

Platform

April 2025 No.23

The World Anti-imperialist Platform

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





Contents

Work	Lessons of the Revolution ······ 2 V.I. Lenin
Article	The Dialectics of the Historical Process and the Methodology of Its Research ······ 11 Victor Alexeyevich Vaziulin
	“Reflection on revolutionary and counterrevolutionary processes in the 20th and 21st centuries” – Case studies Yugoslavia ······ 20 Aleksandar Đenić New Communist Party of Yugoslavia (Serbia)
	Who will seize the strategic initiative in WWII? ······ 29 Dimitrios Patelis Revolutionary Unification (Greece)
	Interview on the World Anti-Imperialist Platform ······ 39 Stephen Cho Coordinator of the Korean International Forum
	The war in the “Republic of Korea” is the ultimate scheme of the desperate imperialist forces to ignite a World War 3 ······ 46 Stephen Cho Coordinator of the Korean International Forum

Lessons of the Revolution

V.I. Lenin

July-September 1917

Every revolution means a sharp turn in the lives of a vast number of people. Unless the time is ripe for such a turn, no real revolution can take place. And just as any turn in the life of an individual teaches him a great deal and brings rich experience and great emotional stress, so a revolution teaches an entire people very rich and valuable lessons in a short space of time.

During a revolution, millions and tens of millions of people learn in a week more than they do in a year of ordinary, somnolent life. For at the time of a sharp turn in the life of an entire people it becomes particularly clear what aims the various classes of the people are pursuing, what strength they possess, and what methods they use.

Every class-conscious worker, soldier and peasant should ponder thoroughly over the lessons of the Russian revolution, especially now, at the end of July, when it is clear that the first phase of our revolution has failed.

I

Let us see, in fact, what the workers and peasants were striving for when they made the revolution. What did they expect of the revolution? As we know, they expected liberty, peace, bread and land.

But what do we see now?

Instead of liberty, the old tyranny is coming back. The death penalty is being introduced for the soldiers at the front.^[1] Peasants are prosecuted for the unauthorised seizure of landed estates. Printing presses of workers' newspapers are wrecked. Workers' newspapers are closed down without trial. Bolsheviks are arrested, often without any charge or upon blatantly trumped-up charges.

It may be argued that the persecution of Bolsheviks does not constitute a violation of freedom, for only certain individuals are being prosecuted and on certain charges. Such an argument, however, would

be a deliberate and obvious lie; for how can anyone wreck printing presses and close down newspapers for the crimes of individuals, even if these charges were proved and established by a court of law? It would be a different thing if the government had legally declared the whole party of the Bolsheviks, their very trend and views, to be criminal. But everybody knows that the government of free Russia could not, and did not, do anything of the kind.

What chiefly exposes the libelous character of the charges against the Bolsheviks is that the newspapers of the landowners and capitalists furiously abused the Bolsheviks for their struggle against the war and against the landowners and capitalists, and openly demanded the arrest and prosecution of the Bolsheviks even when not a single charge against a single Bolshevik had been trumped up.

The people want peace. Yet the revolutionary government of free Russia has resumed the war of conquest on the basis of those very same secret treaties which ex-Tsar Nicholas II concluded with the British and French capitalists so that the Russian capitalists might plunder other nations. Those secret treaties remain unpublished. The government of free Russia resorted to subterfuges, and to this day has not proposed a just peace to all nations.

There is no bread. Famine is again drawing near. Everybody sees that the capitalists and the rich are unscrupulously cheating the treasury on war deliveries (the war is now costing the nation fifty million rubles daily), that they are raking in fabulous profits through high prices, while nothing whatsoever has been done to establish effective control by the workers over the production and distribution of goods. The capitalists are becoming more brazen every day; they are throwing workers out into the street, and this at a time when the people are suffering from shortages.

A vast majority of the peasants, at congress after

congress, have loudly and clearly declared that landed proprietorship is an injustice and robbery. Meanwhile, a government which calls itself revolutionary and democratic has been leading peasants by the nose for months and deceiving them by promises and delays. For months the capitalists did not allow Minister Chernov to issue a law prohibiting the purchase and sale of land. And when this law was finally passed, the capitalists started a foul slander campaign against Chernov, which they are still continuing. The government has become so brazen in its defense of the landowners that it is beginning to bring peasants to trial for “unauthorised” seizures of land.

They are leading the peasants by the nose, telling them to wait for the Constituent Assembly. The convocation of the Assembly, however, is being steadily postponed by the capitalists. Now that owing to Bolshevik pressure it has been set for September 30, the capitalists are openly clamouring about this being “impossibly” short notice, and are demanding the Constituent Assembly’s postponement. The most influential members of the capitalist and landowner party, the “Cadet”, or “people’s freedom”, Party, such as Panina, are openly urging that the convocation of the Constituent Assembly be delayed until after the war.

As to land, wait until the Constituent Assembly. As to the Constituent Assembly, wait until the end of the war. As to the end of the war, wait until complete victory. That is what it comes to. The capitalists and landowners, having a majority in the government, are plainly mocking at the peasants.

II

But how could this happen in a free country, after the overthrow of the tsarist regime?

In a non-free country, the people are ruled by a tsar and a handful of landowners, capitalists and bureaucrats who are not elected by anybody.

In a free country, the people are ruled only by those who have been elected for that purpose by the people themselves. At the elections the people divide themselves into parties, and as a rule each class of the population forms its own party; for instance, the

landowners, the capitalists, the peasants and the workers all form separate parties. In free countries, therefore, the people are ruled through an open struggle between parties and by free agreement between these parties.

For about four months after the overthrow of the tsarist regime on February 27, 1917, Russia was ruled as a free country, i.e., through an open struggle between freely formed parties and by free agreement between them. To understand the development of the Russian revolution, therefore, it is above all necessary to study the chief parties, the class interests they defended, and the relations among them all.

III

After the overthrow of the tsarist regime state power passed into the hands of the first Provisional Government, consisting of representatives of the bourgeoisie, i.e., the capitalists, who were joined by the landowners. The “Cadet” Party, the chief capitalist party, held pride of place as the ruling and government party of the bourgeoisie.

It was no accident this party secured power, although it was not the capitalists, of course, but the workers and peasants, the soldiers and sailors, who fought the tsarist troops and shed their blood for liberty. Power was secured by the capitalist party because the capitalist class possessed the power of wealth, organisation and knowledge. Since 1905, and particularly during the war, the class of the capitalists, and the landowners associated with them, have made in Russia the greatest progress in organising.

The Cadet Party has always been monarchist, both in 1905 and from 1905 to 1917. After the people’s victory over tsarist tyranny it proclaimed itself a republican party. The experience of history shows that whenever the people triumphed over a monarchy, capitalist parties were willing to become republican as long as they could uphold the privileges of the capitalists and their unlimited power over the people.

The Cadet Party pays lip-service to “people’s freedom”. But actually it stands for the capitalists, and it was immediately backed by all the landowners, monarchists and Black Hundreds. The press and the

elections are proof of this. After the revolution, all the bourgeois papers and the whole Black Hundred press began to sing in unison with the Cadets. Not daring to come out openly, all the monarchist parties supported the Cadet Party at the elections, as, for example, in Petrograd.

Having obtained state power, the Cadets made every effort to continue the predatory war of conquest begun by Tsar Nicholas II, who had concluded secret predatory treaties with the British and French capitalists. Under these treaties, the Russian capitalists were promised, in the event of victory, the seizure of Constantinople, Galicia, Armenia, etc. As to the people, the government of the Cadets put them off with empty subterfuges and promises, deferring the decision of all matters of vital and essential importance to the workers and peasants until the Constituent Assembly met, without appointing the date of its convocation.

Making use of liberty, the people began to organise independently. The chief organisation of the workers and peasants, who form the overwhelming majority of the population of Russia, was the Soviets of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies. These Soviets already began to be formed during the February Revolution, and within a few weeks all class-conscious and advanced workers and peasants were united in Soviets in most of the larger cities of Russia and in many rural districts.

The Soviets were elected in an absolutely free way. They were genuine organisations of the people, of the workers and peasants. They were genuine organisations of the vast majority of the people. The workers and peasants in soldiers' uniforms were armed.

It goes without saying that the Soviets could and should have taken over state power in full. Pending the convocation of the Constituent Assembly there should have been no other power in the state but the Soviets. Only then would our revolution have become a truly popular and truly democratic revolution. Only then could the working people, who are really striving for peace, and who really have no interest in a war of conquest, have begun firmly and

resolutely to carry out a policy which would have ended the war of conquest and led to peace. Only then could the workers and peasants have curbed the capitalists, who are making fabulous profits "from the war" and who have reduced the country to a state of ruin and starvation. But in the Soviets only a minority of the deputies were on the side of the revolutionary workers' party, the Bolshevik Social Democrats, who demanded that all state power should be transferred to the Soviets. The majority of the deputies to the Soviets were on the side of the parties of the Menshevik Social-Democrats and the Socialist-Revolutionaries, who were opposed to the transfer of power to the Soviets. Instead of removing the bourgeois government and replacing it by a government of the Soviets, these parties insisted on supporting the bourgeois government, compromising with it and forming a coalition government with it. This policy of compromise with the bourgeoisie pursued by the Socialist-Revolutionary and Menshevik parties, who enjoyed the confidence of the majority of the people, is the main content of the entire course of development of the revolution during the five months since it began.

IV

Let us first see how this compromising of the Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks with the bourgeoisie proceeded, and then let us try to explain why the majority of the people trusted them.

V

The Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries have compromised with the capitalists in one way or another at every stage of the Russian revolution.

At the very close of February 1917, as soon as the people had triumphed and the tsarist regime had been overthrown, the capitalist Provisional Government admitted Kerensky as a "socialist". As a matter of fact, Kerensky has never been a socialist; he was only a Trudovik,^[2] and he enlisted himself with the "Socialist-Revolutionaries" only in March 1917, when it was already safe and quite profitable to do so. Through Kerensky, as Deputy Chairman

of the Petrograd Soviet, the capitalist Provisional Government immediately set about gaining control of and taming the Soviet. The Soviet, i.e., the Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks who predominated in it, allowed itself to be tamed, agreeing immediately after the formation of the capitalist Provisional Government to “support it”—“to the extent” that it carried out its promises.

The Soviet regarded itself as a body verifying and exercising control over the activities of the Provisional Government. The leaders of the Soviet established what was known as a Contact Commission to keep in touch with the government.^[3] Within that Contact Commission, the Socialist-Revolutionary and Menshevik leaders of the Soviet held continuous negotiations with the capitalist government, holding, properly speaking, the status of Ministers without portfolio or unofficial Ministers.

This state of affairs lasted throughout March and almost the whole of April. Seeking to gain time, the capitalists resorted to delays and subterfuges. Not a single step of any importance to further the revolution was taken by the capitalist government during this period. It did absolutely nothing even to further its direct and immediate task, the convocation of the Constituent Assembly; it did not submit the question to the localities or even set up a central commission to handle the preparations. The government was concerned with only one thing, namely, surreptitiously renewing the predatory international treaties concluded by the tsar with the capitalists of Britain and France, thwarting the revolution as cautiously and quietly as possible, and promising everything without fulfilling any of its promises. The Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks in the Contact Commission acted like simpletons who were fed on fancy phrases, promises, and more promises. Like the crow in the fable, the Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks succumbed to flattery and listened with pleasure to the assurances of the capitalists that they valued the Soviets highly and did not take a single step without them.

But time passed and the capitalist government did

absolutely nothing for the revolution. On the contrary, during this period it managed, to the detriment of the revolution, to renew the secret predatory treaties, or, rather, to reaffirm them and “vitalise” them by supplementary and no less secret negotiations with Anglo-French imperialist diplomats. During this period it managed, to the detriment of the revolution, to lay the foundations of a counter-revolutionary organisation of (or at least of a rapprochement among) the generals and officers in the army in the field. To the detriment of the revolution it managed to start the organisation of industrialists, of factory-owners, who, under the onslaught of the workers, were compelled to make concession after concession, but who at the same time began to sabotage (damage) production and prepare to bring it to a standstill when the opportunity came.

However, the organisation of the advanced workers and peasants in the Soviets made steady progress. The foremost representatives of the oppressed classes felt that, in spite of the agreement between the government and the Petrograd Soviet, in spite of Kerensky’s pompous talk, in spite of the “Contact Commission”, the government remained an enemy of the people, an enemy of the revolution. The people felt that unless the resistance of the capitalists was broken, the cause of peace, liberty and the revolution, would inevitably be lost. The impatience and bitterness of the people kept on growing.

VI

It burst out on April 20–21. The movement flared up spontaneously; nobody had cleared the ground for it. The movement was so markedly directed against the government that one regiment even appeared fully armed at the Marinsky Palace to arrest the ministers. It became perfectly obvious to everybody that the government could not retain power. The Soviets could (and should) have taken over power with out meeting the least resistance from any quarter. Instead, the Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks supported the collapsing capitalist government, entangled themselves even further in compromises with it and took steps that were even more fatal to the revolution,

that tended to lead to its doom.

