

With the emergence of private property and antagonistic classes, begins the transformation of natural ties of origin (tribes, clans etc.). As long as the latter have not been fully transformed, they do not simply coexist idly as parts of the same mechanism alongside social classes (constituted according to the dominant form of private property), but are interwoven with them and (to the extent that they are differentiated from them) interact with them organically. Established and hereditarily transmitted hierarchical relations (slave-ownership, feudalism) are constituted on the basis of relations of natural origin (preserved in class society in a sublated /transformed form).

Class socio-economic formations constitute gradients of interaction/transformation of the community from the successive historical forms of private property, until the essential ‘sublation’ of the former, when the latter acquires a basis corresponding to itself (under capitalism), when classes reach their most developed form. In these formations, population groups—historical communities of people—that fluctuate in historical

space and time play a formative structural role: from packs, to the forager clans and tribes of the primitive community (initially nomadic hunter/gatherers and herders and then permanently settled farmers), to slave-owning communities (from city-states to empires), feudal peasant communities under serfdom and feudal monarchies/empires (as associations of feuds and feudal dominions), peoples, ethnic groups/nationalities and finally nations.

The nation is not ‘constructed’, but is shaped as a contradictory formation under capitalism (by overcoming feudal fragmentation) with the constitution of unified economic ties (internal market of the nation-state), geographic territory and language (‘direct reality of cognition’, ‘practical consciousness’—K. Marx). It is on this objective historical basis that any common elements of intellectual life, intellectual culture, consciousness, ideology and so on are rooted, but also the contradictory nature of every national civilization connected with class struggle (in every ‘national’ civilization there are two civilizations—V.I. Lenin). Any reconfigurations of this objective basis also reconfigure the contradictory formation of the nation. The ideologies put forward by the ruling class also stem from the same objective basis.

To summarize the above, let’s look at a concise definition: a nation is a historically formed community of people, constituted in the course of acquiring a common place of territorial settlement and residence, establishing common economic relations—relations of production (internal market under capitalism), a common scholarly language (which largely eliminates the idioms and dialects inherited from the feudal fragmentation of society, through literature, poetry, formal education and which may result as an official state language), as well as certain specific elements of culture—traditions, mentality, social psychology and character.

In a classic statement, 'A nation is a historically constituted, stable community of people, formed on the basis of a common language, territory, economic life, and psychological make-up manifested in a common culture.' (J. V. Stalin, *Marxism and the National Question*).

The dominant confusion in bourgeois philosophy, sociology and historiography of the concepts of the nation is not accidental. For bourgeois thought and ideology, the contemporary nation is projected and perceived as a timeless continuity from the indefinite past, e.g. from the primitive community of tribes and clans. Other approaches link the nation constitutionally with the state, with the 'national spirit' (national consciousness, national character, national identity) as the primary, if not the only, characteristic of the nation. There are also approaches that reduce the nation to a 'psychological concept', an 'unconscious mental community', or to a community of 'national character'. V. I. Lenin sharply criticized a number of similar concepts and showed their idealistic essence.

The formation of the nation may be favoured by the existence of some national affinity or racial proximity, but this is not a necessary condition. Most nations have been formed as a historical synthesis of various races, nationalities and ethnic groups. It is therefore highly unscientific to confound the concepts of 'nation' and 'race', especially when the latter is attributed with properties of alleged 'biological predetermination' and 'purity'... Moreover, a nation is not uniquely determined by a particular religion, religious denomination or tradition, nor even by the existence of a nation-state.

Based on the theory of K. Marx, F. Engels and V. I. Lenin, the nation emerges and is formed according to dialectical law as a novel historical phenomenon, in the process of overcoming of the feudal fragmentation of society and the establishment of

centralised political power within the framework of rising capitalist economic relations.

Of course, the formation of the nation is preceded by a long process of formation of various historical forms of communities, namely ethnogenesis.

Long-term cohabitation of people connected by a common economy, territory and language also leads to a community of intellectual life. The linguistic, territorial, economic and cultural community of people, which was formed historically and preceded the nation, is termed nationality. Nationalities first appeared during the period of the consolidation of tribal unions. It is in this context that tribal coalescence escalates and is gradually accompanied by the replacement of blood ties by territorial ties (the transition from a community of clans to a territorial community). This gives rise to the nationalities of the slave-owning era (Egypt, Greece, Rome, etc. in antiquity).

In some regions (e.g. in Europe) the formation of such pre-capitalist linguistic, territorial and cultural communities, i.e. nationalities, is mainly completed under feudalism (ancient Russian, Polish, French, etc. nationalities), while elsewhere, this historical process is ongoing. Some nationalities are formed from tribes related by descent and language, e.g. Polish from Slavic tribes: the Poles of Vistula, Mazovians, etc., while others are formed from tribes with different languages, the fusion of which came about through conquests and the absorption of some tribes from others, such as French, formed from Gallic tribes, Roman colonists and Germanic tribes: Franks, Visigoths, Burgundians, etc.). In the course of this ethnogenesis, through the strengthening of ties between constituent tribes, one of the languages or dialects of the nationality under formation (due to population and/or level of development) becomes the basis for the formation of the common language of the nationality, with a corresponding degradation of the others into dialects or even their gradual

disappearance/integration into the common one. This process leads to the formation of a single economic, territorial and cultural community with a corresponding name. A process which is sometimes accompanied by and consolidated by the establishment of a single centralised state (e.g. in the form of a monarchy, a fiefdom union), while elsewhere there is no such direct coincidence of state and linguistic territory.

With the development of commodity and monetary relations in depth (the terms of production—means, objects, materials and labour power—are transformed into commodities) and in breadth (internal market), capitalist relations dominate, thus strengthening economic and cultural ties. In this way, nationalities are transformed into nations. Nationalities suddenly separated by state borders are at some point the origins of some national formations (such as the Portuguese and the Galicians, the Germans, the Austrians and the Luxembourgers, etc.). Elsewhere, populations originating from a few ethno-linguistic communities are united into a single state (e.g. Switzerland, Belgium), always in accordance with specific historical correlations of internal and external tendencies and forces.

In any case, since ethnogenesis is initiated from the primitive community and culminates in the subsequent socio-economic formations, it is intertwined at many levels with the respective modes of production of slave-owning and feudal structures, hence it is faced with the problem of established classes (hereditary positions and privileges).

Nation and capitalism. Imperialism and the national question

Wherever the phenomenon of ethnogenesis is launched in conjunction with the decline of feudalism and the rise, development and consolidation of capitalist relations of production

within the nation-state, the nation takes on characteristics of development in a more or less 'pure form'. This applies to a few cases of European countries, e.g. France. In this historical epoch, the rising bourgeoisie takes on a progressive and revolutionary role; it leads the front of social and political forces (working class, poor peasantry, progressive intellectuals, etc.) under the banner of the 'national idea'. In these cases, the nation is largely synonymous with the 'people', whose frontal formation constitutes the broader historical subject of the revolutionary process of the time, leading to victory over the forces of feudalism and its remnants, not only in the economic field, but also at the level of the political, legal/institutional and broader state superstructure.

However, even in this process that is unfolding in 'pure form', the relation between social forces of progress and reaction is not fixed, linearly constant and unambiguous. The social and political alliances themselves are historically fluid at different phases of this revolutionary process. Moreover, even at the moment of the most brilliant revolutionary milestones of such peoples, at the international level the main forces claiming or even holding power in this struggle, continue or even intensify their horrific repression of the colonies. Even during the most revolutionary outbreaks of the rise of capitalism, what prevails is an 'ethnocentric' and/or Eurocentric tendency to focus on the internal tasks of the colonial metropolis, the 'civilised countries'. The periphery of the colonies, the other peoples, continue to be perceived even by the majority of the lower classes of the metropolises as 'backdrop' and instruments working behind the scenes, as 'naturally inferior material', 'natural and human resources' to be superexploited, for the well-being of the 'superior people and state'. Colonized peoples are usually forced into the trajectory of 'scientifically justified' enslavement (leading up to ethnic cleansing and genocide),

‘civilising’, ‘missionary’, etc. functions of the metropolises. Sometimes, at best, they are treated in the spirit of abstract casual philanthropy, or even with the contemplative attitude of the inquisitive European towards the exotic colony, as picturesque folklore and attractions, as an object for the elite intellectuals of the ‘West’ and the ‘North’ to document from above. In this spirit, the bourgeois sciences of ethnography, ethnology, anthropology are also developed, the acquis of which is regarded by the decision-makers of the ruling class of colonialism as a tool of colonial control.

This is the history of the capitalist and imperialist colonisation of the peoples of Latin America, Africa and Asia. A tragic history of successive conquests of indigenous peoples by European invaders, enslavement, genocide and varied forms of super-exploitation of people and nature. In this predatory relationship, oppression by colonialists led to the extermination of indigenous peoples, combined with the importation of slaves, i.e., a brutal system of colonial super-exploitation, carried out by means of a combined genocide of the peoples of three continents: Latin America, Africa & Asia. When the colonialists exhausted, for example, the ‘material’ of African slaves in Cuba, they imported new ‘material’ from China...

In this way, the emergence, formation and development of nations under capitalism is intertwined from the outset with the conflict between capital and wage labour, but also with the increasing inequality at the regional and global level. This inequality takes on dramatic dimensions with capitalist colonialism, which maintains, subordinates, reproduces and often revives the most brutal forms of exploitation for the primary accumulation and, more generally, for the increasing accumulation of capital. Typical for the brutal conquest of entire continents, and the predatory exploitation of nature and peoples, is the massive development of slave labour (even

established in the 1st Constitution of the USA) and the slave trade for centuries, on the basis of which the ‘greatness’ of the most powerful colonial capitalist countries was cemented.

This contradiction takes on unprecedented dimensions during the monopoly stage of capitalism, under imperialism. As Lenin and other Marxist thinkers have scientifically demonstrated, under imperialism exploitation intensifies, deepens and expands on a regional and global scale. This is achieved not only on the basis of colonial occupation, but also on the export of capital, various forms of capital flows, through which a network of exploitative relations is formed for the extraction of surplus value in the form of monopoly super-profits from the dominant monopoly groups and from the parasitic states that are the strongest in terms of capital, a handful of ‘rentier states’ as described by Lenin. The internationalisation and globalisation of the exploitative relations of production constitutes an essential manifestation of the fundamental exploitative capital/labour relation on a world scale, which results in the manifold exploitation by the most powerful monopolies not only of the working class within the imperialist states, but also of the global working class, of all the oppressed peoples, including the local ruling classes.

Racial, national, religious and more general cultural differentiations and conflicts are not linearly linked to class differentiations, nor are they related to them. Their course can be traced to the pre-class stages of history and to those communal remnants which capitalist ‘globalisation’ under imperialism not only did not eliminate but is reproducing, transformed as organic/determining elements of the increasing inequality inherent in capitalism, as distinctive manifestations of the increasingly globalised and now planet-wide field of class conflicts.

Socialist revolutions, the national question and anti-imperialism

The Great October Socialist Revolution and the early socialist revolutions that followed it, imparted radically different characteristics within societies with the revolutionary transformations they initiated. In the USSR, for example, the victory of the revolution in Russia and its colonies sublated the economic, technological, educational, cultural, etc. backwardness of its peoples and nationalities. The material basis for the distinction between 'superior' and 'inferior' nations, the dominant and the dominated, the oppressor and the oppressed, largely ceased to exist. With the cultural revolution and with illiteracy combating, processes of a different type of ethnogenesis were initiated, even for nomadic peoples without a written language, a different type of relation between nations and nationalities, through the pursuit of actual self-determination and unification on a voluntary basis, through the creation and flourishing of national cultures within the framework of socialist construction.

For example, the ancient Russian nationality was the common origin of three nationalities (Russian, Ukrainian and Belarusian) which were essentially established as national formations mainly after the revolution, under the USSR. In the USSR certain nationalities (e.g. Turkmen, Kirghiz, etc.) were established as nations, essentially bypassing the capitalist stage of development.

The early socialist revolutions also ignited international waves of anti-colonial, anti-imperialist and national liberation struggles, as a result of which, since the 20th century and especially after WWII, the balance of power and the global political map itself changed to a significant extent.

The crisis of the initially consolidated colonial system of imperialism, the anti-colonial and national liberation struggles that often led to the attainment of various forms and levels of

statehood and national independence in many countries of Asia, Latin America and Africa accelerated processes of emergence, formation and consolidation of the national self-consciousness of peoples. Thus, from the various associations of tribes, nationalities and territorial communities, new nationalities, new nations were formed.

In a number of former colonies, ethnogenesis takes place within the struggle for independence, the attainment of which takes place in a territorial area historically shaped by colonial super-exploitation, sharing characteristics that are making them extremely susceptible to attempts of manipulation through the principle of 'divide and rule'. Communities of tribes and nationalities having different languages, cultures and economic life, result in novel and fragile state formations of territorial and economic integration, political and cultural development.

The founders of the revolutionary theory and practice of the communist movement foresaw the organic links between the class struggle of the working class of the most developed capitalist countries and the anti-colonial, national liberation movements of the less developed and dependent countries and peoples.

The great leaders of the socialist revolutions were distinguished, among other things, by their ability to perceive the tasks of the new era in their organic interconnection, in the light of the global/historical internationalist role of the communists, in the context of the world revolutionary process. It was precisely within the framework of the tasks of the movement that they placed the various manifestations of the national question.

Stalin's 10 positions on the subject in the chapter of his 1924 book 'The Foundations of Leninism' entitled 'The National Question', are extremely insightful: 'In solving the national question Leninism proceeds from the following theses:

a) the world is divided into two camps: the camp

of a handful of civilised nations, which possess finance capital and exploit the vast majority of the population of the globe; and the camp of the oppressed and exploited peoples in the colonies and dependent countries, which constitute the majority;

b) the colonies and the dependent countries, oppressed and exploited by finance capital, constitute a vast reserve and a very important source of strength for imperialism;

c) the revolutionary struggle of the oppressed peoples in the dependent and colonial countries against imperialism is the only road that leads to their emancipation from oppression and exploitation;

d) the most important colonial and dependent countries have already taken the path of the national liberation movement, which cannot but lead to the crisis of world capitalism;

e) the interests of the proletarian movement in the developed countries and of the national liberation movement in the colonies call for the union of these two forms of the revolutionary movement into a common front against the common enemy, against imperialism;

f) the victory of the working class in the developed countries and the liberation of the oppressed peoples from the yoke of imperialism are impossible without the formation and the consolidation of a common revolutionary front;

g) the formation of a common revolutionary front is impossible unless the proletariat of the oppressor nations renders direct and determined support to the liberation movement of the oppressed peoples against the imperialism of its “own country”, for “no nation can be free if it oppresses other nations” (Engels);

h) this support implies the upholding defence and implementation of the slogan of the right of nations to secession, to independent existence as states;

i) unless this slogan is implemented, the union

and collaboration of nations within a single world economic system, which is the material basis for the victory of world socialism, cannot be brought about;

j) this union can only be voluntary, arising on the basis of mutual confidence and fraternal relations among peoples.’

The clarity and relevance of these positions, a century after their formulation, is striking.

A great deal has happened since then. The triumphant successes of the USSR and of the other great socialist revolutions, culminating in the crushing of the Anti-Comintern Axis, as well as the tragedy of the counterrevolutions in the USSR and in the European countries of early socialism.

The national question and anti-imperialism: from WWII to WWII

We find that today the national question is brought to light with greater intensity and in more complex forms. Early socialism launched qualitatively new forms of ethnogenesis within socialist countries, but also the beginnings of completely unique and historically unprecedented communities of people, such as those of multinational peoples: the Soviet people, the Yugoslav people, the Chinese people, etc.

Early socialism also favoured and launched processes that brought forward a new dynamic and essential component of the world revolutionary process: the anti-imperialist struggle of the peoples, rooted on the claim for national independence and popular sovereignty.

Without exception, all the victorious early socialist revolutions had such characteristics, they were closely linked to the historical necessity of solving the national question. A question which for the overwhelming majority of peoples, capitalism is unable to resolve. On the contrary, the national question is utilised by the imperialist financial oligarchy, the profits of which are based on uneven

development, disparities and inequalities as a basis for superexploitation on a global scale, with the extraction of surplus value in the form of monopoly super-profits.

Moreover, the bourgeois counter-revolutions that prevailed in the USSR and in the European countries of early socialism, effectively deployed mass-manipulations on the basis of resurrected or crudely ‘constructed’ and ‘reconstructed’ nations, on the basis of the parasitic ruling classes that emerged from the transformation of the illicit economy/organised crime into the main subject of reaction and the predatory/destructive processes of privatisation, the launching of historically unprecedented forms of primitive capital accumulation, preying on the achievements of the defeated early socialism.

The resurgence of extreme anti-communism, nazism, racism and various forms of fascism in most of the regimes that emerged from these counterrevolutions with the full support of the US-led imperialist aggressor axis is organically linked to the monstrosities of these regressive regimes. Typical are the cases of the dissolution of multinational states through wars or even ‘peacefully’: of Yugoslavia, the USSR and Czechoslovakia.

From the last quarter of the 20th century, some secessionist movements in imperialist countries have also emerged, invoking the national question. However, the class content of such movements is rather specific.

We therefore find that not every national separatist movement is progressive and worthy of solidarity with the communists. The main criterion for communists is the relation of each movement to the strategic perspective of socialist revolution and communism.

From formal to actual independence and sovereignty

The intensification of all reactionary tendencies constitutes an overall escalation of the ongoing WWII unleashed by the US/NATO/EU imperialist axis across all the fronts, both current and anticipated.

All efforts of direct and indirect (by proxy) attacks by the imperialist axis are driven through unjust, monstrous and murderous machinations of a predatory and reactionary character, sharing references to the national question.

On the contrary, all defensive movements and counter-offensive efforts of the forces of anti-imperialism and socialism are organically linked to the socially just and progressive rise of struggles and demands for national independence and popular sovereignty. Struggles that according to dialectical law can escalate in towards a revolutionary direction. This was and is fundamentally the struggle of the Serbian people. This is also the struggle in the Ukrainian front against imperialism and nazism. The people of Palestine are fighting a life-or-death national liberation struggle against the Zionist regime—the war machine of the Euro-Atlantic axis—with the solidarity of the people of Yemen.

The struggles of the peoples of Latin America, Africa and Asia against the imperialist axis and its local instruments are anti-imperialist, national liberation struggles.