Revolution enlightens all classes with a rapidity and thoroughness unknown in normal, peaceful times. The capitalists, better organised and more experienced than anybody else in matters of class struggle and politics, learnt their lesson quicker than the others. Realising that the government's position was hopeless, they resorted to a method which for many decades, ever since 1848, has been practised by the capitalists of other countries in order to fool, divide and weaken the workers. This method is known as a "coalition" government, i.e., a joint cabinet formed of members of the bourgeoisie and turncoats from socialism.

In countries where freedom and democracy have long existed side by side with a revolutionary labour movement, in Britain and France, the capitalists have repeatedly and very successfully resorted to this method. When the "socialist" leaders entered a bourgeois cabinet, they invariably proved to be figureheads, puppets, screens for the capitalists, instruments for deceiving the workers. The "democratic and republican" capitalists of Russia resorted to this very method. The Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks let themselves be fooled at once, and the "coalition" cabinet, joined by Chernov, Tsereteli and Co., became a fact on May 6.

The simpletons of the Socialist-Revolutionary and Menshevik parties were jubilant and fatuously bathed in the rays of the ministerial glory of their leaders. The capitalists gleefully rubbed their hands at having found helpers against the people in the persons of the "leaders of the Soviets" and at having secured their promise to support "offensive operations at the front", i.e., a resumption of the imperialist predatory war, which had come to a standstill for a while. The capitalists were well aware of the puffed-up impotence of these leaders, they knew that the promises of the bourgeoisie—regarding control over production, and even the organisation of production, regarding a peace policy, and so forth—would never be fulfilled.

And so it turned out. The second phase in the development of the revolution, May 6 to June 9, or

June 18, fully corroborated the expectations of the capitalists as to the ease with which the Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks could be fooled.

While Peshekhonov and Skobelev were deceiving themselves and the people with florid speeches to the effect that one hundred percent of the profits of the capitalists would be taken away from them, that their "resistance was broken", and so forth, the capitalists continued to consolidate their position. Nothing, absolutely nothing, was undertaken during this period to curb the capitalists. The ministerial turncoats from socialism proved to be mere talking machines for distracting the attention of the oppressed classes, while the entire apparatus of state administration actually remained in the hands of the bureaucracy (the officialdom) and the bourgeoisie. The notorious Palchinsky, Deputy Minister for Industry, was a typical representative of that apparatus, blocking every measure against the capitalists. While the ministers prated everything remained as of old.

The bourgeoisie used Minister Tsereteli in particular to fight the revolution. He was sent to "pacify" Kronstadt when the local revolutionaries had the audacity to remove an appointed commissar. [4] The bourgeoisie launched in their newspapers an incredibly vociferous, violent and vicious campaign of lies, slander and vituperation against Kronstadt, accusing it of the desire "to secede from Russia", and repeating this and similar absurdities in a thousand ways to intimidate the petty bourgeoisie and the philistines. A most typically stupid and frightened philistine, Tsereteli, was the most "conscientious" of all in swallowing the bait of bourgeois slander; he was the most zealous of all in "smashing up and subduing" Kronstadt, without realising that he was playing the role of a lackey of the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie. He turned out to be the instrument of the "compromise" arrived at with revolutionary Kronstadt, whereby the commissar for Kronstadt was not simply appointed by the government, but was elected locally and was confirmed by the government. It was on such miserable compromises that the ministers who had deserted socialism for the

bourgeoisie wasted their time.

Wherever a bourgeois minister could not appear in defence of the government, before the revolutionary workers or in the Soviets, Skobelev, Tsereteli, Chernov or some other “socialist” Minister appeared (or, to be precise, was sent by the bourgeoisie) and faithfully performed their assignment; he would do his level best to defend the Cabinet, whitewash the capitalists and fool the people by making promise after promise and by advising people to wait, wait and wait.

Minister Chernov particularly was engaged in bargaining with his bourgeois colleagues; down to July, to the new “crisis of power” which began after the movement of July 3-4, to the resignation of the Cadets from the Cabinet, Minister Chernov was continuously engaged in the useful and interesting work, so beneficial to the people, of “persuading” his bourgeois colleagues, exhorting them to agree at least to prohibition of the purchase and sale of land. This prohibition had been most solemnly promised to the peasants at the All-Russia Congress of Peasant Deputies in Petrograd. But the promise remained only a promise. Chernov proved unable to fulfil it either in May or in June, until the revolutionary tide, the spontaneous outbreak of July 3-4, which coincided with the resignation of the Cadets from the Cabinet, made it possible to enact this measure. Even then, however, it proved to be an isolated measure, incapable of promoting to any palpable extent the struggle of the peasants against the landowners for land.

Meanwhile, at the front, the counter-revolutionary, imperialist task of resuming the imperialist, predatory war, a task which Guchkov, so hated by the people, had been unable to accomplish, was being accomplished successfully and brilliantly by the “revolutionary democrat” Kerensky, that new-baked member of the Socialist-Revolutionary Party. He revelled in his own eloquence, incense was burned to him by the imperialists, who were using him as a pawn, he was flattered and worshipped—all because he served the capitalists faithfully, trying to talk the “revolutionary troops” into agreeing to resume the war being waged in pursuance of the treaties

concluded by Tsar Nicholas II with the capitalists of Britain and France, a war waged so that Russian capitalists might secure Constantinople and Lvov, Erzurum and Trebizond.

So passed the second phase of the Russian revolution—May 6 to June 9. Shielded and defended by the “socialist” Ministers, the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie grew in strength, consolidated their position and prepared an offensive both against the external enemy and against the internal enemy, i.e., the revolutionary workers.

VII

On June 9, the revolutionary workers’ party, the Bolsheviks, was preparing for a demonstration in Petrograd to give organised expression to the irresistibly growing popular discontent and indignation. The Socialist-Revolutionary and Menshevik leaders, entangled in compromises with the bourgeoisie and bound by the imperialist policy of an offensive, were horrified, feeling that they were losing their influence among the masses. A general howl went up against the demonstration, and the counter-revolutionary Cadets joined in this howl, this time together with the Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks. Under their direction, and as a result of their policy of compromise with the capitalists, the swing of the petty-bourgeois masses to an alliance with the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie became quite definite and strikingly obvious. This is the historical significance and class meaning of the crisis of June 9.

The Bolsheviks called off the demonstration, having no wish to lead the workers at that moment into a losing fight against the united Cadets, Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks. The latter, however, so as to retain at least a vestige of the people’s confidence, were compelled to call a general demonstration for June 18. The bourgeoisie were beside themselves with rage, rightly discerning in this a swing of the petty-bourgeois democrats towards the proletariat, and they decided to paralyse the action of the democrats by an offensive at the front.

In fact, June 18 was marked by an impressive victory

for the slogans of the revolutionary proletariat, the slogans of Bolshevism, among the people of Petrograd. And on June 19 the bourgeoisie and the Bonapartist^[5] Kerensky solemnly announced that the offensive at the front had begun on June 18.

The offensive meant in effect the resumption of the predatory war in the interests of the capitalists and against the will of the vast majority of the working people. That is why the offensive was inevitably accompanied, on the one hand, by a gigantic growth of chauvinism and the transfer of military power (and consequently of state power) to the military gang of Bonapartists, and, on the other, by the use of violence against the masses, the persecution of the internationalists, the abolition of freedom of agitation, and the arrest and shooting of those who were against the war.

Whereas May 6 bound the Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks to the triumphal chariot of the bourgeoisie with a rope, June 19 shackled them, as servants of the capitalists, with a chain.

VIII

Owing to the resumption of the predatory war, the bitterness of the people naturally grew even more rapidly and intensely. July 3–4 witnessed an outburst of their anger which the Bolsheviks attempted to restrain and which, of course, they had to endeavour to make as organised as possible.

The Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks, being slaves of the bourgeoisie, shackled by their master, agreed to everything: dispatching reactionary troops to Petrograd, bringing back the death penalty, disarming the workers and revolutionary troops, arresting and hounding, and closing down newspapers without trial. The power which the bourgeoisie in the government were unable to take entirely, and which the Soviets did not want to take, fell into the hands of the military clique, the Bonapartists, who, of course, were wholly backed by the Cadets and the Black Hundreds, by the landowners and capitalists.

Down the ladder, step by step. Having once set foot on the ladder of compromise with the bourgeoisie, the Socialist Revolutionaries and Mensheviks slid

irresistibly downwards, to rock bottom. On February 28, in the Petrograd Soviet, they promised conditional support to the bourgeois government. On May 6 they saved it from collapse and allowed themselves to be made its servants and defenders by agreeing to an offensive. On June 9 they united with the counter revolutionary bourgeoisie in a campaign of furious rage, lies and slander against the revolutionary proletariat. On June 19 they approved the resumption of the predatory war. On July 3 they consented to the summoning of reactionary troops, which was the beginning of their complete surrender of power to the Bonapartists. Down the ladder, step by step.

This shameful finale of the Socialist-Revolutionary and Menshevik parties was not fortuitous but a consequence of the economic status of the small owners, the petty bourgeoisie, as has been repeatedly borne out by experience in Europe.

IX

Everybody, of course, has seen the small owner bend every effort and strain every nerve to “get on in the world”, to become a real master, to rise to the position of a “strong” employer, to the position of a bourgeois. As long as capitalism rules the roost, there is no alternative for the small owner other than becoming a capitalist (and that is possible at best in the case of one small owner out of a hundred), or becoming a ruined man, a semi-proletarian, and ultimately a proletarian. The same is true in politics: the petty-bourgeois democrats, especially their leaders, tend to trail after the bourgeoisie. The leaders of the petty-bourgeois democrats console their people with promises and assurances about the possibility of reaching agreement with the big capitalists; at best, and for a very brief period, they obtain certain minor concessions from the capitalists for a small upper section of the working people; but on every decisive issue, on every important matter, the petty-bourgeois democrats have always tailed after the bourgeoisie as a feeble appendage to them, as an obedient tool in the hands of the financial magnates. The experience of Britain and France has proved this over and over again.

The experience of the Russian revolution from February to July 1917, when events developed with unusual rapidity, particularly under the influence of the imperialist war and the deep-going crisis brought about by it, has most strikingly and palpably confirmed the old Marxist truth that the position of the petty bourgeoisie is unstable.

The lesson of the Russian revolution is that there can be no escape for the working people from the iron grip of war, famine, and enslavement by the landowners and capitalists unless they completely break with the Socialist-Revolutionary and Menshevik parties and clearly understand the latter's treacherous role, unless they renounce all compromises with the bourgeoisie and resolutely side with the revolutionary workers. Only the revolutionary workers, if supported by the peasant poor, are capable of smashing the resistance of the capitalists and leading the people in gaining land without compensation, complete liberty, victory over famine and the war, and a just and lasting peace.

Afterword

This article was written at the end of July, as is apparent from the text.

The history of the revolution during August has fully corroborated what is said in this article. Then, at the end of August, the Kornilov revolt^[6] caused a new turn in the revolution by clearly demonstrating to the whole people that the Cadets, in alliance with the counter-revolutionary generals, were striving to disband the Soviets and restore the monarchy. The near future will show how strong this new turn of the revolution is, and whether it will succeed in putting an end to the fatal policy of compromise with the bourgeoisie.

September 6, 1917

Notes

[1] On July 12 (25) the Provisional Government introduced capital punishment at the front. The divisional "military revolutionary tribunals" that were set up passed sentences which became effective immediately and were executed without delay.

[2] The Trudoviks (Trudovik group) were a Duma group of petty-bourgeois democrats—peasants and intellectuals with Narodnik

leanings. The group was formed by the peasant Deputies to the First Duma in April 1906. In the Duma it wavered between the Cadets and the revolutionary Social-Democrats. During the First World War most of the Trudoviks adhered to a social-chauvinist position.

After the February revolution the Trudoviks, expressing the interests of the kulaks, actively supported the Provisional Government. Their reaction to the October Revolution was hostile and they took part in the counter-revolutionary activities of the bourgeoisie.

[3] The Contact Commission was formed by decision of the compromising Executive Committee of the Petrograd Soviet on March 8 (21) to "influence" and "exercise control over" the activity of the Provisional Government. Its members were M. I. Skobelev, Y. M. Steklov, N. N. Sukhanov, V. N. Filipovsky and N. S. Chkheidze (subsequently V. M. Chernov and I. G. Tsereteli were included). The Commission helped the Provisional Government take advantage of the prestige of the Petrograd Soviet to disguise its counter-revolutionary policies. The Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries hoped with its aid to keep the people from revolutionary action aimed at effecting the transfer of power to the Soviets. The Commission was abolished in the middle of April 1917, its functions being handed over to the Executive Committee's Bureau.

[4] On May 17 (30), 1917, in view of a conflict between the Kronstadt Soviet and Pepelayev, the Provisional Government Commissar, the non-affiliated section of the Soviet passed a resolution abolishing the office of government commissar and investing the Kronstadt Soviet with full powers. The resolution, supported by the Bolsheviks, said that the only authority in Kronstadt was the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, which should enter into direct contact with the Petrograd Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies on all matters affecting the state.

The bourgeois, S.R. and Menshevik press launched a slander campaign against the people of Kronstadt and the Bolsheviks, alleging that Russia had begun to disintegrate, that a state of anarchy was in, that Kronstadt had seceded, and so on.

First the Petrograd Soviet and then the Provisional Government sent delegations (Chkheidze, Gotz and others in the former case and the Ministers Skobelev and Tsereteli in the latter) to deal with the Kronstadt incident. In the Kronstadt Soviet the two Ministers succeeded in putting through a compromise decision stipulating that the commissar be elected by the Soviet and his election confirmed by the Provisional Government. A political resolution was also passed, saying that the Kronstadt Soviet recognised the authority of the Provisional Government but adding that this "recognition certainly does not rule out criticism and the desire that the revolutionary democrats should form a new central authority and transfer all power to the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies". = The resolution expressed the hope that the Bolsheviks would achieve this by exerting ideological influence. It ended with an emphatic protest against attempts to attribute to the Kronstadt Bolsheviks "the intention of severing Kronstadt from the rest of Russia".

[5] The Kornilov revolt against the revolution was organised by the bourgeoisie and landowners in August 1917. It was led by the tsarist general Kornilov, then Supreme Commander-in-Chief of the Army. The conspirators aimed at capturing Petrograd, smashing the Bolshevik Party, disbanding the Soviets, establishing a military dictatorship, and paving the way for the restoration of the monarchy. A. F. Kerensky, head of the Provisional Government, joined in the

conspiracy. However, when the revolt began, he dissociated himself from Kornilov, fearing that he might be swept away with Kornilov, and declared Kornilov to be a rebel against the Provisional Government.

The revolt began on August 25 (September 7). Kornilov marched the Third Cavalry Corps against Petrograd. In Petrograd itself, the counter-revolutionary organisations of Kornilov's backers were getting ready for action.

The Bolshevik Party led the people against Kornilov as it continued, in accordance with Lenin's recommendation, to expose the Provisional Government and its S.R. and Menshevik hangers-on. In response to the call of the Bolshevik Party's Central Committee, the workers of Petrograd and the revolutionary soldiers and sailors rose to fight the rebels. The Petrograd workers promptly formed Red Guard units. Revolutionary committees were set up in several localities. The advance of the Kornilov troops was checked and Bolshevik propaganda began to demoralise them.

The Kornilov revolt was put down by the workers and peasants under the leadership of the Bolshevik Party. Under pressure from the people, the Provisional Government had to order the arrest and trial of Kornilov and his accomplices.

[6] Bonapartism (from Bonaparte, the name of the two French emperors) is a name applied to a government which endeavours to appear non-partisan by taking advantage of a highly acute struggle between the parties of the capitalists and the workers. Actually serving the capitalists, such a government dupes the workers most of all by promises and petty concessions. —Lenin

The Dialectics of the Historical Process and the Methodology of Its Research

Victor Alexeyevich Vaziulin

Contents

1. Introduction. Posing the Problem
2. The Methodology of Researching the Development of Society
3. Society as an “Organic” Whole
4. The Process of Historical Development of Society
5. In Place of a Conclusion

The previous content was published in the last issue.

2. The Methodology of Research of the Development of Society

The template for researching society at a certain historical stage of its development is the greatest work of Marxism-Leninism, Karl Marx’s *Capital*.

In *Capital*, Karl Marx not only brilliantly revealed the economic relations of the capitalist socio-economic formation, but also outlined, intertwined with political-economic material, the most profound scientific foundation of the materialist understanding of history and the systematic development of dialectical-materialist logic. “Now,” emphasised V. I. Lenin, “since the appearance of *Capital*—the materialist conception of history is no longer a hypothesis, but a scientifically proven proposition.”^[1] And F. Engels wrote: “The working out of the method which underlies K. Marx’s critique of political economy is, we think, a result hardly less significant than the basic materialist conception.”^[2]

To understand what F. Engels means when speaking of the method developed by K. Marx, one should pay attention to another thought from the same work: “The purpose of a work like the one under review cannot simply be desultory criticism of separate

sections of political economy or the discussion of one or another economic issue in isolation. On the contrary, it is from the beginning designed to give a systematic résumé of the whole complex of political economy and a coherent elaboration of the laws governing bourgeois production and bourgeois exchange. This elaboration is at the same time a comprehensive critique of economic literature, for economists are nothing but interpreters of and apologists for these laws.

Hardly any attempt has been made since Hegel’s death to set forth any branch of science in its specific inner coherence.”^[3]

The object of scientific research in *Capital* is the capitalist socio-economic formation as an “organic whole” (K. Marx).

What is an organic whole? An organic whole is a whole primarily characterised by the internal interconnection, the internal interaction of its parts. If this whole is dissected into its constituent parts, its very essence disappears. For example, if we were to dissect any living organism into its constituent elements, parts, etc., life would be destroyed.

K. Marx’s approach to the capitalist socio-economic formation as an organic whole is fundamentally different from that of bourgeois economists.

Before K. Marx, economists viewed society primarily as a sum of isolated individuals, as a whole, the elements of which are mainly connected externally. An element (part, etc.) of such a whole, considered separately from other elements, largely retains its specificity.

The bourgeois political economy’s representation of the isolated individual, or the so-called “robinsonade,” grew out of private property. Private

property alienates people from each other. In the grip of private property relations, people imagine man as an “atom,” as an isolated individual, and society as a mechanical aggregate of such individuals.

K. Marx, who practically and theoretically defended the interests of the class destined by the objective course of history to lead the struggle for public property, also emphasised internal interconnection, internal interaction in the field of methodology. This allowed him, in analysing private property, to explain the life of society and to understand private property itself as a social relation.

The object of research as an organic whole was already studied by Hegel. K. Marx’s position, however, differs fundamentally from Hegel’s views on the organic whole.

For Hegel, the organic whole appeared essentially as an exclusively spiritual product. In other words, the organic whole was imagined by him as not existing within objective reality, independently from thought. The representation, the thought of the organic whole, was in fact understood as detached from this reality.

As a result, the link with the soil on which and from which the representation of the true organic whole grows, has been severed. Naturally, in such a case, the thought of the organic whole (identified with the actual organic whole itself), as it was formed in the mind of the thinker, appears essentially unchanged.

Hegel’s methodology expresses the great thinker’s attempt to overcome the alienation of people from each other. However, this attempt was undertaken on the basis of preserving the existing, antagonistic society, and therefore the only way to overcome alienation was to overcome it in thought, in representation, i.e., detached from the actual overcoming of social antagonisms.

K. Marx, expressing the views of the consistently revolutionary class, the class leading the struggle of all working people against exploitation, the struggle for the abolition of the old, antagonistic society, in the field of methodology, firstly, strictly distinguished

the real organic whole from its reflection in thought, and secondly, consistently viewed the organic whole in the process of its development.

Thus, K. Marx’s dialectical-materialist approach is internally united with a strictly defined practical political position. Moreover, the correct practical political position serves as a necessary basis for developing a true methodology.

However, the correct practical political position by itself does not automatically generate the correct methodology. The theoretical reflection of the real existing organic whole is very complex and is carried out through a process of developing contradictions.

What are the paths, ways, and means of reflecting the organic whole in the process of its development?

First, let us name them. The organic whole in the process of its development is reflected—if we speak in the most general terms—by the method of ascent from the abstract to the concrete, as well as through the unity of logical and historical consideration. Moreover, in our view, the mechanism of ascent from the abstract to the concrete consists in the interrelation of the categories of surface, essence, phenomenon, and reality.^[4]

Where does the reflection of the organic whole begin? First, the necessary prerequisite for the reflection of the organic whole is its actual existence. The actually existing organic whole can be denoted by the term “real concrete.” The actually existing organic whole is initially reflected sensually, in live observation, perceived mainly directly, externally. The aspects of the object that come into view appear mainly as unrelated to each other; a holistic understanding of the object is almost absent. Familiarisation with individual aspects, etc. and their separate study, i.e., analysis, predominates.

It would be wrong, however, to say that only the perception and study of individual aspects of the object take place here. From the very beginning, people’s attention is drawn to this organic whole by some vital need. For example, the research of

bourgeois economists was driven by the need to increase bourgeois wealth.

Wanting to understand the need and what can satisfy it, gives rise to an assumption about the object as a whole, outlining, at first very roughly, the boundaries of the object of interest. This assumption, the initial representation of the object under study, guides the analysis. The analysis generally proceeds, by random deviations, from the consideration of the more complex aspects of the object to its increasingly simpler aspects, until the simplest aspect of this organic whole is identified. It should be kept in mind that although the whole is given as is, the aspects of the object are mainly understood separately. For example, K. Marx describes the path that bourgeois political economy took at its inception: “When we consider a given country politico-economically, we begin with its population, its distribution among classes, town, country, the coast, the different branches of production, export and import, annual production and consumption, commodity prices etc. It seems to be correct to begin with the real and the concrete, with the real precondition, thus, to begin, in economics, with e.g. the population, which is the foundation and the subject of the entire social act of production. However, on closer examination this proves false. The population is an abstraction if I leave out, for example, the classes of which it is composed. These classes in turn are an empty phrase if I am not familiar with the elements on which they rest. E.g. wage labour, capital, etc. These latter in turn presuppose exchange, division of labour, prices, etc. For example, capital is nothing without wage labour, without value, money, price etc. Thus, if I were to begin with the population, this would be a chaotic conception [Vorstellung] of the whole, and I would then, by means of further determination, move analytically towards ever more simple concepts [Begriff], from the imagined concrete towards ever thinner abstractions until I had arrived at the simplest determinations. From there the journey

would have to be retraced until I had finally arrived at the population again, but this time not as the chaotic conception of a whole, but as a rich totality of many determinations and relations”^[6].

Thus, the cognition of the organic whole initially proceeds from a chaotic perception^[6] of the whole, i.e., of the concrete, as it is given in perception, in live observation, to ever simpler definitions, until, finally, the simplest aspect (relation, etc.) of the whole is identified. On this path, analysis predominates. But even here, the path of cognition is contradictory. Analysis is taking place in unity with synthesis. The existence of a social need to know about this object, the assumptions about what it is, directs cognition and forces one to look for connections between the aspects being analysed. Nevertheless, initially, analysis still dominates.

This is the real initial path of cognition. Awareness of it, however, can also be one-sided. The predominance of analysis can obscure the presence of moments of synthesis in this process of cognition, and then the initial stage of cognition of the organic whole will appear as purely analytical. This was typical of the classics of bourgeois political economy^[7].

What is the final point of this path of cognition from a chaotic perception of the whole?—The isolation of the simplest aspect, the simplest relation of the organic whole.

What is the simplest aspect (relation) if we define it in relation to the above path of cognition?—It is the limit of the dissection of the organic whole. Further dissection goes beyond the scope of this object. For example, the simplest relation of the capitalist economy is the commodity. The commodity has use-value and value. Value cannot be understood without understanding what use-value is. But use-value cannot be taken as the simplest relation when considering the capitalist economy, because value does not only exist under capitalism, and even then, it does not only exist in relation to commodities. If we take use-value as the simplest relation, the specificity

of capitalism will be lost. In other words, the simplest aspect is the most abstract concept. Abstraction is a detachment. In determining the simplest aspect, the thinking subject achieves the maximum detachment from all other aspects of the object. Consequently, the considered path of cognition is the path from a chaotic perception of the whole to the simplest relation, aspect, from the sensory concrete to the abstract.

After the stage of cognition during which the organic whole was primarily dissected into separate aspects, which were mainly studied separately, and increasingly simpler aspects were identified, the next stage begins. At this stage, the main task is to determine the interconnection, unity, interaction of various aspects. Moreover, cognition moves mainly from the simplest aspect of the organic whole to its increasingly more complex aspects. This movement of cognition is called the ascent from the abstract to the concrete. The result of the ascent from the abstract to the concrete constitutes such a reflection of the actually existing organic whole, in which the aspects of the organic whole are understood not chaotically, not disconnected from each other, but in unity with each other. However, as already mentioned above, the very essence of the organic whole consists in the specific, distinctive unity of its various aspects. Consequently, at the stage of cognition when the ascent from the abstract to the concrete predominates, the main aim of research is to reveal the essence of the organic whole.

At the previous stage, the connection, when observed, appears mainly as a simple coexistence of the aspects of the object alongside one another or as their sequential succession, i.e., mainly as an external connection of the aspects.

At the stage of the ascent from the abstract to the concrete, the reflection of the internal connection, internal unity of the aspects predominates, i.e., of such a connection that each aspect becomes defined in its essence precisely because of its connection with

other aspects of the organic whole.

The concrete, as a result, the final point of the ascent from the abstract to the concrete, is the unity (and mainly internal unity) of various diverse definitions of the object.

In the ascent from the abstract to the concrete, synthesis predominates. At the same time, just as at the first stage, analysis, though predominant, was carried out in unity with synthesis, so in the stage of ascent from the abstract to the concrete, synthesis, though predominant, is carried out in unity with analysis. Just as the establishment of the difference of individual aspects (i.e., analysis) is impossible without some similarity between them, so the establishment of the unity of aspects (i.e., synthesis) is impossible without the establishment of the difference between them. But the predominance of analysis or synthesis is possible. The spotlight of our conscience, so to speak, can illuminate either one or the other. Either the illuminated area contains the difference of the aspects, and their connection is in the shade, or, on the contrary, the unity of the aspects is illuminated, and their difference is in the shade.