The struggle of the Korean people led by the DPRK for the liberation of the US occupied part of the Korean peninsula is a revolutionary struggle for the reunification of the nation and for socialism. Likewise, the struggle being waged by the people of the PRC for reunification with Taiwan and to resist the US-led axis-fomented separatist ‘movements’ is also in the same vein.

We have pointed out in other texts the character of the escalating WWII and the powers involved in it.

Here it is necessary to point out an additional specificity of this war on the part of the forces of

anti-imperialism and socialism.

In the 20th century, especially after WWII, there were waves of victorious anti-imperialist movements in the former colonies and imperialism-dependent countries. Some of these countries that emerged also attempted to initiate processes of reform in a non-capitalist direction, in cooperation with the USSR and other countries of early socialism. As a result of these struggles, many countries gained at least formally some form of independence and statehood.

These processes also created the 'Non-Aligned Movement' under the iconic leadership of Cuba and Fidel Castro. These processes to a considerable extent ended or regressed, especially after the counterrevolutions in the USSR etc. Imperialism has not given up its predatory claims. The presence of hundreds of foreign military bases (occupation troops) of the US and other imperialist countries, successive military interventions, 'civil wars' and coups to impose controlled corrupt regimes in the service of imperialism, are on the agenda.

In any case, the achievements of these anti-imperialist movements have not been able to effectively stop the super-exploitation of the peoples. In place of traditional occupation-colonialism came neo-colonialism, with an emphasis on the numerous and varied siphons of super-exploitation concealed under a veil of legitimacy.

Thus, if during the previous conflicts the anti-imperialist movement managed to establish some form of formal independence for many peoples, the ongoing WWIII brings to the surface the possibility and necessity of the transition of anti-imperialism from a formal to an actual and essential attainment of national independence and popular sovereignty for peoples with an average and below-average level of development.

The transition from formal to actual and essential independence and sovereignty is now more

necessary than ever. It will be made possible to the extent that the anti-imperialist and socialist forces, by all means (armed, economic, etc.) will effectively cut off the imperialist forces under the US from the regional and global sources of the extraction of monopoly super-profits, by undermining, invalidating, abolishing and ultimately crushing the mechanisms of the constant exsanguination of the peoples, severing the arteries/siphons linking the imperialists to the sources of their predatory parasitism. The processes that are already underway indicate extremely positive trends.

This is the main social and economic content of WWIII from the point of view of the interests of the de facto emerging pole of the anti-imperialist and socialist forces, which also constitutes the main historical justification for their involvement in it.

No other war, including WWII, has posed such a task in such scale. This is the main purpose of the involvement of the national question in this conflict from the point of view of the interests of the pole of the anti-imperialist and socialist forces.

This is the content which imperialism's mechanisms of mass manipulation and propaganda have every reason to keep as a well-sealed secret from the peoples.

Opportunism working consistently at the service of the imperialist axis

In this deceitful work, the imperialists are today being abetted by the most dangerous opportunism and revisionism in history. The present leadership of the KKE, within the framework of its pharaonic nonsense, the absurdly irrational dogma of the 'imperialist pyramid', is striving to undermine the world anti-imperialist and communist movement. It thus reduces every anti-imperialist struggle and every claim for national independence to 'opportunism', to 'marching under foreign flags, at the tail of some capitalist classes'. In the minds of these bureaucrats having 'the only correct and

consistent anti-capitalist line’, ‘all countries are equally imperialist and their capitalist classes practice imperialist policies, corresponding to their position in the pyramid’!

Based on this counter-revolutionary abjection, they proclaim that ‘there is no dependence, only mutual interdependence’ and that on this basis, ‘the national question no longer exists in the world today’!

Question: in the whole world? ‘More or less’, answer the luminaries of opportunism. The Palestinian front today in Gaza is clearly one of the fronts of one and the same imperialist war: the same axis under the USA supports in every way and by all means both the nazi regime in Kiev and the Zionist racist regime in Israel. However, because of the deepest traditions of solidarity of the Greek people with the Palestinian people, in order to avoid mass outcry, the leaders of the KKE are proudly claiming: ‘that’s different! The Palestinian issue is the only unresolved national question today, the only exception to the rule of the pyramid’! Without bothering to explain why and how! This is how they try to keep up some temporary pretences by declaring their solidarity with Palestine, in order to continue their divisive manipulation in the service of imperialism... That is why they denounce the war in Palestine, making sure to stress each and every time in conclusion that ‘the people of Israel are also suffering from the war’!

Simply by claiming that the national question has been almost completely resolved today by imperialism, they are doing an invaluable service to the axis they have been bent on serving in the midst of the war.

In all other aspects, they continue undaunted in their pretence of ‘equal distances’ with emphasis on the condemnation of ‘Russian imperialist aggression’, ‘Chinese imperialism’ and of the DPRK, which they even came to slander both inside and outside the bourgeois parliament as a ‘neoliberal

model which features private universities’...

One would think that on the basis of their ‘pyramid’ ramblings, they would seek—in the context of their favourite ahistorical analogy of today with WWI—the defeat of ‘their own’ imperialist coalition in every way and by every means. Of course not! They continue to demand a cease-fire and withdrawal of Russian troops from the ‘occupied’ territories of Ukraine, which is ‘waging a just war’!

Moreover, they declare that ‘in case Greece comes under attack, the KKE will take the lead in the struggle for territorial integrity’! They are thus preparing the ground for even more direct engagement on new fronts in favour of the US/NATO/EU axis, by invoking the question of ‘territorial integrity’ espoused by the subservient to the axis, bourgeois Greek government.

In conclusion

As we have seen, the national question and anti-imperialism are rapidly brought to the surface as WWII is escalates. The problem of ethnogenesis, of nationalities and nations, is organically linked to the relation between the natural and the social in the logic of history, to the whole framework of the structure and history of human relations with nature and of relations between people, to forms of property, to the established and social classes.

The nation as a concrete historical community emerges, is formed and develops under capitalism and is organically linked to the class structure of the latter. The national question takes on extremely contradictory characteristics under imperialism, since it is organically linked to increasingly uneven development, to transnational and global relations of super-exploitation, to colonialism and neocolonialism, and thus to the ‘weak link’ of the global revolutionary process. The forces of imperialism cannot and are not willing to resolve it.

The early socialist revolutions are organically

linked to the national question and its resolution, launching within them different processes of ethnogenesis and internationalism, while they contribute catalytically to the development of anti-colonial and anti-imperialist movements, especially after WWII.

With the counterrevolutions in the USSR and the other early socialist countries of Europe, multinational socialist states are dismantled, while neo-colonial forms of super-exploitation render any independence most countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America used to have, rather formal.

With the escalating WWII, in the event of the victory of the forces of the anti-imperialist and socialist pole, it will become necessary and largely possible to move from formal to actual independence and sovereignty of peoples, through the drastic detachment of imperialism from its sources of parasitism. This process will launch a new wave of victorious anti-imperialist and socialist revolutions, at the centre of which the national question is once again placed.

The victory of the forces of anti-imperialism and socialism requires a frontal struggle of all progressive forces, with the communists in the vanguard. A necessary condition for this victory is the exposure, the refutation of the vile ideologies, of all subversive/divisive action and the crushing of opportunism, which is firmly at the service of the imperialist axis.

To achieve these goals, it is necessary to strengthen and develop the World Anti-Imperialist Platform, the most promising revolutionary internationalist project of the last decades.

Defeat to the USA-led imperialist axis!

Struggle for actual independence, sovereignty, prosperity, and development of the peoples!

Victory to the national liberation, anti-imperialist, and socialist forces!

On the current state and problems of the communist movement

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

October 2023

Looking at the communist movement today, we can see many problems—far from being a united and coordinated whole, it is characterised by disunity, disorganisation, fragmentation and ideological confusion. The first thing to understand is that all of these problems have their roots in the realities of class struggle: the constantly shifting balance of class forces nationally and internationally, and the objective state of the revolutionary conditions in each country as well as in the world as a whole.

Comrades new to our movement are often surprised to discover that the class struggle is not only going on in wider society, it is not only being waged between obviously hostile forces, but is also being conducted inside every part of the working-class movement and within the ranks of every communist party.

Since the bourgeoisie is still the dominant class globally, and since it has occupied that position for some time, bourgeois influence and ideology is everywhere; it affects us all without exception. Our best protection against the harm that bourgeois ideas can do to our movement is to be found in the regular and dedicated study of Marxism, both individual and collective, which acts like a daily inoculation against infection and help us to keep a clear class perspective and broad overview.

Communists combine personal and collective study with the practice of collective decision-making, doing their best to make sure that all those involved in the process are also working individually to improve their understanding of Marxism and their experience of connecting Marxism with the masses. In the end, a collective's strength is rooted in the strength of the

participating individuals.

While a collective can certainly make mistakes, it is less vulnerable to error than a single individual—some members will usually notice when others are going wrong, and can help them to correct themselves, provided the mistakes are honest ones and those making them are prepared to put the needs of the class and the movement ahead of their personal egos. Both as individuals and as organisations, we must be open and alert to recognising and correcting mistakes, acknowledging where we have gone wrong and changing direction when necessary.

World War One

There have been several moments in the history of our movement when the evidence of a fierce class struggle—and of the capture of large sections of our leadership—have become glaringly evident.

The first world war was once such clarifying moment. While all kinds of promises had been made before the war broke out, once it had started, the overwhelming majority of supposedly 'Marxist' leaders sided with their own imperialist ruling classes and ditched their former revolutionary stances. The most important exception to this pattern of betrayal by European socialist parties in 1914 was, of course, Russia's Bolshevik party, led by VI Lenin.