Consequently, in one way or another, human thinking in both the first and second stages is carried out in the unity of these opposites—analysis and synthesis. Moreover, the stages themselves act as opposites in relation to each other: at the first stage, analysis predominates, and at the second stage—synthesis. In general—if we take the main line of the movement of cognition—the reflection of the organic whole is carried out in a spiral; first, an assumption about the object emerges, the object appears mainly as an undivided whole (although certain differences of aspects are already present here), then the aspects of the object are isolated and studied separately; finally, as it were, a return to the initial “holistic” representation of the object occurs, but rather on the basis of knowledge of its individual aspects and as the determination of the unity of internal relations of the aspects of the object.

The ascent from the abstract to the concrete represents the main stage in the reflection of the organic whole, because it is at this stage that the primary task becomes the revelation of the internal connections, the internal unity of the aspects of the organic whole, in other words, the totality of laws and regularities^[8], the essence of the organic whole.

In the history of human cognition, there have been two most typical errors in relation to the stages of cognition described above. The actual process of cognition is very complex and difficult, and these mistakes can occur under certain conditions—although not in a developed form—even in individual cognition. Knowledge of the history and essence of errors is quite effective medicine against them.

The first typical error. The thinking subject perceives the movement from a chaotic perception of the whole, from the sensory concrete to the abstract in isolation from the ascent from the abstract to the concrete, perceives analysis in isolation from synthesis, and absolutises the movement from a chaotic perception of the whole, from the sensory concrete to the abstract, absolutises analysis. We have seen, however, that the first stage precedes the second and includes the second as a subordinated, undeveloped moment. Such an error, if consistently adhered to, leads to a disorderly, chaotic accumulation of knowledge, to gliding on the surface of objects, processes, to the denial of the essence, to the denial of internal, on the surface invisible connections of objects, processes. In its most pronounced form, such a position is inherent in the vulgar economists in the field of political economy, and in the positivists in the field of philosophy.

The second typical error. The ascent from the abstract to the concrete is detached from the opposite path of cognition, synthesis is detached from analysis, and the ascent from the abstract to the concrete is absolutised, synthesis is absolutised. This error in its most developed and consistent form, is represented in Hegel's logic.

Hegel expressed many brilliant assumptions about the place and role of the method of the ascent from the abstract to the concrete in conscience, about its mechanism, etc. However, Hegel presented the ascent from the abstract to the concrete as the only way of forming knowledge and deprived the opposite path of cognition of any real cognitive significance.

What does this mean and where does it lead?

The movement from the sensory concrete to the abstract is the movement from live observation to thought, to concept, it is the process of comparing thoughts with sensory data, with how the real object is presented in live observation, it is the comparison of thoughts, concepts with facts.

To deprive the movement from the sensory concrete to the abstract of any real cognitive significance and to assert that only the ascent from the abstract to the concrete is real cognition, is to detach the path of thought from comparison with sensory data, with the data of live observation, with facts, is to recognise that the development of thought does not depend on the actual state of things.

In a more general form, this means that thought is detached from actual reality and is presented as merely self-generated. And that is nothing but idealism.

The consistent, dialectical materialist understanding of the method of the ascent from the abstract to the concrete necessarily includes the following moments.

First, the ascent from the abstract to the concrete is not a pure self-generation of thought in itself, but a reflection of the real organic whole, the real concrete.

The more developed the real concrete, the more developed, of course, the method of ascent from the abstract to the concrete can be. In the ascent from the abstract to the concrete, the essence, the internal connections of the organic whole are mainly reflected, and the reflection is carried out from the simplest relation of the organic whole to increasingly complex relations of that whole.

For the method of the ascent from the abstract to

the concrete to become the dominant reflection of the organic whole, it is necessary for this whole to mature, for its aspects, its relations, to take shape. The simplest relation becomes truly the simplest relation of this organic whole when the remaining, more complex relations of this whole are formed.

Secondly. The correct application of the method of the ascent from the abstract to the concrete necessarily presupposes the preliminary realisation of the stage of the movement of cognition from a chaotic perception of the whole, from the sensory concrete to the abstract. This applies both to science as a whole and to the individual. Science, the object of which is this organic whole, must pass through the stage in which the movement of cognition from the sensory concrete to the abstract predominates. The thinking individual must be sufficiently developed so that in their cognition of this organic whole the method of ascent from the abstract to the concrete can become dominant. To do this they must also pass through the stage in their development where the movement of cognition from the sensory concrete to the abstract predominates.

Thirdly, both paths of the movement of cognition—from the sensory concrete to the abstract and from the abstract to the concrete—must always be taken in their unity, but at the same time, the predominance of one or the other at different stages of cognition should be noted.

Concluding the section devoted to the consideration of the method of the ascent from the abstract to the concrete, it seems appropriate to us, after its general characterisation, to return to the mechanism of this path of cognition, but now from a more rigorous, categorical point of view. Without such a characterisation, it is impossible to present the question of the relationship between the historical and the logical approach in a sufficiently precise and complete manner.

The mechanism of the ascent from the abstract to the concrete is more fully and rigorously revealed,

in our view, in the interrelation, interconnection of the categories “surface,” “essence,” “phenomenon,” “reality.”

The term “surface” is used here to denote the level of understanding of an object that exists at the very beginning of its representation in thought. At this stage of thinking, the object appears primarily as something given directly.

Let us consider the universal moments of the representation in thought of two interacting aspects of an organic whole. Where does the representation begin? It begins with the representation of the aspect that appears on the surface of the object, directly grasped.

Thus, in *Capital*, K. Marx begins his study of the commodity with use-value, i.e., with that which first catches the eye. This aspect is primarily characterised in itself, independently of the other aspect interacting with it.

Then, the external connection between the first, superficial, external aspect and the other aspect is revealed. In *Capital*, for example, K. Marx shows that use-value serves as a bearer of value under certain conditions.

From establishing the external connection between the first and second aspects, thought moves on to the characterisation of the second, internal aspect in itself, considered independently of the first. In *Capital*, having examined the use-value of the commodity in itself and established its external connection with value, K. Marx proceeds to define value in itself, independently of use-value. The second, internal aspect of the interaction emerges as the essence of the interaction. Only at this level does the self-motion of the object begin to be understood. To reach the cognition of the essence of the object is to reach the reflection of its internal contradictions.

We have mentioned that the second aspect, the essence of the object, is now considered in itself, independently of the first aspect. This does not mean, however, that what we learned about the first aspect

is completely forgotten. In the dialectical movement of thought, the previous path of cognition does not disappear entirely but is preserved in a sublated, transformed form. In the second aspect, the first is sublated, becoming a moment of the second. The essence of the object is contradictory: the object in its essence relates to itself as it would to another, external object.

After the essence has been defined in itself, thought embarks on the reverse path: from essence back to the surface. But now the surface appears differently, with other aspects and facets than before the essence was defined. Now, only those facets of the surface through which the essence “shines through” or manifests itself become interesting. This is the phenomenon of the essence of the object. In his analysis of the commodity, K. Marx, after first considering use-value in itself, then the external connection between use-value and value, and finally value in itself, expounds the theory of the forms of the manifestation of value, thus returning, as it were, to use-value, since value manifests itself only in the relations of the use-values of commodities.

Finally, the unity of phenomenon and essence, as well as the form of this unity, is specifically observed. The formed unity of phenomenon and essence is reality. It should be noted that the term “reality” is used here not in the senses of “actuality” “matter,” “realised possibility,” etc. It is important not to confuse these meanings with each other.

Thought moved from the way the object appeared on the surface to its depth, and then the movement became the opposite. In reflecting the reality of the object, thinking returned to the surface, but now to the surface understood on the basis of the essence, and therefore of other facets, moments of the surface.

Only on the path of considering the essence in itself and on the path of movement from the essence to the phenomenon and reality do the internal interconnections and relations become the object of special consideration. On the path from the surface to

the essence, the analysis of the external connections and relationships comes to the fore.

However, it would be insufficient to say only this. Thought is constantly moving in opposite directions, realising itself as the unity of opposites. Even on the way from the surface to the essence, the opposite movement of thought is present as a subordinated moment, although it does not dominate. Thus, K. Marx defines use-value before value, bearing in mind its connection with value, although he does not yet consider this connection itself. In defining use-value per se, K. Marx abstracts from what generates need and how the given thing satisfies human need. He does not explain why he emphasises one thing and omits another. Only later, in the specific characterisation of commodity exchange, can the reader discover these reasons.

Consequently, thought moves both from the surface to the essence and from the essence to the surface, although the first path dominates. On the path from essence to phenomenon and reality, the situation changes to the exact opposite: the movement from the essence to the phenomenon and reality dominates, while the movement from the surface to the essence remains as a subordinated moment.

Mastering the theoretical representation of the organic whole must also be both a movement forward and a return, as it were, to material already mastered.

The method of the ascent from the abstract to the concrete is applicable to the extent that certain features of the developmental process have matured. In its classical, most complete form, the method of the ascent is the mental representation of the mature stage of the developmental process, which constitutes an organic whole.

The problem of the ascent from the abstract to the concrete, formulated in this way, turns out to be a problem of the historical and the logical, namely, the problem of the actual process of development (historical approach) and its representation in thought (logical approach).

The real organic whole develops.

The question arises: what are the stages of development of the real organic whole, and what stages of cognition are determined by them?

The organic whole does not form instantaneously. Initially, preconditions emerge, or, in other words, the beginning of the object. At this stage, the object itself does not yet exist. Thus, before the emergence of capitalism, pre-capitalist commodity-money relations emerge.

In the next stage, the object itself appears for the first time. This is the primary emergence of the given organic whole. For example, the primary emergence of capitalism is established with the appearance of the commodity “labour power.” Primary emergence means that the given organic whole, the given object, has emerged.

Then begins the transformation of the inherited system by the newly emerging organic whole, the system from which and on the basis of which it emerged. This is the process of formation of the new organic whole.

The completion of the transformation of the inherited basis by the emerging new organic whole represents the maturity of that new organic whole. At this stage, the contradictions leading to the transformation of the new whole into a different object become clearly apparent.

These are the main stages, steps of the progressive development of the object as an organic whole. They necessarily correspond to quite clearly defined stages of cognition.

The stages of development of an immature organic whole are predominantly reproduced through the movement from a chaotic perception of the whole, from the sensory concrete to the abstract, while the ascent from the abstract to the concrete plays a subordinated role. The situation changes to the exact opposite in the process of representing the mature organic whole: now the ascent from the abstract to the concrete dominates, while the movement from

a chaotic perception of the whole, from the sensory concrete to the abstract, becomes a subordinated moment.

The maturity of the organic whole is a stage in the process of its development. The past is not fully preserved in the present, but it does not disappear entirely; it is preserved in the present in a transformed form. The present changes, develops, and thus, in one way or another, contains the seeds of the future, it is transforming into the future.

Therefore, according to Marxist understanding, the ascent from the abstract to the concrete must be such a representation of the existing stage of development, such a representation of the present, that it also represents the past and the future within the present.

The mature stage of the development of the organic whole is mentally represented through the movement of thought from the surface to the essence and from the essence to the phenomenon and reality of the organic whole. This movement of thought is not only a reproduction of the existing organic whole but also, at the same time, in a sublated form, the history of its formation.

In the movement of thought from the surface to the essence, the historical process of the formation of preconditions and the primary emergence of the given organic whole is represented in a sublated form, while in the movement from the essence to the phenomenon and reality, the process of transformation of the inherited basis by the newly emerged organic whole is considered in a transformed form. For example, in *Capital*, K. Marx first characterises the commodity, money, and the transformation of money into capital. Logically, this is the path from the surface of capital to its essence, but at the same time, the historical development of the preconditions of capital and its emergence is represented here in a sublated form.

The past is not only transformed but is preserved in the present in a transformed form. The present does not relate to the past in such a way that the

past is completely deprived of its independence. This is how Hegel understood the relationship between the past and the present. Applied to the historical development of humanity, this meant that the past was deprived of any independent significance, but then the present became the goal of history. In the Marxist understanding, the past never completely and absolutely disappears in the present, just as the future is not entirely reducible to the present.

Therefore, in the mental representation of the mature organic whole, there must be three relatively independent spirals of thought, in which the present is reflected, as well as the past and the future, in their relative independence of existence within the present. In the logic of Capital, the surface of capital (commodity-money relations), the essence of capital (the production of surplus value), the phenomenon of capital (the circulation of capital), and the reality of capital (the forms of unity of the productive processes and the circulation of capital) are represented. In addition, there is a study of the surface, essence, and reality of the commodity, as well as a characterisation of the preconditions for the emergence of a new mode of production (quality, quantity, measures of the negation of capital-there is no essence etc., here, since the essence of the new communist mode of production has not yet emerged).

The correct solution to these problems allows one to understand the organic whole, so to speak, at its root. Such understanding is not an end in itself. It is necessary for the conscious, fundamental practical transformation of the object of research, to direct the development of the organic whole.

In the next section, we will attempt to show the possibilities of using the methodology briefly outlined above in the study of human society.