It was in the wake of this betrayal, and of the Bolsheviks' success, that our modern communist movement was founded. Out of the confusion and treachery of 1914, there rose like a phoenix from the ashes the Third International, headed by the outstanding Marxist-Leninist leadership of the CPSU(B), in 1919. The basis for this regrouping

had been laid by the Bolsheviks and other members of the Zimmerwald left—that part of the socialist movement that held true to its principles throughout the course of the first world war.

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

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

Those who attended the Zimmerwald conference revealed themselves to have three tendencies. The first of these was a consistently revolutionary left wing, headed by Lenin, which stuck firmly to the line that had been previously agreed on. In 1912, in Basle, all socialist parties in Europe had made a commitment that they would work to mobilise the workers to actively oppose the war, and would endeavour to transform an interimperialist war, in which workers slaughtered their fellow workers in the interests of the financiers, into a civil war, in which the revolutionary workers would turn their guns against their own imperialist rulers.

On the other side was the Zimmerwald right, those who officially supported the old antiwar line, but who were afraid to be seen as ‘splitting the movement’ and wanted to conciliate with the open social-chauvinists, hoping to reunite

the movement as soon as the nasty interruption caused by the war was over. Objectively, this line was a line of capitulation to the bourgeoisie and to the bourgeois-aligned opportunists, who had revealed their loyalties only too clearly. Lenin wrote extensively about the need to expose rather than cover over these important differences—about the need to break cleanly rather than try to mend what could no longer be considered as a whole.

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

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

History, of course, we know. Not only did the Bolsheviks, guided by Lenin’s brilliant scientific leadership, prove correct. Not only were they successful in establishing the world’s first socialist state and building the world’s first socialist economy, but they inspired the development of parties of the Bolshevik type all over the world. That is why almost every country has an ‘official’ communist party whose establishment dates to the years immediately following the October Revolution

and the establishment of the Comintern.

This was the movement that inspired revolutionary developments all over the world, and which unleashed the pent-up desire for national-liberation across the colonies. For so long as the Soviet Union continued to be guided by Marxist-Leninist science, the world communist movement worked in harmony and garnered great prestige in every corner of the globe.

This prestige was enhanced tremendously by the victory of the communists over fascism. The victory in Europe was won by the Soviet Union at tremendous cost to itself. The victory in the East was won by China. In both the east and the west, from Korea to Greece, from Vietnam to France, the most important supplementary forces—partisan liberation movements against fascist occupiers—were led by communists.

The triumph of the Khrushchevite clique

Our present troubles also owe their origins to opportunism and have their roots in a similarly crucial moment—the triumph of Khrushchevite revisionism in the Soviet Union.

With the installation of Nikita Khrushchev as leader of the CPSU(B) after the death of Josef Stalin (1953), and especially at its 20th party congress (1956), the Soviet Communist party set itself on a revisionist path from which it never deviated, taking actions that steadily undermined the economic mechanisms of socialist central planning, while at the same time weakening the theoretical and organisational strength of the party.

Leaders who did not agree with Khrushchev's market reforms and theoretical revisions were systematically purged from all important Soviet organisations (all-union, national and regional party and government bodies, economic, cultural and educational institutions), and at the same time party membership was opened up to all kinds of non-proletarian strata under the guise of building a

'party of the whole people'.

Meanwhile, the quantity and quality of Marxist education given to party members and the wider population was downgraded, Stalin's works ceased to be produced and studied, and censorship laws that had controlled the spread of bourgeois ideology were relaxed. While capitulating to imperialism all along the line, Khrushchev lulled the Soviet people to sleep by promoting idealistic utopian fantasies such as 'the party of the entire people' and 'the state of the entire people'. All of this fatally undermined the basis of socialism in the USSR.

In the international sphere, the Khrushchevite clique did tremendous damage to the unity and prestige of the world communist movement by promoting a similarly anti-Marxist set of concepts, including the possibility of a 'peaceful transition' to socialism, and the possibility of 'peaceful competition' and 'peaceful coexistence' between socialist and imperialist states. Instead of standing up to imperialist nuclear blackmail, Khrushchev echoed and reinforced it, using the threat of nuclear war as a justification for abandoning the positions of class struggle without which the final victory of socialism is impossible.

In large part, Khrushchev was able to do these things because he had appropriated the leading position in the party of the great Lenin; the party of victorious revolution—a position that had been so brilliantly occupied by Josef Stalin for three decades, during which a great socialist motherland had been constructed, and to whose leadership the workers and peasants of the world had learned to trust implicitly.

The so-called 'secret speech' made by Khrushchev at the 20th party congress was kept secret only from the Soviet people. The denunciations it contained against Josef Stalin and his leadership were leaked to the imperialist press, which jubilantly published its contents all over the world. Within a year, half the world's communist party members had been

demoralised into resigning their membership, assuming that Khrushchev spoke in good faith when he declared that the great hero who had led their movement for 30 years had actually been a delusional, self-aggrandising and paranoid monster.

Meanwhile, even if they did not accept every slander against Stalin and his leadership at face value, the trust of leading communists around the world in the Soviet leadership, combined with their lack of detailed knowledge about what was happening inside the USSR, left many parties unable to recognise or resist Khrushchevite revisionism.

Even the Communist Party of China issued articles endorsing Khrushchev's analysis and condemning Stalin's supposed 'mistakes' and 'abuses'. Among other things, the Chinese party agreed with Khrushchev in condemning Stalin's (absolutely correct) emphasising of the truth that class struggle not only continues but intensifies after the socialist revolution.

Some parties, especially in the imperialist countries, were quiet for other reasons. The Soviet turn away from class struggle chimed very well with the class-collaborationist line in which they were already engaging in the postwar conditions of welfare state construction and social-democratic dominance.

The Communist Party of Great Britain, for example, had already published its *British Road to Socialism* in 1951. This manifesto, which replaced the old *Class Against Class*, had declared five years before Khrushchev's secret speech that revolution was no longer necessary and that the British working class would be able to achieve socialism gradually through bourgeois parliamentary means and via an alliance with the imperialist Labour party.

So it was that in the immediate aftermath of the CPSU's 20th party congress, very few voices were raised against the new Soviet line. One notable

exception to this was the Greek revolutionary leader Nikolaos Zachariadis. Although exiled to the USSR after the defeat of the Greek revolution and wholly dependent on Soviet hospitality, Zachariadis nevertheless bravely and repeatedly spoke out against the revisionist line being taken by the CPSU under Khrushchev's leadership.

To silence this troublesome guest, the Soviet party used its influence to have Zachariadis removed as general secretary, and then expelled from the Greek Communist party (KKE) entirely, along with others in the leadership who were loyal to him and to the Marxist-Leninist line upheld so steadfastly by Stalin. They were replaced with a new leadership that was loyal to Khrushchev and his line—to the great detriment of the Greek working-class movement.

Despite their initial acceptance, however, it gradually became clear to growing numbers of revolutionaries around the world that they had been duped.

As this happened, the Khrushchevites used their power to force changes in the leadership of other parties that refused to follow blindly in their wake. In 1960, Khrushchev abruptly withdrew the thousands of Soviet technical experts who had been helping to construct Chinese industry and organise its central planning—and the revolutionary wing of the CPC became aware of the great danger that threatened not only the Soviet revolution but also their own.

The political split between the Soviet Union and China had begun to simmer in 1959 after Khrushchev opened talks with the USA in pursuit of his policy of 'peaceful coexistence'. In 1960, Albania and China formed an anti-revisionist alliance and began a series of heated polemics denouncing the USSR's revisionism. The world communist movement began to splinter.

During this period, Chairman Mao Zedong came to the fore as the chief theoretical leader

of the revolutionary wing of world communism. Although it had taken him a few years to realise that Khrushchev had not spoken in good faith when he made his anti-Stalin ‘secret’ speech, the Soviet Union’s changed attitude towards the People’s Republic of China was unmistakable.

By 1962, the dispute between the two sides had erupted into full-fledged open hostilities that led to splits in almost all the communist parties across the capitalist world. (The assumption that a party with the suffix ‘Marxist-Leninist’ must be a ‘Maoist’ party stems from this time, when many new parties founded in the 1960s and 1970s adopted this suffix so as to distinguish themselves from the revisionists they had broken with.)

The rupture led China to pursue a geopolitical line which centred around opposing the USSR as its primary goal. China took this policy to the lengths of backing all kinds of countries and movements around the world purely on the basis of opposing forces that were backed by the Soviet Union, which Mao had characterised as the ‘main enemy’, and had even labelled as ‘social imperialist’ after the Warsaw Pact invasion of Czechoslovakia had suppressed the counter-revolutionary revolt there in 1968.

An honourable mention must be made here of the position of people’s Korea and its leader Comrade Kim Il Sung during this difficult period. Horrifically weakened by the barbaric war of aggression waged against it by US imperialism and its allied forces (1950-53), the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea (DPRK) had great need of whatever trade and assistance it could get from its large socialist neighbours.

Despite the difficulties of damaging these vital relationships, President Kim Il Sung steered his people with great skill through turbulent waters. While never giving up his country’s adherence to Marxist science and to a planned economy, while agreeing with Chairman Mao and criticising the

revisionist positions of the USSR (thus placing Korea on the Chinese side of the theoretical divide), Kim Il Sung was not afraid also to criticise what he described as the ‘dogmatism’ of China’s approach.

Refusing to allow Korea to be sucked into an ever-more-damaging spiral of enmity, he further developed the doctrine of *juche*—self-reliance—for the Korean revolution, while patiently overcoming difficulties in Korea’s relationships with both the Soviet Union and the People’s Republic of China. The DPRK continued to maintain respectful connections with both while refusing to let the policy of either determine the fate of the Korean revolution or set the parameters for the development of Korean socialism.

Splintering and fragmentation: Revisionism begets Maoism and Trotskyism

Mao’s overreaction to the Khrushchevite betrayals thus had deadly consequences in many parts of the world. Moreover, such open hostilities between the socialist countries and their proxy forces inflicted a blow on our movement that the imperialists could only have dreamed of striking themselves.

They were not slow to recognise their opportunity, and were assiduous in doing everything possible to widen the split between the revisionist and anti-revisionist wings of the communist movement, gleefully promoting every disagreement of principle and helping to elevate many non-essentials and even mistakes into shibboleths and articles of faith.

Whereas in the oppressed world, many Maoist parties, despite taking on some of Mao’s theoretical errors, were successful in applying Mao’s strategy and tactics in order to wage vibrant mass revolutionary struggles, many so-called ‘Maoists’ in the imperialist countries were increasingly looking like provocateurs or lunatics. Their guiding principles were hatred for the Soviet Union and elevating to a religious dogma precisely those mistakes made by anti-revisionists such as Hoxha

and Mao that were most useful in keeping the working-class movement divided and fighting itself—or most likely to render the name of ‘communism’ ridiculous in the eyes of the people.

Such theoretical mistakes included the theory of ‘Soviet social-imperialism’ (followers of this theory today have applied it to China, insisting that this is an imperialist country and the enemy of the working masses), the theory of the ‘three worlds’ (according to which the main exploiters in the world were the Soviet Union and the USA, with the Soviet Union as the ‘most dangerous’ of the two).

Even brilliant tactical applications of Marxism by Mao and the Chinese communists to their own particular conditions—such as the waging of a people’s war by establishing liberated territories, basing themselves in the downtrodden peasant masses, and surrounding the cities as part of their waging of a revolutionary people’s war in a semi-feudal and semi-colonised country—were made ridiculous by such groups. One group in Britain, for example, interpreted the Chinese liberation strategy as a biblical instruction and ‘responded’ by sending its members to live in out of the way seaside towns from which they would one day ‘surround the cities’.

Such activity of course did nothing to build a revolutionary movement or to connect Marxism with the masses, and could only succeed in bringing our movement into further disrepute in the eyes of the working class.

Criticism of the three worlds theory from Enver Hoxha drove a wedge between Albania and China and resulted in the formation of a third, Albanian-centred section of the world communist movement. All three of these international groupings were guilty of errors in Marxist theory, leading to errors in their approach to geopolitics and the fight against capitalist imperialism. But it is with the Soviet Communist party that the culpability for this catastrophic situation primarily lies.

It was the Soviet party that began rapprochement with the imperialists. It was the Soviet party that distorted Marxist teachings to justify retreating from revolutionary positions. It was the Soviet party that instigated the campaign of vilification of Josef Stalin, the great builder of socialism and defeater of fascism. It was the Soviet party that interfered in the affairs of other parties in order to maintain hegemony over them. It was the Soviet party that distorted the principles of internationalism, stopped helping in the vital task of developing China’s socialist economy, and insisted on subservience to its line as a condition of fraternal assistance and relations. And it was the Soviet party that preached reformism, parliamentarism and peaceful coexistence.

Besides providing plenty of opportunity to pour fuel onto the flames in various ways, the secret services of the imperialist centres now had all the ammunition they needed to give a helping hand to the resuscitation of Trotskyism—an imperialist-aligned anti-Marxist ideology that had been entirely discredited by the USSR’s successful building of socialism and heroic victory over fascism.

With Trotsky’s lies about Stalin now being repeated by the leader of the Soviet Union, and with communist parties across the world (and in the west especially) retreating from their revolutionary positions, Trotsky could be presented not only as having foreseen the USSR’s ‘inevitable’ degeneration, but as having been all along the ‘real’ revolutionary.

As a result, newly-founded (and well-funded) Trotskyite organisations began to attract a significant following amongst radical students, teachers and better-off workers in the imperialist countries and bourgeois historiographers trumpeting Trotsky’s inheritance of Lenin’s legacy flourished. This was reinforced by the incorporation of a Trotskyite version of Russian revolutionary history into school and university

history and literature syllabuses. It was also the basis for producing a whole machinery of ‘Marxist’ historians, academics, journals etc in the imperialist countries, whose role was to reinforce bourgeois lies and slanders against socialism in pseudo-Marxist terminology.

Defeat and retreat: counter-revolution in the revisionist USSR

For many revisionist parties that had sunk into social-democratic reformism and all but given up any but the most token lip-service to socialism, the counter-revolutions in the USSR and Europe were a death knell. Parties across the world that had remained affiliated to the revisionist USSR dissolved themselves or changed their names and programmes to embrace the new reality of triumphant capitalist supremacy.

In Britain, for example, the CPGB, already sunk into the pit of reformist ‘Eurocommunism’ (parliamentary cretinism, a desire to go further into revisionism even than the USSR had done, and a propagation of the idea that revolutionary transformation will come through tiny, incremental ‘practical’ changes and reforms), dissolved itself in 1991, declaring in its final resolution that the October Revolution had been “a mistake of historic proportions”.

Without the support of the USSR, and with communism’s reputation severely wounded, many mass movements and liberation struggles in the oppressed countries struggled to continue. Retreats and compromises were the order of the day, as revolutionaries and anti-imperialists everywhere had to come to terms with a world in which the US imperialists’ power seemed limitless. Indeed, in many cases where peace deals and compromises were struck during this period, the USA was present as overseer and ‘arbiter’ (Palestine, Ireland, South Africa)—and no one was in any position to argue.

Separation of Marxism from the masses

The result of 70 years of division and theoretical confusion in our movement, initiated by the Khrushchevites in the 1950s, has been the steady decay of revolutionary influence amongst the masses. Mass parties in many countries adopted increasingly reformist lines and were thus in no position to stand up to bourgeois triumphalism in the 1990s. Parties that retained the name ‘communis’, such as the parties in Italy and France, long ago lost any connection to revolutionary class struggle.

Thus we found ourselves in a situation where large parties had let go of their adherence to Marxism, and the forces that worked to keep Marxism alive were small and without meaningful connection to the masses.

Moreover, decades of mis-leadership and propagation of non-Marxist ideas in the name of Marxism, along with the bourgeois-endorsed habit of creating a split every time there is the slightest disagreement, had left a culture of sectarian cult-building in the place of serious party-building.

It is notable that where parties were able to hold onto a decent Marxist analysis, they did so by letting go of adherence to any particular local guru or international leader and by applying themselves to mastering Marxist science for themselves. This, after all, was the only route to making sense of all the competing claims and counter-claims of the plethora of groups claiming to uphold the true revolutionary spirit.

Pushing back against bourgeois triumphalism: the Pyongyang declaration

Several initiatives were launched in the 1990s by parties that remained faithful to the goal of socialist revolution. Some of these was able to made a contribution towards clarifying the problems and bringing revolutionaries together on the basis of fundamental common aims, although none was

ultimately successful in healing the divides that had plagued our movement for so long in the prevailing atmosphere of pessimism and retreat.

A first important initiative in regrouping the international communist movement was taken in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. Standing isolated and exposed after the fall of the European and Soviet socialist bloc, the remaining socialist countries had to face a hard new reality, in which imperialist pressure greatly intensified. In every remaining socialist country, the USA worked overtime to try to create conditions for a similar defeat, through stoking counter-revolutionary movements (as in Tiananmen Square in China) or through sanctions and economic blockade (as in the cases of the DPRK and Cuba).

The Korean party in particular was adamant that whatever compromises might be necessary for survival (the nuclear agreement entered into with the regime of Bill Clinton, for example), socialism was non-negotiable. Delegates visiting Pyongyang to celebrate the 80th birthday of Comrade Kim Il Sung worked with Korean comrades to produce a document outlining the fundamental principles around which they believed all those who remained true to communist principles should reorganise themselves.

The declaration was launched in Pyongyang in April 1992, entitled 'Let us defend and advance the cause of socialism'. It was initially signed by 69 parties, and by 2017 had garnered 300 signatures. While its content was a positive and defiant endorsement of socialism at a time when so many were retreating and giving up, the declaration outlined the beliefs of its signatories in broad and general terms. No organisation was set up to try to coordinate the efforts of the signatories in their common struggle against imperialism.

As a result, parties whose adherence to socialism was merely lip-service were able to sign in the years that followed and to use the declaration as a badge

of their Marxist faith and loyalty without having to show any practical adherence to the principles they had signed up to—or even to publicise the declaration and its contents amongst the masses in their own countries.

Attempts at regrouping: the ICS

Immediately following the launch of the Pyongyang Declaration came the launch of the annual International Communist Seminar on May Day 1992. The Workers' Party of Belgium (PTB), led by Comrade Ludo Martens, had its roots in the Maoist anti-revisionist movement, but was persuaded to give up its Maoist dogmas in favour of a broader Marxist-Leninist anti-revisionist stance.