If society is an organic whole (and this will be discussed in the next chapter), then it must be studied using the method of the ascent from the abstract to the concrete, that is, beginning with the simplest relation and proceeding to more complex relations,

beginning with the surface and proceeding to the essence, and so on.

Only the study of society through the method of ascent from the abstract to the concrete, and in the unity of logical and historical consideration, allows a consistent and deep revelation of the internal connections of the various aspects, the various spheres of the life of society. And this has enormous practical significance, since it serves as the necessary theoretical condition for directing the life of society as a whole.

The next piece of content will be published in future issues.

Notes

[1] Lenin, V.I. "What the "Friends of the People" Are and How They Fight the Social-Democrats", 1894

[2] Engels, F. Review to Karl Marx, "A Contribution to the Critique of Political economy"

[3] As above

[4] Vaziulin, V.A. "The Logic of "Capital" by K. Marx", 1968

[5] Marx K., "Grundrisse, Foundations of the Critique of Political Economy", 1857-61

[6] Translation note: Here we use the word "perception" when referring to sensory data, instead of the word "conception" used in the translation of the Grundrisse, above.

[7] It should be noted that Marx distinguished between the classical bourgeois political economists, who strove for a sober and precise investigation of bourgeois wealth, and the vulgar bourgeois economists, the shameless apologists of bourgeois society.

[8] Russian "закономерность", German "Gesetzmäßigkeit".

“Reflection on revolutionary and counterrevolutionary processes in the 20th and 21st centuries” – Case studies Yugoslavia

Aleksandar Đenić | New Communist Party of Yugoslavia (Serbia)

This article was published in Cuba at the request of the Cuban comrades and has been posted in several parts on ‘The Platform’.

International Legitimacy of the Partisan Movement

At the Tehran Conference in 1943, the Allies decided to support only the Partisan movement. After a meeting between Tito and Šubašić with Churchill in 1944, the British government recognized the Partisan movement as the only legitimate authority in Yugoslavia. Tito then traveled to Moscow, where he met with Stalin and agreed on joint action between the Red Army and the Partisan units in the liberation of Serbia. With this agreement, the Partisans gained international legitimacy as the sole leaders of the new Yugoslavia, as the USSR sought permission from the communist-controlled army to enter Yugoslav territory.

Post-War Yugoslavia

The Communists triumphed in Yugoslavia because they provided answers to the national and economic questions. They recognized the mood of the masses, who accepted the class dimension of the anti-fascist struggle and the socialist revolution. After the end of World War II, Yugoslavia was re-established, but now as a socialist federation led by the Communist Party. The monarchy was abolished. Yugoslavia was one of the most brutally affected countries by the war, with over a million casualties (along with a demographic loss of 1,685,000) out of 14 million people living there, of which around 300,000 were Partisans. In Yugoslavia, in addition to the fight against the occupiers and their collaborators, there was also a

civil, ethnic, and class war. In war-torn Europe, the Communist Party of Yugoslavia (KPJ) managed to organize the most massive uprising. Thanks to the strength and organization of the KPJ, the scale of the civil war and vengeance was significantly smaller. In addition to the anti-fascist struggle, the KPJ led the socialist revolution, which brought unprecedented progress in the history of our peoples.

Consequences and Postwar Emigration

Although many collaborators with the occupiers and Nazis escaped punishment under the protection of Western allies, they emigrated to various countries, including Argentina, Spain, West Germany, France, Great Britain, and Australia. The Ustaša emigration, which had killed hundreds of thousands of Serbs during the war (and had a camp for children), continued to carry out terrorist activities against Yugoslavia under the sponsorship of the CIA and the BND (intelligence service of Western Germany). To a lesser extent, the Chetniks, who were a monarchist movement and collaborators with the occupiers during World War II, also participated in these activities.

Socialist Construction between 1945–1948

In the first postwar elections of 1945, the People’s Front list, led by the Communist Party of Yugoslavia (KPJ), won, while the opposition decided to boycott the elections. These elections had historical significance as they marked the first time women in Yugoslavia were allowed to vote. Over 90% of citizens participated, and more than 90% supported the list led by Josip Broz Tito, clearly indicating the mood of the people at that time.

Agreement with the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia's Foreign Policy Orientation

On April 11, 1945, an agreement on friendship, mutual assistance, and postwar cooperation was signed between the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia. This agreement laid the foundation for Yugoslavia's foreign policy, which relied on the principles of alliance in the antifascist coalition and orientation towards other socialist countries and the USSR. The KPJ was a member of the Cominform (which included parties from European countries where communists were in power, alongside the two largest western communist parties, the Communist Party of Italy and the Communist Party of France). Yugoslavia supported the revolution in Greece, and Greek communists had their autonomous area in Yugoslavia, specifically in northern Serbia.

The Balkan Federation and International Challenges

After the war, with the help of the Soviet Union, the creation of a Balkan Federation was considered, which would include Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Romania, and Albania, with the possibility of including Greece if the partisans won the civil war. The idea of the Balkan Federation was a response to the desires of the Balkan peoples for integration, which would end the "divide and rule" policy and allow for sovereignty through a socialist system.

Tito actively worked on this project, and Yugoslavia supported the Greek partisans and the unification of Albania with Yugoslavia. Bulgaria proposed a confederation, while Yugoslavia wanted Bulgaria to become an equal republic within Yugoslavia. The USSR supported voluntary unification, but not "assimilation." The biggest opponent to this plan was Great Britain, which supported counter-revolutionary forces in Greece and was prepared to confront the socialist countries of the Balkans if Balkan integration occurred, at a time when the USA had a monopoly on the atomic bomb.

The 1946 Constitution and the Structure of the New Yugoslavia

The Constitution of the Federative People's Republic of Yugoslavia was adopted in 1946, and the new Yugoslavia was composed of six federal units: Slovenia, Croatia, Serbia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro, and Macedonia, along with the Autonomous Province of Vojvodina and the Autonomous Region of Kosovo and Metohija (where Albanians form the majority). During this period, separate republican citizenships were created within the federation.

This constitution was inspired by the "Stalin's" constitution, which shaped relations in the USSR, but it had certain specificities. While the USSR was a multinational federation based on ideology, Yugoslavia was a state of South Slavic peoples united in a supranational community. The criteria for forming federal units also differed—unlike the Soviet Union, Yugoslavia took historical circumstances into account, not just ethnic or national ones. Furthermore, Yugoslav republics had greater fiscal autonomy than republics in the USSR.

The Informbiro Resolution and the Split in the Communist World

The Informbiro Resolution, adopted on June 28, 1948, in Bucharest, was a pivotal moment in the ideological conflict between the Communist Party of Yugoslavia (KPJ) and the Soviet Union. The Informbiro, an international organization of communist parties, was founded in 1947. This resolution condemned the KPJ for its refusal to accept criticism from other communist organizations, which led to serious political consequences. As a result, the KPJ abandoned positions of proletarian internationalism and the international communist movement.

Withdrawal of Soviet Experts

Before the adoption of the resolution, relations between Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union had already deteriorated. On May 18 and 19, 1948, the Soviet Union withdrew its civilian and military experts from Yugoslavia, further worsening the situation. This move was a clear signal of the growing rift between

the two parties.

Criticism of the Informbiro Resolution

The resolution specifically criticized the Yugoslav communists for their implementation of collectivization in the countryside, a key aspect of socialist transformation. This marked the beginning of a deep split between the KPJ and the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) (SKP(b)). Prior to the adoption of the resolution, the KPJ had expelled Sreten Žujović Crni and Andrija Hebrang from the Politburo for their opposition to the five-year plan for Yugoslavia's development and their insistence on following Soviet principles.

Criticism of the KPJ by the Informbiro

The Informbiro analyzed the situation within the KPJ and concluded the following:

- **Deviation from Marxism-Leninism:** According to the Informbiro, the KPJ had deviated from the path of Marxism-Leninism, both in foreign policy and internal politics. The actions of Tito, Kardelj, and Đilas were particularly criticized, especially the rapprochement of Yugoslavia with the West.
- **Hostile policy towards the Soviet Union:** The KPJ spread anti-Soviet propaganda, discredited Soviet experts, and pursued a hostile policy towards the Soviet Union.
- **Denial of class struggle:** The KPJ ignored the growth of capitalism, particularly in the countryside, and neglected Lenin's teachings on the peasantry.
- **Bureaucratic regime:** The party was governed by a bureaucratic regime, lacking democratic processes, which undermined its organizational integrity.
- **Favoring the Popular Front:** The KPJ diminished the role of the communist party, favoring the Popular Front, which weakened the political power of the working class.
- **Refusal to correct mistakes:** The Yugoslav leadership was unwilling to correct its mistakes and continued its anti-Soviet policy.

Conflicts within the Communist Party of Yugoslavia (KPJ)

During the period of conflict with the Informbiro

(1948–1956), around 55,663 members of the KPJ (approximately 12% of the total membership) supported the internationalist line of the Informbiro. Additionally, 28,880 participants in the National Liberation War and 4,153 members of the Yugoslav Army adhered to the Informbiro Resolution. Among them were:

- 2,616 political officials
- 2 members of the Politburo of the KPJ Central Committee (Sreten Žujović and Andrija Hebrang)
- 8 members of the KPJ Central Committee
- 16 members of the Central Committees of the republican communist parties
- 50 members of district committees
- 733 members of municipal committees

Repressions Against the “Informbiro” Supporters

All “Informbiro” supporters were expelled from the party, and around 16,312 people were subjected to reprisals, including being imprisoned in concentration camps on the Adriatic islands of Goli Otok and Sveti Grgur. Among them were veterans of the Great October Socialist Revolution, founders of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia, Spanish fighters, and participants in the National Liberation War.

Yugoslavia and International Relations

In 1948, Yugoslavia rejected the international communist and workers' movement, despite the logistical support of the Soviet Union and proletarian solidarity, which had helped the communists come to power. The conflict within the international communist movement benefited the United States and Western countries, which began to assist Yugoslavia. Many Yugoslav leaders later shifted towards open positions of liberalism, with one of the first being Milovan Đilas, a member of the Politburo, who advocated for civil democracy and publicly abandoned communist positions in 1953.

Greece and the Balkans

The ideological split between the Yugoslav and Soviet parties had serious consequences for the Greek partisans. In 1949, Yugoslavia closed its

borders to Greek partisans and dissolved their camps, leading to the defeat of the partisan forces in Greece. Additionally, Yugoslavia's relations with the socialist countries of the Balkans were severed, and negotiations regarding the Balkan Federation were halted.

Ideological Conflicts and Workers' Self-Management: Yugoslavia in the 1950s

After the ideological conflict between Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union in 1948, the differences gradually increased. In this context, in 1950, the Workers' Self-Management Law was adopted, marking the transition from a planned economy to a market economy. Workers' self-management essentially denied the state's role in managing the economy. Enterprises came under the control of worker collectives, who independently made decisions about key matters, such as the procurement of raw materials, production, prices, wages, and profit distribution. As a result, the Yugoslav economy gradually became a market-based one, and competition between enterprises emerged, leading to increased social differences and disparities between Yugoslav republics.

The essence of workers' self-management was that enterprises were run by worker collectives, which acted independently and made key business decisions, such as procuring raw materials, determining the type and scope of production, setting product prices, creating payrolls, and distributing profits. Enterprises had the right to buy, sell, lease, and rent real estate.

The constitutional law of 1953 defined Yugoslavia as a "socialist democratic federal state of sovereign and equal nations." Along with this change, a new provision was added to the Constitution, emphasizing that all power belonged to the working people, who became the new constitutive body alongside the sovereign nations. This period also revealed a contradiction within the Yugoslav leadership between federalists and confederalists, which marked the history of socialist Yugoslavia.

The shift in political course was evident in Yugoslavia's actions within the United Nations, where it abstained on the U.S. resolution regarding Korea.

Despite the revisionist course taken by Yugoslavia, it remained socialist, as the means of production were in the hands of the working class.

The Sixth Congress of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia (1952): A Turning Point in the Social and Political Development of Yugoslavia

The Sixth Congress of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia (KPJ) was held in Zagreb in 1952, at a crucial moment when Yugoslavia was in conflict with the Informbiro. This congress was of exceptional importance as it allowed for an assessment of the previous struggle against communists who remained internationalists.

At the congress, the basic direction for future social development was clearly defined, which was to be based on the principles of self-management. In addition, the congress proposed that the People's Front be transformed into a united and active mass political organization called the Socialist Alliance of Working People of Yugoslavia (SSRNJ). Ultimately, the congress made the significant decision to rename the Communist Party of Yugoslavia to the League of Communists of Yugoslavia. Although the justification for this change was sought in the classics of Marxism, the main reason was the desire to distinguish the name from other communist parties, while the union of the party with non-communist elements was essentially nonsensical.