Ludo and the PTB took the initiative of bringing together as many parties as possible from around the world, including from the territory of the former Soviet Union, in the hope of finding a path to agreement about what had caused the collapse of Soviet socialism and what the revolutionary movement needed to learn in order to regroup and reunify. Ludo specifically proposed trying to find a basis for the unification of the four main tendencies of the Marxist-Leninist movement at that time: pro-Soviet, pro-Chinese, pro-Albanian and pro-Cuban.

Prominent theoreticians besides Ludo Martens who attended the yearly May Day seminars in Brussels during the 1990s included Harpal Brar (Great Britain), Tamila Yabrova (Ukraine) and Nina Andreyeva (Russia). It was greatly to the credit of Comrade Ludo and the PTB that they made contact with so many currents within the former Soviet Union that were struggling to come to terms with what had happened in their country and who continued to uphold the banner of Marxism. It was unfortunate that there was no party or individual with the prestige to bring together the various warring factions and establish a common line, however.

This has been a recurring theme in our movement

since the loss of a unified leadership—divisions abound and the impetus to overcome them has never yet been strong enough to create meaningful unity of action across international borders or to unify separate groupings within each country in the way Lenin and the Comintern were able to after the October Revolution.

The truth is that this will probably continue to be the case until a new socialist revolution is successful, and is led by a party that is guided by scientific socialism, restoring the prestige of Marxist science in practice, inspiring the masses of the world, and earning the right to be seriously listened to by Marxists and revolutionaries around the world.

The Marxist-Leninist character of the Brussels seminar was steadily eroded after Comrade Ludo stepped down as party leader in 2008. Since that time, the PTB has steadily shifted—at first a little and then in a wholesale fashion—into the camp of social democracy, becoming the main opposition party in Belgian politics and giving up its revolutionary programme in a drive to become big at any cost. To this end, the PTB has followed the time-honoured opportunist strategy of putting aside its Marxist politics in order to become respectable (in the eyes of the bourgeoisie and its media) and win votes. This is a great loss to the movement in Belgium and internationally and a tragic end to decades of hard work by Ludo and his comrades, although their anti-revisionist legacy lives on in many ways outside of the present PTB.

Major works aimed at reasserting a Marxist line during this period include Ludo Martens' book *Another View of Stalin* and Harpal Brar's works *Perestroika, the Complete Collapse of Revisionism, Trotskyism or Leninism?, Social Democracy, the Enemy Within and Imperialism Decadent, Parasitic, Moribund Capitalism*. I may of course be biased, but to the best of my knowledge nothing better than Harpal's *Perestroika* has been written

that explains the economic and political roots of the fall of Soviet socialism.

International Meeting of Communist and Workers Parties

In 1998, the Greek Communist party, which had gone along with Gorbachev's catastrophic anti-socialist policies of Glasnost and Perestroika in the 1980s, began the process of piecing back together some semblance of a communist international. These gatherings, named after similar events that were hosted in the Soviet Union during the period of the Sino-Soviet split (1957, 1960, 1969), have grown and are now portrayed by many of their participants as representing the 'official' communist movement. Several problems were baked into the cake of this organisation from the beginning, however.

The first was that the main organising party, the KKE, had by no means settled accounts with its revisionist past. While some of its statements about the collapse of the USSR (made at its 2009 congress) appeared to indicate a willingness to come to terms with revisionism and reverse course, this has not in any way been reflected by a change in its organising practices.

Picking up where the old revisionist grouping had left off, the core of the IMCWP meetings was heavily skewed from the start towards Soviet revisionist-aligned parties—all of which had long ago abandoned Leninist revolutionary politics in order to remain aligned with Khrushchev and his successors, and none of which any longer represented the revolutionary vanguard of the masses. Most of these parties have still failed to make any meaningful evaluation of the collapse of the USSR or the opportunist course taken by themselves, referring vaguely to 'mistakes' and preferring to draw a discreet veil over the details.

An attitude further from the Leninist revolutionary practice of assessing and learning from mistakes,

explaining them clearly to the masses and adjusting our activities accordingly would be hard to find.

Just as the CPSU had had a dominating influence in the postwar gatherings it hosted, so the KKE has dominated the agenda, discussion, participants and outcomes of the work undertaken by the IMCWP, known to many by the name of its website, Solidnet. The KKE has likewise come to dominate other international organisations that were previously run from Moscow, and which it has taken responsibility for rejuvenating: the World Federation of Trade Unions, the World Federation of Democratic Youth and the World Peace Council in particular.

While there was much gratitude to the Athens comrades for picking up the threads of this work, time has shown that all these organisations have continued to be run on the basis of having politics that are acceptable to the KKE, or of being willing to go along with being a militant side-show with no ability to have any meaningful influence on outcomes. Leaders of all the international organisations revived by the KKE are invariably its proteges, personally connected with its leaders and officials and owing them gratitude and loyalty.

Over the years, many friendly organisations have tried to persuade my party that we should apply to join Solidnet and add our weight to the revolutionary wing there. After our first attempt to join in the early period of our party's formation, we re-applied several times, but were consistently kept out, our contacts going unanswered, presumably because our politics were not acceptable to Solidnet's gatekeepers. Great efforts have been made even to keep our young comrades out of supposedly 'broad' events like the World Festivals of Democratic Youth.

At the time of our first application in 2008, the international department of the KKE actually asked the revisionist Communist Party of Britain (CPB) to report on our party's 'suitability' for admittance

to membership. The resulting 'assessment', so bizarrely commissioned from a group that could not but be our deadly political opponents (or else we surely would have been members of their organisation!), was immediately leaked to us. We published this tissue of lies and slanders along with a thorough refutation, but no direct contact was ever made by the KKE at this or any other time.

There was some hope felt about the prospects for Solidnet when parties with state power such as the CPC (China) and WPK (North Korea) began to attend its events. Surely now its political content would shift and its activity become more meaningful? Surely now old divisions would be ended and a meaningful politics would begin to emerge? This hope was further boosted by the admittance of a trickle of smaller parties with a more revolutionary programmes and no history of alignment to the revisionist USSR.

Sadly, however, these hopes came to nothing. Solidnet gatherings remained toothless and empty affairs as far as the working out of a common platform or coordinated actions were concerned. What they did achieve was to accustom most of the participants to the idea that meeting together once or twice a year, presenting conflicting papers in an atmosphere of respectful, gentlemanly disagreement, signing a 'joint declaration' that was so broad as to be essentially meaningless (and which was in any case destined only for a dusty shelf), and then retiring to the pub for a convivial drinking session was the height of internationalist revolutionary work.

The KKE has thus been very effective at creating a network of personal relationships that nobody involved wants to be seen to break. The accusation of 'splitting the movement' is one every delegate fears to draw on their heads—even those who know that really there is no unity in the true sense of the word, only a polite glossing over of uncomfortable differences. Meanwhile, whatever happens in the

debate, the resulting statement is the one that has been approved by the KKE and its self-reinforcing clique.

Far from becoming a conduit for revolutionary ideas to spread to the opportunist wing of our movement, far from preparing an organisation that is ready to rise to the challenges of the new and more revolutionary situation that was bound to arrive (and is now arriving), Solidnet has been far more effective at calming the ardour of those forces which entered it in the hope of combating opportunism.

In becoming accustomed to the norms of a bourgeois academic conference, many sincere comrades have come under the influence of these personal connections and by the timescales of this period, in which nothing much ever seemed to change and the overall balance of class forces seemed firmly stacked against us.

But such activity and such a timescale have nothing at all in common with the rapidly changing needs of the situation in which we now find ourselves.

It is no surprise that the escalation of the war in Ukraine brought the deep fractures and inadequacies of our movement to the forefront and our differences into the cold light of day. The war, and our movement's assessment of and response to it, is the primary political question of our time—the pivotal point around which all other differences have become secondary.

In front of our eyes, the world order is remaking itself. A new coming together of the socialist and anti-imperialist forces in the world has begun and is rapidly advancing—a cohesion in the anti-imperialist camp not seen since the days when Stalin's Soviet Union and Mao's China stood side by side at the head of the oppressed and working masses of the world. This realignment is a result of the shifting balance of class forces as the latest turn of the global crisis of overproduction

makes itself felt in a rapidly deepening crisis and an accompanying desperate drive to war by the imperialist camp.

In this situation, two events occurred which revealed that the days of Solidnet are numbered; that it remains constitutionally incapable of rising to the challenge of the new era; that it will never be a vehicle for uniting communists across borders and helping them to take their place at the front and centre of this rising anti-imperialist bloc—of throwing their weight behind the struggle against imperialism and playing a decisive role in the titanic battles that lie before us in the coming period.

Impotence of Solidnet, formation of the Platform

At an international conference hosted by the People's Democracy Party of south Korea in May 2022—a party of serious and dedicated revolutionary Marxists—a clear split revealed itself in the evaluation of those present regarding the war. Our PDP comrades were dismayed to find that many organisations they had considered to be 'fraternal' and 'on the same side' were promoting a bourgeois propaganda line to the effect that 'Russian aggression' was to blame for the escalation in Ukraine and that 'Russian imperialism' was the cause of this 'interimperialist' conflict.

In its investigations into what could be driving these differences, the PDP discovered that so influential a party as the KKE had not only adopted this line, but had presented the international communist movement with a 'worked out' theoretical justification, couched in Leninist terminology, to back up what is essentially bourgeois propaganda. Such lies, in the mouths of communists, have the potential to do the most serious harm to our chances of unifying the masses and successfully mobilising to defeating the imperialists' war aims.

A group of likeminded organisations, which shared the PDP's dismay at this betrayal of Marxism and the cause of the workers, and which understood that this question is the pivotal one of our era, came together to draft the Paris Declaration and to found the World Anti-imperialist Platform.

Recognising that the essence of the coming battles is of a struggle between the allied imperialists on the one hand and the independent anti-imperialist world on the other, it is plainly the duty of communists to do everything in their power to strengthen the forces of anti-imperialism, to help in bringing the anti-imperialist bloc more firmly together, to explain the nature of the struggle to the workers in our own countries, and to lay the groundwork for a defeat of the imperialist camp in every possible way—practically, organisationally and theoretically.

Meanwhile, at its meeting in Havana, Cuba, in November 2022, the split in Solidnet came into the open in a most revealing way. Instead of one declaration, two were issued—two statements in diametrical opposition to one another.

The first, sponsored by the KKE via a small group of its Ukrainian proxies, put forward the imperialist line about Russian imperialism and aggression etc. The second was most significantly sponsored by two Russian communist parties that have in general had great difficulty in working together owing to the revisionist positions of the larger (KPRF) and the antipathy to revisionism of the smaller (RCWP). Nevertheless, on the question of facing the imperialist attack on Russia, the two parties were united, and put forward an unequivocal resolution to that effect.

The list of signatures on the two resolutions tell you much about the state of this disunited 'movement' and where the fracture lines are to be found. So, too, did the increasingly outspoken statements of participants who are not under the KKE's control about the undemocratic way

in which leading bodies are sewn up. Despite a general fear of incurring the KKE's wrath, it is well known amongst all who operate in the international movement that the KKE has developed a system of control through influence over dependent organisations and individuals, and these dependents are routinely appointed to leading bodies to be sure that the right decisions will be made.

Since it was impossible to gloss over the differences regarding the war in Ukraine, however, the two resolutions were published on the Solidnet website and the delegates were sent home to prepare their papers for next time. The impotence of the organisation as a whole and the rottenness of the party that controls its operations were left clearly revealed, and it seems unlikely that its meetings will continue for very much longer in their present form.

Like the Second International, Solidnet is destined for an ignominious burial, and those who remain affiliated to whatever is left standing when it splits will have earned their place in the annals of shame alongside such 1914 heroes of socialism as Eduard Bernstein and Ramsay MacDonald.

Meanwhile, those who attempt to hide and paper over the cracks of this divide should beware of finding themselves in the camp of such as Karl Kautsky, whose vacillations and attempts to find a peaceful way out of the divisions of the movement a century ago ultimately led him into the camp of those who denounced the October Revolution and worked actively to destroy it.

Rising to the challenge of the new era

Understanding the nature of the looming third world war, the Platform does not confine itself to working only with communists, but aims to harness all the forces in the world capable of understanding the main issue and uniting behind its broad line. At the same time, the founders and principal

organisers of the Platform are communists: we aim not only to strengthen the anti-imperialist struggle but to strengthen the role of the communists within that struggle.

We are working hard to bring our analysis to Marxists and anti-imperialists everywhere and to persuade them to join us in this, the single most important endeavour of our era.

As Marxists, we know that only Marxism provides the tools to ensure the most steadfast, most disciplined, most thorough struggle against imperialism. That real Marxist involvement and leadership of such a struggle provides its best chance of success. It is our undoubted duty to do what we can to fulfil that honourable role in the coming period, undaunted by either the size of the task or the shocking disarray into which our movement has been thrown.

We may not be starting from an ideal or easy situation, but we are where we are and must deal with reality as it is.

There is no doubt at all that the coming struggles will see many large and long-established organisations decay and fall apart, while small and relatively newer ones will grow—these changes will be determined by their ability to play the role demanded of them; by the impetus of history, and not by any inherited ‘right’ to be considered as a ‘vanguard’. Our theory sets our line of action, and we must be sure of our theory if we want to act correctly, but in the end it is our deeds that will define us and determine our relevance to the times.

While it is true that the defeat of the imperialists in the coming conflicts will not automatically and immediately result in worldwide victory of socialism, it should be clear that through the course of this struggle, the main impediment to socialism—capitalist imperialism—will be fatally weakened and revolutionary forces will be strengthened in the same proportion.

A new wave of revolutionary upsurge is being

prepared by the present crisis, national-liberation struggles are already resulting from this upsurge, and socialist revolutions will undoubtedly break out too. Wherever in the world these movements begin, and it is clear that the west will not be at the front of this surge, we can be sure their inspiration and influence will spread rapidly, just as the influence and inspiration of October set fire to the world after 1917. The same desperate conditions of economic crisis, of rising costs of basic food and energy, of unendurable poverty and disease, of imperialist-backed terrorism and war are facing workers everywhere, including in the formerly protected imperialist heartlands.

If further proof were needed of the inability of the KKE-led organisations to deal politically with the questions that now face us, its recent actions in the European Communist Initiative must surely provide it. This grouping of left-wing communist parties in Europe, established under the leadership of the KKE at a time when the Greek party looked as if it was serious about addressing its revisionist past and moving over to the revolutionary Marxist camp, has, like many other Athens-based groups, never really lived up to its potential or the hopes that were placed in it at its founding.

This September, no doubt aware of the rising tensions amongst its members and the likelihood of serious political disagreements being aired and its own line being criticised, the KKE organised a zoom call of the Initiative. At that meeting, without having previously notified members of its intention, the KKE announced the unilateral disbandment of the group in such a way as to give no space for debate or discussion. The call was ended and the Telegram group for its participants was deleted. In such a way, the KKE deals with political differences and perceived threats to its hegemony.

Fighting imperialism in Britain

I have been asked to outline our approach to

fighting imperialism in Britain. As with you here in Germany, our country is ruled by an established imperialist class whose subordinate position to US imperialism does not in any way mean that it has ceased to be a power in its own right.

We continue to stress in our analysis to British workers the power and interests of British imperialism and how those interests affect its activities. But it is indisputable that the war in Ukraine has highlighted the reduced position of British imperialism in the most stark way, and revealed the fact that interimperialist rivalries have been subordinated to the need of all the imperialists to group together for the survival of their system.

I am not able to give a detailed history of the world since 1914. I will simply sum up by saying that the first world war was the result of the global crisis of the capitalist economic system—a crisis that was inescapable except by means of war precisely because the capitalist market had come to embrace the whole world and there was nowhere left to expand into.

The war itself hugely weakened all the individual imperialist powers that fought it, including the victors, as well as the capitalist-imperialist system as a whole. This was partly because of the scale of destruction and devastation, but particularly because of the October Revolution, which had been propelled by the war and which signalled the rise of the era of socialism and national liberation. Not only the workers in the imperialist countries, but the oppressed masses in the colonies began to struggle in earnest for their emancipation from imperialist slavery.

The second world war further weakened the old imperialist powers of Europe and Asia. In fact, it was only the existence of the USA—the one imperialist power that had got stronger through each of the wars rather than weaker—that stopped the further spread of communist revolution across western Europe and deeper into Asia after 1945.

In the interests of saving the capitalist system, the USA came to the rescue of the decimated European imperialist powers and helped them to somewhat of a recovery.

But while German, French and British finance capital were thus assisted in maintaining a seat at the imperialist table, were facilitated in continuing to loot the oppressed peoples and to buy social peace at home through welfare programmes, their position was not what it had been. The USA was careful to establish a system, via Breton Woods, the IMF and World Bank, Nato and the European Economic Community, that none of the subordinated imperialist powers has since been in a position to circumvent. As a result, they rely for their military strength on US imperialism, and must therefore ultimately subordinate their economic interests to those of the USA—for the time being at least.

This has never been clearer than in the recent months of Russia's special military operation, when the European countries were called upon to sacrifice their independent economic interests in the interests of the 'greater good' of destroying Russia. No doubt if Russia had been quickly defeated and dismantled as planned, the imperialists would have been satisfied that the short-term pain had been worth the long-term gain of unbridled looting that would have ensued. But since the Russian economy refused to buckle under the sanctions blitzkrieg, and since the Russian government remained in place despite all attempts to stir up regime change, both the economic and military wars being waged via the proxy conflict in Ukraine have backfired on the aggressors.

It is not wrong to point out to workers in western Europe that they are being asked to sacrifice their access to cheap and reliable power sources, fertilisers etc, that inflation is being stoked and industries lost in the interests of an alien class. It is perfectly correct to take notice of and use to our

advantage the publicity that is created when our rulers are divided amongst themselves. Smaller-scale capital in Europe (and in this case, ‘smaller’ may still mean huge multinationals) is being asked to pay the price of trying to keep the profits flowing for the biggest capitalists.

Equally, there is a reason why all the European officials in the EU and Nato, and so many government ministers in all our countries, are happy to go along with this programme. This is because in Germany as in Britain, the biggest financiers understand that their only hope of surviving this crisis is on the coat-tails of US imperialist power—and so ultimately that is where their loyalty will lie. If millions of German and British workers lose their jobs or are otherwise plunged into poverty in the process, that matters little to them. They are equally indifferent to the plight of their fellow capitalists who are going to the wall. There is no honour among thieves. The capitalist system is characterised first and foremost by competition, and it is in the nature of the system that the biggest players will survive at the expense of the smaller, medium and even very big.