Starting in March 1953, the government began the process of dissolving cooperatives and state agricultural combines, which had previously received favorable treatment. Within nine months, two-thirds of the farmers had abandoned the cooperative system, and the social share of land ownership dropped from 25% to 9%. Later, in the mid-1970s, state ownership of land reached about 24%. To mitigate the problem of landlessness among peasants, the government reduced the allowable size of private holdings from 25-35 hectares to 10 hectares of arable land, and this restriction remained in effect for over three decades. Additionally, the system of compulsory purchases and fixed advance taxes was abolished, encouraging farmers to procure and sell products

through cooperatives. The specificity of Yugoslav socialism was that, along with Poland, Yugoslavia did not implement collectivization in the countryside, making it the only socialist practice in Europe. However, small private properties created the problem of uncultivated fertile land, making its efficient use more difficult due to further fragmentation after inheritance divisions. These property relations led to high unemployment in Yugoslavia, and the solution was found in opening borders, allowing for the mass departure of surplus labor, mainly to Germany, Switzerland, France, Austria, and Italy, through state employment agencies. In the 1960s, Yugoslavia faced problems with the healthcare workforce as medical professionals emigrated in large numbers. The shortage of doctors in rural areas became a serious issue that persists to this day. Thus, in 1981, 625,069 workers were employed temporarily abroad (48% from Serbia, 24% from Croatia, 21% from Bosnia and Herzegovina, 9% from Macedonia, 7% from Slovenia, and 2% from Montenegro).

Additionally, the Balkan Pact of 1953, officially known as the Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation, was a political-military agreement signed on February 28, 1953, in Ankara by three countries: the Kingdom of Greece, Turkey, and Yugoslavia. This agreement was directed against the Soviet Union and provided for the establishment of a joint military headquarters for the three countries. At the time of the pact's formation, Turkey and Greece were members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), while Yugoslavia was a non-aligned socialist state. Although Yugoslavia was not a formal NATO member, the Balkan Pact allowed it to indirectly connect with this military-political bloc. The establishment of the pact was completed with a military agreement in August 1954, when a treaty was signed in Bled. In October of the same year, Israel expressed interest in joining this alliance, believing that Yugoslavia could help improve relations between Egypt and Israel. However, Israel never joined the alliance. During the pact's existence, the Yugoslav military doctrine was aligned with NATO standards, with a particular emphasis on aviation, while air defense was secondary. This strategic approach, favoring

aviation, turned out to be a critical mistake during later events that led to the breakup of Yugoslavia. Before the pact was signed, in 1950, Yugoslavia began receiving U.S. military and technical aid, and could count on U.S. support in the event of a war with the USSR.

Yugoslavia Restores Relations with the USSR and the Eastern Bloc

After Nikita Khrushchev took over the leadership of the Soviet Party, Yugoslavia restored relations with the Soviet Union and the Eastern Bloc. This included renewed economic cooperation with socialist countries in Europe and the dissolution of camps where sympathizers of the Informbiro were held. In 1956, Yugoslavia supported the Soviet Union in suppressing the counter-revolution in Hungary. Although Yugoslavia restored relations with the USSR, its trade with the European Community and the U.S. dominated until its breakup, followed by relations with the USSR and the Eastern Bloc, and finally with non-aligned countries.

The Non-Aligned Movement and Support for Decolonization

The first conference of the Non-Aligned Movement was held in Yugoslavia in 1961. The founding of the Non-Aligned Movement at that time was beneficial to the U.S., as it aimed to prevent newly decolonized countries from falling under the influence of the USSR. Despite many contradictions within the Non-Aligned Movement, it had significant emancipatory potential. Yugoslavia actively supported decolonization, providing logistical support to Algeria's fight for independence, while France organized terrorist actions in collaboration with political immigrants against Yugoslavia as an act of revenge. After 1967, Yugoslavia broke diplomatic ties with Israel and supported the Palestinian struggle for independence. Additionally, hundreds of thousands of students from non-aligned countries studied in Yugoslavia, and by 1989/90, their number reached 4,000. Yugoslavia also helped develop infrastructure in these countries.

Tito condemned the U.S. aggression in Vietnam, and

protests supporting the Vietnamese were organized in Yugoslavia, along with demonstrations following the assassination of Patrice Lumumba, which became some of the largest protests in the history of Belgrade.

Amendments to the Constitution of 1963

The 1963 Constitution was focused on decentralization and market liberalization, while the state was renamed the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. The terms “state” were replaced with “social community” and “social-political community.” Yugoslavia became a “union of voluntarily united and equal nations” based on the power of the working people and self-management. The republics were granted greater authority, but the centralist approach remained dominant.

In 1968, students initiated mass demonstrations in Belgrade, calling the University the “Red University—Karl Marx.” They protested against growing social inequalities (“red bourgeoisie”) and demanded more socialism in Yugoslavia. Tito supported the students, and the minimum wage for workers was raised by 30%.

Rise of Nationalism: Demonstrations in Kosovo and the Croatian Spring

In 1968, large demonstrations by the Albanian population in Kosovo and Metohija began as student protests. After these protests, Albanians gained the right to education in their native language, and the province was renamed the Socialist Autonomous Province of Kosovo. The Croatian Spring of 1971, also known as the MASPOK movement, was a nationalist and secessionist movement that demanded the exclusion of the Serbian language from use and the declaration of Croatia as a national state. MASPOK had the support of part of the Croatian communist leadership and the Ustaše (fascist) emigration. The movement was led by Savka Dabčević-Kučar and Mika Tripalo, communist leaders in Croatia who established ties with the Ustaše emigration. Tito dealt with the nationalists in Croatia, and the following year, with the liberals in Serbia.

Decentralization and the 1974 Constitution

After the student demonstrations of 1968, there was a withdrawal of the state from governance throughout Europe. Yugoslavia introduced further decentralization with the 1974 Constitution. This constitution essentially turned the federation into a confederation, as the republics and autonomous provinces gained the right to veto federal decisions. The Constitution enabled the political strengthening of the republics, which reduced the centralized power of the federation and increased the statehood of the republics. This constitution was seen in the West as a step toward democratization of Yugoslavia, while the Soviet Union believed it would lead to its disintegration.

The League of Communists of Yugoslavia and Eurocommunism

Yugoslavia provided financial support to Eurocommunist parties, particularly the Communist Party of Italy (PCI), and in its ideological magazines, it wrote positively about their deviations, presenting them as an “autonomous” path to socialism. While these parties rejected revolutionary strategies in favor of an evolutionary approach—promoting peaceful coexistence through institutions as a method for achieving socialism—Yugoslavia still considered their path justified, even though the PCI openly supported NATO.

Yugoslavia After Tito

After the death of Josip Broz Tito, the party was taken over by a collective leadership. During this period, Yugoslavia gradually abandoned the principles of non-alignment, and during the Iran-Iraq war, it refused to condemn Iraq, as it was sourcing the majority of its oil from that country. At the same time, the country faced an ideological and economic crisis, partly caused by the repayment of debts to the IMF and the World Bank, which were incurred in the 1960s and 1970s. This period was also characterized by a rise in nationalism and social tensions.

In the 1980s, the United States, under President Ronald Reagan, launched a special war against Yugoslavia. The first concrete initiative was National Security Directive 54 from 1982, which called for

support of the “silent revolution” in communist countries. Directive 133 from 1984 was specifically directed at Yugoslavia, and part of this special war involved economic sanctions. During this time, real wages in Yugoslavia decreased by 25% between 1979 and 1985.

Throughout the 1980s, the party and state were primarily led by technocrats who sought to transform Yugoslav society to resemble Western countries. Yugoslavia gradually moved closer to the European Community, which would later become the European Union. In 1988, the Federal Secretary for Foreign Affairs, Budimir Lončar, informed the Presidency of the SFRY about the need to adapt to new integrative processes in Europe, with a special emphasis on the future transformation of the European Economic Community (EEC). It is important to note that the broader structure of the Federal Secretariat for Foreign Affairs was pro-European, which was frequently reflected in public discourse in Yugoslavia.

In mid-1989, the Presidency of the SFRY issued a statement on the necessity of European integration. Later that year, the Federal Executive Council of the SFRY initiated negotiations for joining the European Economic Community. A significant contribution to maintaining Yugoslavia’s pro-European course in its last years (1989-1991) came from Federal Prime Minister Ante Marković. As president of the Federal Executive Council, Marković tried to unite the political forces of Yugoslavia’s liberal orientation (the so-called Alliance of Reform Forces of Yugoslavia) to preserve Yugoslavia and its European path. Marković was known for his liberal reforms, privatization, and neoliberal policies, and the BBC referred to him as “the best American friend in Yugoslavia.”

The Process of the Distraction of Yugoslavia (1990-2000)

The counter-revolutionary processes in Eastern Europe had a significant impact on Yugoslavia, which was essentially a confederate state with a high degree of autonomy within its republics and autonomous provinces. Each of them sought greater political power, and in practice, there were eight political parties, with local organizations

subordinated primarily to the authorities of their respective republics or provinces, rather than to the central government. In this environment, nationalism became a powerful tool for legitimizing the power of local leaderships in a multiethnic country. Instead of the idea of “brotherhood and unity”, promoted by the Yugoslav concept during socialism, local bureaucracies adopted nationalism as the new dominant ideology.

In Yugoslavia, as in many other Eastern European countries, there were no mass protests demanding the introduction of civil (bourgeois) democracy. Instead, it was the political elites who made the key decisions. Within Yugoslavia, there were three main political currents: liberal, conservative-nationalist, and socialist (the dominant socialist current supported the self-management system). However, it would not be accurate to claim that the 1974 Constitution was the primary cause of the breakup of Yugoslavia. It was followed by numerous other factors, both internal and external, including changes in international politics, the reorientation of security structures, and the counter-revolution in Eastern Europe, which indicated that the Yugoslav path to socialism, based on socialist self-management, was hybrid and had a limited lifespan. Practice confirms this, as today there is no political party, movement, or state that supports Yugoslav self-management.

The last attempt to preserve the unity of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia (LCY) occurred at the 14th extraordinary congress in Belgrade in 1990, when sharp conflicts arose among the delegates. Delegates from Serbia, led by Slobodan Milošević, advocated for the preservation of centralized unity, while delegates from Slovenia called for a looser federation. After a two-day debate, on January 22, 1990, Milan Kučan, the president of the League of Communists of Slovenia, left the congress with 106 Slovenian delegates, soon joined by delegates from the League of Communists of Croatia. This event marked the formal end of the political existence of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia, which was a key moment in the process of the breakup of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, soon leading to a civil war.

One of the key factors that accelerated the breakup of Yugoslavia was American policy, which in November 1990 adopted a Public law that clearly showed the United States' intention to encourage the distraction of Yugoslavia. The law included the suspension of all loans and aid to Yugoslavia, which had a devastating impact on the country that did not have a stable domestic currency. The law also required that any republic wishing to receive U.S. aid must separate from Yugoslavia and declare independence. Aid was granted only to those republics that adopted "democratic values" according to the American definition, which practically meant support for right-wing, ultra-nationalist, and fascist groups. The goal of this policy was to break Yugoslavia into underdeveloped, right-wing "banana republics" that would become privatized and deindustrialized.

Under political pressure, Yugoslavia passed a law on political parties, and each republic held separate elections. In Slovenia and Croatia, nationalist parties came to power, while in Bosnia and Herzegovina a coalition of nationalist parties of Serbs, Croats, and Muslims was formed. In Serbia and Montenegro, socialists, former communists, came to power, and in Macedonia, social democrats, also former communists.

Before the armed conflict broke out in Slovenia, on June 25, 1991, U.S. Secretary of State James Baker clearly warned Yugoslavia that the U.S. would not allow changes to republic borders and that the military should not be used against Slovenia and Croatia. Two days later, Slovenia and Croatia declared independence, followed by Bosnia and Herzegovina and Macedonia in 1992. Bloody conflicts erupted in Bosnia as Serbs rejected the idea of a unitary Bosnia and Herzegovina.

In contrast, the leaders of Slovenia were aware that they could attack the JNA (Yugoslav People's Army) without fear of a serious response because they knew that the JNA would not use all its force. Although the JNA had strong military power, especially after transitioning to Soviet weaponry in the 1960s and developing a strong military industry, its weaponry strategy was problematic. The JNA lacked an adequate air defense system while investing large amounts

of money in aviation. In contrast, in conflicts with NATO, the JNA had no chance. As Zhukov said after the bombing of Dresden: "He who cannot defend his sky cannot defend his independence." Yugoslavia had a military doctrine similar to NATO's, while the Soviet Union and other socialist countries invested in air defense.

In that context, the situation became clear: either the Yugoslav People's Army (JNA) would intervene in Croatia and Slovenia, allowing NATO to take the initiative and likely determine the outcome, as in Libya, or a controlled civil war would ensue (which was the case), with the army retreating to territories that supported the JNA, or Yugoslavia would move towards liberalism. This is why the JNA withdrew its forces to territories with a predominantly Serbian population, as Serbs, the largest ethnic group in Yugoslavia, supported the preservation of a unified state. The war in Bosnia and Herzegovina, as well as the earlier conflicts in Croatia after its recognition, were under the full control of the U.S. From the perspective of military resources, whether regarding the remaining JNA forces or the military formations it supported, the opponents would have been defeated if the U.S. had not intervened. A conflict with NATO became inevitable, which is why all military equipment was withdrawn to territories that supported the JNA.

Additionally, during the 1990s, Yugoslavia faced an economic crisis and international isolation. The economy experienced a drastic decline, industrial production fell by 80%, and inflation was at a daily rate of 62% between 1992 and 1994. The U.S., the EU, and Russia under Boris Yeltsin imposed sanctions, further worsening the situation. While many other Eastern European countries went through similar processes, Yugoslavia faced both sanctions and civil war, leading to even greater problems. The wars in Yugoslavia were directly influenced by the U.S., and the war ended when the U.S. decided through the Dayton Agreement in 1995, making Bosnia and Herzegovina a NATO-controlled protectorate.

The destruction of Yugoslavia was a tragic process, involving mass migrations, expulsions (more than 500,000 Serbs were expelled from Croatia), and over

125,000 killed. Particularly tragic was the period of bombing in Yugoslavia in 1999. During the NATO aggression over the situation in Kosovo and Metohija, thousands died, and there were long-term consequences, such as an increase in cancer cases due to the use of depleted uranium.

Afterward, the so called Kosovo Liberation Army activated in Kosovo and Metohija, supported by the U.S. and the EU, which became the pretext for NATO bombing of Yugoslavia in 1999. Before the military aggression, a media campaign and demonization of the Serbian people, the Yugoslav state, and its leadership were in full swing. It was often claimed that the Yugoslav authorities and Serbs were violating human rights, killing innocent civilians, and that the international community (in essence, Western imperialism) needed to intervene (which, in practice, meant aggression). It was also fabricated that Serbian police in Račak allegedly killed innocent civilians, when those people were actually terrorists, which served as a justification for NATO bombing. This pattern of Western media activity is repeated around the world. During the 78 days of bombing, over 4,000 people were killed, and tens of thousands were injured. Long-term effects included an increase in cancer, leukemia, and lymphoma cases, as NATO used depleted uranium and cluster bombs. The war ended with the Kumanovo Agreement, leading to the withdrawal of the Yugoslav Army from Kosovo, while international forces (NATO and Russia, which withdrew in 2004) arrived in the region. It is important to note that Kosovo and Metohija represent a strategically key point in the Balkans, where the U.S. built the Bondsteel base, which can accommodate up to 50,000 soldiers.

Thanks to the preserved combat strength of the Yugoslav People's Army, Yugoslavia provided strong resistance to NATO and retained 95% of its military equipment. The most difficult period in the country's history was survived thanks to the socialist industry and economy, which were prepared for special conditions. However, under external and internal pressures, the system began to disintegrate.

During the 1990s, the government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia made numerous concessions,

opening space for non-governmental organizations and media controlled by the West. Large sums were invested in propaganda, particularly among the youth. Objective dissatisfaction due to the decline in living standards, wars, increased crime, high corruption, and the introduction of the private sector, which enriched a layer overnight, led many young people to become anti-communist and anti-leftist, often turning towards conservative and liberal propaganda.

Additionally, the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia faced international isolation, including sanctions from the UN Security Council (1992–1995), as well as sanctions from the U.S. and the EU (1998–2000), and the country had no allies in the region due to objective circumstances. All of Yugoslavia's assets were frozen or seized by Western countries. Nevertheless, over 80% of the income came from state-owned enterprises, and the country had to find ways to survive. At that time, the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia had a left-wing, patriotic, and anti-imperialist government, although Western propaganda tries to present that time as an era of nationalist and chauvinist domination, claiming that the wars in Yugoslavia were caused by Greater Serbian nationalism and Slobodan Milošević. These contradictions allowed the counter-revolutionary process to be completed under external pressures. However, the entire process of the destruction of Yugoslavia was part of NATO's eastward expansion and the attempt to prevent the creation of any alternative to liberal capitalism in the region.

The example of sanctions on Yugoslavia, Cuba, Venezuela, and other countries exposes the myth of the free market. According to that logic, the free market should regulate things on its own, and socialist societies are supposedly inefficient and doomed to collapse. However, a logical question arises: if the market regulates everything, why then do countries with "democratic systems" impose sanctions on these countries? This shows that the "free market" is actually defended by the protectionism of the most powerful imperialist countries, which want to preserve their monopolies.

Who will seize the strategic initiative in WWII?

Dimitrios Patelis | Revolutionary Unification (Greece)

Contents

- Introduction
- The active and potential theatres and fronts of military operations. A crisis of tactics
- Escalation of Economic Warfare
- Politics and war diplomacy. A Change in Tactics
- Some Conclusions

Introduction

The conflict in Ukraine has been escalating for over three years, making it the largest theatre of operations in World War III (WWIII).

At the same time, the confrontation in all active and potential theatres of war is rapidly intensifying. This is especially true for the escalating offensive of the imperialist axis and its instruments, led by the USA, against the “weak links” of the resistance axis in West and South-West Asia: Palestine, Syria, Lebanon, Yemen, with Iran as the main target.

There are also potential theatres of war in East Asia (the Korean peninsula and Taiwan), as well as in the regions of the Transcaucasia and Central Asia, where the involvement of the axis of aggression through Turkey and Israel is increasing.

The confrontation is escalating at all levels: operational military, economic, ideological-political, diplomatic and scientific. Here we will address some key aspects of a range of possibilities, and the need to improve tactics.

With the escalation of the conflict to a quantitatively and qualitatively higher stage, the problem of the mismatch between the subjects involved on both sides is brought to the surface. The central issue is the adoption of tactics capable of ensuring the reorganisation of the subject with the prospect of victory, through control of the strategic initiative, the element of surprise, asymmetric attacks, etc.

The active and potential theatres and fronts of military operations. A crisis of tactics

The US-NATO-EU imperialist axis continues to use the Ukrainian people as “cannon fodder”, using the occupation regime to forcibly impose participation in a fratricidal war that has devolved into genocide. The Ukrainian Armed Forces (UAF) are largely made up of men of all ages who have been forcibly conscripted through military police raids, turning the country into a vast concentration and extermination camp under the supervision, sponsorship and guidance of the imperialist axis. In this “conflict by proxy” between the axis and the Russian Federation (RF) and its allies, changes have taken place.

The armed forces of the RF are slowly advancing within the framework of the “Special Military Operation” (SMO). However, despite the successful liberation of Suja after a surprise attack by Russian commandos via a disused natural gas pipeline, the part of the Kursk region captured by Euro-Atlantic forces of the “Ukrainian Army” and foreign mercenaries in August 2024 has not yet been fully retaken.

Despite minor advances, the front line has remained stagnant for the past two years. The SMO has now taken on the characteristics of a bloody, static “war of attrition” in which the RF is emerging as the victor “on points,” a fact that is increasingly acknowledged even by Western sources.

The tactics used by the RF Armed Forces—under the orders of the political leadership—the means, methods, forces involved and the direction of operations, do not seem to achieve the strategic initiative on the battlefields.

The initially declared “strategic objectives” (“denazification” and “demilitarisation” of Ukraine) remain vague, while even greater confusion is sown by political officials and diplomats as to the constantly

changing territorial claims... This ambiguity of the objectives, combined with ideological confusion, is affecting the morale of the armed forces.

It is unequivocally clear that the forces of the imperialist axis have systematically constructed the Nazi regime in Kyiv as a “battering ram” and “strike force” for the destruction and dissolution/conquest of the RF itself.

Therefore, if even the smallest territory of this entity remains as a state formation, it will continue to serve as a fascist instrument of the axis, available for new murderous adventurism of a revanchist nature. A formation that will not only be “anti-Russian”, but will be promoted as a model for the fascisation of European and other countries, in the framework of the militarisation of the economy and society that imperialism will need for the further spread of war.

Consequently, despite the rhetoric and tactics of the political leadership of the RF, any objective other than the total defeat and unconditional surrender of this regime is, in reality, inconsistent with the character of the conflict in the Ukrainian theatre of WWII and works to the advantage of the axis of aggression.

This stagnation of the front line may reflect:

- the reluctance of the leadership for escalating aggression against a brotherly people brutally exploited by the enemy,
- the actual inability to effectively counter the strength not only of Nazi Ukraine but also of some 55 countries directly and in various ways involved in the attack on the RF,
 - the political leadership of the RF fearing a rapid escalation leading to total thermonuclear destruction,
 - fearing having to contend with a victorious army fighting the Nazis once again, “like their grandfathers in the USSR in 1941-1945”, with a pro-Soviet ideological reference and elevated political consciousness,
 - the observed reluctance of this leadership of the newly formed bourgeoisie in the RF to achieve an effective strategic victory, limiting the scale and intensity of the confrontation to some partial successes in the field,

- the reduction of strategy to the tactic of languidly collecting more bargaining chips for renegotiation under more favourable conditions, a return to the familiar and comfortable position and role of comprador/mediator in the sale of energy, raw materials and cheap labour to the dominant structures of imperialism, or, finally,

- a combination of the above in the spirit of vulgar pragmatism and opportunism, so that the leadership of the RF buys some time with an approach summarised as “figuring things out as you go”.

This situation is now being interpreted even by the men of the RF armed forces as a failed tactic of selling out and defeatism. This mass discontent, combined with the possibility of a shameful compromise with the axis, a “ceasefire” that will be widely perceived as “a victory stolen from us by traitors and national sellouts, may become unmanageable for the RF ruling class.

Adding to the confusion is the RF leadership’s declared willingness to negotiate from the beginning of the SMO and its occasional ... practical outcomes.

Typical were the indescribable negotiations in Constantinople, which led to the voluntary withdrawal of the RF Armed Forces from all positions held at the time, thus essentially abandoning the strategic initiative they had secured since the spring of 2022. A withdrawal carried out on Putin’s orders, as a “gesture of goodwill”!...

Then there is the experience of previous shameful agreements, such as the infamous pledge “not to expand NATO an inch eastward” in 1991, and the so-called “Minsk-1” and “Minsk-2” agreements of 2015. The former was violated almost immediately with the fragmentation, conquest and wholesale NATOisation of almost all the counterrevolutionary regimes that prevailed in the early socialist countries of Europe, along with a number of statelets/protectorates that emerged from the counterrevolutionary dissolution of the USSR. By the admission of the Western leaders of the time and their “guarantors”, the agreements were only signed as a pretext to allow the full Nazification and arming/militarisation of

the Kiev junta regime, while—under pressure from the Kremlin, as a “gesture of goodwill”—they were implemented only by the militias of the Lugansk and Donetsk People’s Republics! For eight years, the Nazis of the Axis carried out a virtually unimpeded genocide against the rebellious people of Donbass.

As Vladimir Putin himself said, “It turned out, and everyone knows this today, that both the Ukrainian authorities and their Western curators were unfortunately misleading us and trying to trick us. Former leaders who used to stand at the helm of several leading Western nations, including former President of France Hollande and Ms Merkel, the former German Chancellor, stated openly that they needed these Minsk agreements merely to deliver more weapons to the Ukrainian regime and to prepare it for a military confrontation with Russia. However, during these eight years, the people in Donbass, Lugansk and Donetsk faced outright genocide, and I mean real genocide. But the Ukrainian regime’s Western curators preferred to turn a blind eye to these developments, forcing us to try to stop the war which started in 2014 by military means. We were not the ones who started it.

By the way, even when the armed conflict escalated into open confrontation in 2022, we were still offering to settle all the outstanding issues by peaceful means. Moreover, as I have said many times, we reached an agreement with Ukraine during our talks in Istanbul. I must mention that we had an agreement on matters that are being raised all the time these days and are viewed as something impossible. I am referring to de-Nazifying and demilitarising efforts. In fact, we had a deal on these issues, and it was all set forth in the agreement, I mean its draft. Ukraine’s head negotiator initialled a summary of this document. They initialled and signed this document, which means that it was acceptable to them.

We know what happened next. After that, their European curators arrived, including former UK Prime Minister Boris Johnson, who convinced the Ukrainian leadership to keep fighting until there are virtually no Ukrainians left and to inflict a

strategic defeat on Russia” (Vladimir Putin visited Arkhangelsk nuclear-powered cruiser submarine. 27 March 2025).

In Syria, a new systematic genocide against Alawites, Shiites and Christians has begun by the Islamofascist terrorist self-proclaimed “new authorities”, who are creations of the US-NATO-EU axis and under the direct guidance of the Turkish and Israeli regimes. These “authorities” have cut off access to the internet in order to conceal the genocide, as the main source of information remains the habit of the drunken monsters / sadists—to post pictures of the atrocities they are committing on social media. Mercenaries from the Muslim populations of the Russian Federation and the post-Soviet space are at the forefront of the atrocities against civilians. The bodies of the massacred are loaded onto trucks, while countless incidents of horrific rape and torture take place.

The racist Zionist instrument of the axis in West Asia is escalating the genocide/ethnic cleansing in Palestine with the absolute support of the US-NATO-EU, the attacks on Lebanon and the expansion of the occupied territories into Syria under the “new authorities”.

WWIII is a war of life and death for Palestine, for the peoples of Lebanon, Syria, Iran and especially for heroic Yemen. The people and armed forces of Yemen are at the forefront of the struggle for freedom, independence, popular sovereignty and dignity.

The imperialist axis led by the USA is launching new waves of attacks against the Yemeni people and armed forces. The governments of NATO and EU countries are providing material support, bases and forces to the imperialist operations in the Red Sea.