In showing these truths to workers in our countries, our aim is not to recruit them to the cause of the capitalists who are threatened by US hegemony and wish to return to the days when they had the power to go it alone (as represented in Britain by what is known as the ‘little Englander’ mentality and in Europe by the proponents of the EU army). Our job is to help workers see that not only are those days gone forever, but that workers have no interest in returning to them. We do not want to ‘make Britain great again’ by returning to the days when the British empire ruled the waves, but to help workers understand by their own experience that there is simply no way out of crisis and war except through socialist revolution.

It’s notable that the labour aristocracy in western Europe (made up of privileged workers and petty-

bourgeois strata, professionals and NGO workers as well as the highly-paid and professionalised trade union leaderships), being totally tied to and dependent on imperialism for its privileged position in capitalist society, is the most loyal section of the population when it comes to defending imperialist interests. In Britain, we were recently treated to the disgusting spectacle of the Trades Union Congress (TUC) voting for an imperialist-backed motion to ‘stand with Ukraine’, condemning Russian aggression more strongly even than the most impeccable bourgeois politicians, and practically demanding an open-ended commitment to arms and other support for Nato’s proxy Ukronazi army.

This serves to highlight the importance of continuing to study and act on the lessons taught to us by Lenin during the Bolsheviks’ history and development, both within their own party and country and in the international arena.

Opportunism within the working-class movement remains our most deadly enemy. It represents the influence of the bourgeoisie in our midst, our enemy within, and has been the cause of so many of our catastrophic reverses.

Only those who have waged serious and relentless struggles against opportunism have been successful in carrying out socialist revolutions, and there is not a doubt that this will continue to hold as true in the future as it has in the past.

On the “New Cold War”

Stephen Cho | Coordinator of the Korean International Forum

December 26, 2023

It is the era of the “New Cold War”. The term “New Cold War” is now commonly used and can be easily found in various media. The “New Cold War” is a new “Cold War” between the anti-imperialist and imperialist camps in the modern era. The current situation is, in short, a dangerous one in which the flames of World War III started in Eastern Europe and are spreading, through the Middle East (West Asia), to East Asia. On a global scale, several anti-imperialist battlefields have been formed under one anti-imperialist united front, which is expanding and intensifying. World War III, the anti-imperialist front, and the “New Cold War” are closely linked.

In order to understand the nature of the “New Cold War”, we should pay attention to its differences with the previous “Cold War”.

First, the “Cold War” and the “New Cold War” had different outbreak timing.

The “Cold War” began with the end of World War II, but the “New Cold War” began with the beginning of World War III. The “Cold War” was initiated to prevent the spread of socialism when the socialist camp was formed globally immediately after World War II. In order to hinder the westward and southward advance of the socialist camps that liberated large parts of Eurasia, “Trumanism” and “containment” policies emerged, the Marshall Plan was implemented in Western Europe, and “ASEAN” was organized in Southeast Asia.

The “New Cold War” began with World War III, a war induced by the imperialist camp to isolate and dismantle the anti-imperialist camp, a war which broke out with Russia’s special military operation in 2022. The war in Ukraine began with the Maidan coup d’état in 2014, an operation born out of by Zbigniew Brezinsky’s “Grand Chessboard” strategy

and a new episode of the “color revolutions” orchestrated under the control of the US. The conflict deepened over the next eight years with the massacre of 14,000 people in Donbas, before entering all out with Russia’s special military operation in 2022. This is when World War III broke out. It then deepened with the war in Palestine and the Middle East in 2023, and will enter in full swing with the imminent wars in Taiwan and South Korea.

Second, from the “Cold War” to the “New Cold War”, the camps involved have different characteristics.

The “Cold War” was a confrontation between the socialist camp and the imperialist camp, while the “New Cold War” is between the anti-imperialist camp and the imperialist camp. Therefore, ideological differences were relatively more important in the “Cold War” than in the “New Cold War”.

During the “Cold War”, the ideological orientation toward socialism and its positivity were essential, but in the “New Cold War”, the problems in reality and the negativity caused by imperialism are emphasized.

During the “Cold War”, the socialist camp was divided between the Soviet Union and China, but in the “New Cold War”, Russia and China are united within the anti-imperialist camp.

In the “Cold War”, the Soviet Union and China, the big countries within the socialist camp, each claimed that they were incarnations of socialism; but in the “New Cold War”, there is no disagreement that North Korea, a small country, is the most advanced country on the socialist path.

The “Cold War” began when US imperialism was

at its strongest in history. The beginning of the modern imperialist system, in which the imperialist camp is reorganized around US imperialism, coincides with the beginning of the “Cold War”. For example, the US dollar became the world’s reserve currency with the establishment of the Bretton Woods system led by the US after winning World War II. Even the currency crisis that followed the US decision to abandon the gold standard was easily overcome: the US was able to conclude an agreement with OPEC around Saudi Arabia on the exclusive use of dollars for oil-related transactions, paving the way for the rise of petrodollars.

The “New Cold War” began at the height of US imperialism’s political and economic crisis. The US presidential election in 2020 embodied a confrontation between the anti-Deep State forces and the Deep State forces, and it is reported that the Deep State forces are likely to be defeated in the US presidential election in the 2024. US influence is very different than before, as evidenced by the successive rejections of the US-led UN Security Council sanctions against North Korea’s missile launches and the overwhelming passage of the resolution of the ceasefire in Palestine by the UN General Assembly despite US opposition. The US’s status in the global economy has also weakened significantly, as evidenced by the rise of China and the expansion of the BRICS. The petrodollar system is coming to an end, with Saudi Arabia and other Arab countries joining the anti-imperialist camp.

Third, the “Cold War” and the “New Cold War” follow different phases of development.

In the period of the “Cold War”, it proceeded without any “hot war” between the socialist camp and the imperialist camp. The “hot wars” were provoked by the imperialist camp against the small countries in the Third world. The examples are the Korean War in the 1950s, the Vietnam War in the 1960s and 1970s and wars in the Middle East waged by the imperialist camp and Israel against

Arab countries. At that time, the imperialist camp conducted the “Cold War” against its main adversaries—the big countries like the Soviet Union and China—not through “hot wars”, but through the invisible wars or the wars without gunfire.

In the period of the “New Cold War”, the “hot wars” and the “Cold Wars” have been conducted simultaneously between the anti-imperialist camp and the imperialist camp. Today, the imperialist camp is waging the “hot war” against Russia, which is a big country, and provoking another “hot war” against China, which is another big country. The imperialist camp, while preparing a “hot war” against China, is already carrying out a “Cold War” against Beijing. The declaration of the “New Washington Consensus” and the “de-risking” mantra merged in 2023, as part of this Cold War against China: they represent a cunning and deceptive attempt at laying the responsibility for the “New Cold War” on China, although the American plan is already clear: igniting the war in Taiwan.

The war in Palestine, the war in Middle East, which broke out in 2023, clearly demonstrate that, in the midst of this “New Cold War”, the imperialist forces are also carrying out “hot wars” against small countries.

While the Korean War in the period of the “Cold War” was the “hot war” which the imperialist camp waged against North Korea, the national liberation country, the Korean War in the period of the “New Cold War” will be the “hot war” which the imperialist camp wages against North Korea, the socialist country. North Korea in the period of the “New Cold War” is, different with itself in the period of the “Cold War”, the military power armed with the nuclear missile.

The last one is the difference between the result of the “Cold War” and prospect of a “New Cold War”.

Although the imperialist camp has won in the “Cold War”, the result of the “New Cold War” will

have the opposite results. The “Cold War” ended with a victory for the imperialist camp with the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991.

The socialist camp and its allies, national liberation forces, which were at their height because of the victory of the world anti-fascist forces in World War II, declined with the collapse of the Soviet Union. The rise of the socialist camp and national liberation forces started the “Cold War” and went into decline after the “Cold War”. The imperialist camp, trying to save itself from its own internal crisis, contrived the “New Cold War” and provoked World War III in order to carry it out. However, the war in Ukraine in Eastern Europe and war in Palestine in the Middle East are not going the way the imperialist camp hoped they would, thus provoking a crisis within the imperialist camp. The wars to come in Taiwan and in South Korea in East Asia, key for the imperialist camp’s strategy to kick off the “New Cold War”, will decisively lead to the crisis of the imperialist camp. Russia, China, and North Korea are all nuclear and missile powers armed with hydrogen bombs and hypersonic missiles, and the anti-imperialist countries in the Middle East including Palestine are strongly armed. Most of all, on all these 3 battlefields, the anti-imperialist camp is waging the just war as the anti-imperialist liberation war. The strategic errors of the imperialist camp are, first, to unite Russia and China in an anti-imperialist camp; second, to push 2 billion Muslims into the anti-imperialist camp; and third, to lose its excuse by the logical contradiction between the anti-Russian propaganda and the pro-Israeli propaganda. As reality shows, Russia is winning on the battlefield in Ukraine and is getting stronger militarily, politically and economically day by day. In the Palestinian and the Middle East wars, it is the Zionist Israel that is isolated, while the anti-Zionist and anti-imperialist forces in the Middle East are uniting and increasing the intensity of their struggle. The outcome of

the wars in Taiwan and South Korea will be no different.

Platform



The World Anti-imperialist Platform