The valiant struggle of the Yemeni people has become a symbol of solidarity with the Palestinian people and all struggling peoples in the consciousness of the whole world, a unique example of preserving honour and human dignity, a model of solidarity with incomparable self-sacrifice and selflessness. An example of greatness of spirit and physical strength, endurance, ingenuity and creativity, which

succeeded in humiliating the vulgar arrogance and conceit of the imperialist ruler with successive blows. An example that will illuminate the path of the peoples for centuries to come, showing that when fundamental principles are at stake, no superior enemy can overcome the will of a rebellious people. The consciously rebellious people know that it is better to sacrifice themselves fighting with dignity against the oppressor than to live on their knees in endless humiliating submission!

In support of the escalation of the attacks, the area around the US naval base at Diego Garcia (1,796 kilometres south of India) has been declared a no-fly zone until at least 1 May. At least 7 strategic B-2 Spirit bombers and 7 C-17A Globemaster III transport aircraft have landed at this US base. Iran and Yemen are within the operational range of the B-2s.

Obviously, the imperialists' military movements are linked to the 1st of May 2025, the expiry date of the ultimatum that Trump gave to Iran in order to force them to abandon the guarantee of their sovereignty that is the pursuit of a nuclear arsenal, as the DPRK has demonstrated.

Additionally, "a new U.S. missile system deployed in the Philippines puts key Chinese military and commercial hubs within striking distance".

The system includes:

⊙ Tomahawk missiles (range 1,200 miles): capable of striking radar systems and command centres in Guangzhou and Nanjing.

⊙ SM-6 missiles (range 150-290 miles): capable of engaging ships, aircraft, cruise missiles and potentially hypersonic threats.

Escalation of Economic Warfare

The war is also escalating in the field of the global economy. The US dollar will continue its decline as a global reserve currency, as will the entirety of US securities in the global capital market, as the countries and peoples in WWIIIIII fiercely reject the parasitic mechanism of monopoly super-profit extraction through imperialist neocolonial exploitation.

The "war of sanctions" also continues. In total,

almost 21,700 new sanctions were imposed on Russia from February 2022 to January 2025. Most of them came from: the USA (6,433), Canada (3,185), Switzerland (3,010), the European Union (2,234), France (2,175), the UK (1,918), Australia (1,378), Japan (1,359). Of these, more than half (12,910) are individual sanctions (<https://www.castellum.ai/russia-sanctions-dashboard>).

Sanctions are used to attack the economy, science, technology, society, communications and culture of countries that are "disobedient" to the axis.

Sanctions are intended to change the policies of states, bring about regime change through riots, destabilisation of governments and incitement of "colour revolutions"/coups (as they attempted in Cuba, the overthrow of Salvador Allende in Chile, Yugoslavia, Syria, etc.), the cessation of unwanted hostilities, the undermining of the economic and military strength of countries, the dissolution of alliances, coalitions and the fragmentation of countries into bickering statelets/protectorates, the prevention of the development of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction, etc.

The imposition and establishment of scientific and technological dependence is a primary objective of this economic war, with the emphasis on extracting super-profits in the form of "technological revenue" through intellectual property and patents. The extreme monetarist tariff policy and the use of sanctions as a unique weapon of coercion and subjugation of countries seem to hit the USA, the G-7 and the EU harder than the "punished" disobedient countries due to the rapid change in the balance of power. Deindustrialisation is escalating, particularly in the EU, leading to a revaluation of many imported products, while established global supply chains (logistics) are being hit, a fact that seems to have a more severe impact on the "punisher" countries.

Moreover, the sanctions and economic warfare unleashed by the US and its axis often produce unforeseen, diametrically opposed and asymmetrical results in favour of the "punished". The examples of the DPRK, the PRC, Vietnam, Iran and, more recently,

the RF show interesting trends: industrialisation or even reindustrialisation, development of research and know-how, repatriation of production, strengthening of self-sufficiency, food, technological and military-industrial security, development of equitable and mutually beneficial relations and cooperation, enhancement of prestige, exports, position and role in the global division of labour, etc...

Politics and war diplomacy. A Change in Tactics

WWIII is also escalating in the political-diplomatic field, with the group of the US oligarchy under Trump gaining the initiative, with more theatrics, surprises, threats, blackmail, faits accomplis, deceptions, etc.

Already on 18 February 2025 negotiations between Russia and the U.S.A. took place in Saudi Arabia.

On 18 April 2025 there was a telephone conversation between Trump and Putin, where Trump demanded a 30-day ceasefire. In the end, they agreed in principle to the possibility of a 30-day cessation of attacks on energy infrastructure between Russia and Ukraine, without setting a start date for this cessation. The next day, 19 April 2025, 175 Ukrainian prisoners were exchanged for 175 Russians. Moscow also handed over an additional 22 severely wounded Ukrainian prisoners in need of urgent medical care, as a “gesture of goodwill”.

On the same day, the Russian Defence Ministry announced that “seven Russian attack drones were airborne, targeting Ukrainian energy infrastructure facilities connected to the military-industrial complex in the Nikolaev region. Thus, “Russian air defences were ordered to neutralize the drones, six of which were shot down by the Pantsir missile system and one by an air force fighter jet”, again as a “gesture of goodwill”...

The White House also announced: “Trump and Putin agreed that Iran must never be able to destroy Israel”! The Kremlin did not deny it... If the ruling class of the Russian Federation takes practical steps in this direction, its credibility will be deeply undermined, and the pole of resistance will be

irreparably weakened.

On 28 February 2025, an unprecedented event in the annals of diplomacy took place: a “clash between Trump and Zelensky” in the White House in front of the cameras. This clearly staged performance had many facets, motives and audiences, which, of course, cannot be reduced to the former’s personal dislike of the latter because of his “close ties” to the Biden administration.

This is a show of symbolism, signalling a turning point in the tactics and diplomacy of the leader of the imperialist axis of aggression.

It was an unprecedented public “dressing down” by the imperialist leader, a dramatised manipulation of global public opinion, warning of the dismissal of subservient staff: a thespian appointed as head of the servile Nazi regime in Kiev, an instrument of externally assigned/imposed by the US.

At the same time, it is a performance with a particular symbolism, aimed directly at the conditioned reflexes of the political personnel and the oligarchy of the RF. It is part of an effort to appease, win over, and trap the current Russian leadership in a dubious agreement.

In parallel, the US is making efforts to appease, win over and obtain the approval of India and other countries in softer tones (as part of the undermining of BRICS by manipulating historical antagonisms with the PRC).

The ultimate goal of this agreement is to undermine and ultimately break the alliance between Russia-China-Iran-the DPRK and the broader pole of anti-imperialist forces and socialist forces in WWIII.

This performance was aimed at the hasty and aggressive promotion of the US in the role of “global peacemaker”, starting with Ukraine.

The urgent need to change tactics and terms of engagement in this stagnant front situation, in this war of attrition against weapon systems, advisors, personnel, instructors, mercenaries, and even the prestige of the USA and NATO, takes on existential significance. However, it does not suit them to present the change of tactics not as an admission of defeat by the Axis, but as a “desperate and responsible” search

by the USA for an “honourable surrender”, or at least a ceasefire, similar to that of the 38th parallel on the Korean peninsula in 1953.

Thus, they staged this performance and others that followed so that the defeat of the US-led axis in Ukraine could be attributed specifically to the failure of a “corrupt” scapegoat, a “disobedient and ungrateful, who is also non compos mentis”, the soon-to-be-dismissed Zelensky.

The U.S. rush to achieve even a temporary ceasefire in Ukraine, by definition, is not and cannot be about improving the position of the RF and its allies.

The main puppeteers, organisers, sponsors and directors of this protracted tragicomedy, on the pretext of a change of tenant in the White House, are suddenly proclaiming and projecting themselves as supposedly blameless “innocent doves” in the role of supposed “mediators and peacemakers”!

The hasty change of tactics of the USA, aimed at dynamically regaining the strategic initiative in WWIII, must redefine the tactical objectives and priorities in the escalation of the war, as well as the consequent changes in the positions and roles of the components of the axis. Even if some kind of ceasefire is achieved in Ukraine, the war will continue unabated.

A partial or total withdrawal of the US “security umbrella” and military presence in Europe is therefore necessary, with a corresponding shift of economic, political and military commitments to the UK and the EU, so that the US can concentrate undistractedly on other theatres of operation: the attack on Yemen, Iran, then the DPRK and finally the PRC.

Of course, the US is trying to shift a significant part of the costs of the axis’ involvement in other theatres of operations to the UK, EU, Japan, South Korea, Australia and other “willing” parties. In addition, they seek traditional colonial-type conquests of territories, populations and natural resources, in Ukraine, the RF, Canada, Greenland, Mexico, Panama, etc.

On 24 April 2025, representatives of the Russian Federation and the United States held negotiations

in Saudi Arabia. The choice of Saudi Arabia as the venue for the negotiations is symbolic in many ways, including the practical intention to reattach the country to the US chariot, undermine BRICS, involve it again in the war against Yemen and the genocide in Palestine, strengthen the artery of combined sea and land transport through Saudi territory to supply Israel, etc. The two sides, after hours of expert negotiations, were initially reluctant to issue joint or even separate statements. The next day, separate statements were issued, first by the US and then by the RF.

The White House statements were brief, general and covered:

⊙ ensuring safe navigation, avoiding the use of force and preventing the use of commercial vessels for military purposes in the Black Sea.

⊙ achieving a mechanism to prohibit strikes on Russian and Ukrainian energy infrastructure targets.

⊙ U.S. assistance in restoring Russia’s access to global markets for the export of agricultural products and fertilisers, reducing the cost of maritime insurance, and expanding access to ports and payment systems for such transactions.

⊙ the general intention to achieve a “stable and lasting peace”.

In addition to the above, the Kremlin’s statements included other details such as:

- Lifting of sanctions against the Russian Agricultural Bank (Rosselkhozbank) and other financial institutions involved in international trade in food (including fisheries) and fertilisers, their reintegration into SWIFT and the opening of necessary accounts.

- Lifting of restrictions on the financing of commercial transactions.

- Lifting of sanctions on companies engaged in the production and export of food (including fisheries) and fertilisers, as well as the ban on insurance companies covering such cargoes.

- Lifting of restrictions on ships transporting food and fertilisers (including ships flying the Russian flag).

- Lifting the ban on imports of agricultural machinery and other goods related to food and fertiliser production...

- an abstract reference to efforts of achieving lasting peace.

The Kremlin also published a list of Russian and Ukrainian targets protected by the temporary moratorium on strikes on energy infrastructure:

Oil refineries, oil and natural gas pipelines and storage facilities (including pumping stations), electricity production and distribution infrastructure (power plants, substations, transformers), nuclear power plants, hydroelectric dams.

In principle, the very participation of the RF in this process constitutes an admission of a brutal distortion/inversion of reality: the USA, as the main leading subject of the axis' aggression (which established, constructed and set in motion the Kiev regime through "external assignment", the power that shamelessly continues to provide all economic, military, technological, etc. support to the war machine against the RF), is presented as a "neutral peacemaker, mediator and guarantor power in the negotiations and in monitoring the implementation of the agreement"!

None of the above terms is even remotely related to the demands made on the US-NATO, as formulated in the ultimatums of 17 December 2021, which included no further eastward expansion, no NATO membership for post-Soviet countries and no military cooperation agreements with them, the cessation of exercises near the Russian border with nuclear strike scenarios and involving forces larger than a brigade, no further development and withdrawal of medium and long-range missiles and launchers from countries near Russia, as well as the withdrawal of nuclear weapons deployed in third NATO countries (e.g. in Turkey and Germany) to US territory.

None of the above is even remotely related to the stated objectives of the SMO. The territories of the four new regions, which constitutionally form an integral part of the RF following referendums by their populations, have not yet been fully liberated.

Moreover, no rational belligerent who is a victor even "on points" and far from achieving his objective strategic goals will engage in ceasefire negotiations while operations are raging in the field. The opposite implies ineptitude and defeatism from the outset, contributing to the loss of both the initiative and the moral high ground.

Imagine, for example, what it would have looked like in August 1943, after the victory in the Battle of Kursk, if the Soviet leadership had sat down to negotiate a ceasefire with the Romanian Armed Forces at Hitler's invitation, with his "neutral mediation" and "guarantees"!

The eagerness of the leadership of the RF to cite the terms in detail is, at the very least, an indication of uncertainty and lack of confidence. The very terms which the RF side emphatically cites, clearly concern its reintegration into the previous regime of international transactions, rather than security. Moreover, the Russian side is once again declaring to the international community that it is prepared to assume certain responsibilities, both in the escalation of the negotiations and in the fulfilment of the conditions. What is the purpose of this willingness? To buy time? Can all this be presented to the armed forces and people of the Russian Federation as a "victory" and "success"?

Behind the technical-diplomatic terminology, it is clear that great pressure is being exerted on Russia with the stick of continuation/escalation of the war & sanctions of the attacking axis and the carrot of partial restoration of its position as a "colonial partner" of imperialism!

Wild bargaining is taking place, with largely vague, unclear promises and controversial partial lifting of sanctions and some return of the RF to international transactions with axis-controlled countries, hence: with the bait of some partial restoration of Russia's position and role as a source of raw materials and energy for imperialism.

Any implementation of similar conditions will, in reality, function as a strengthening of the tendencies of cooptation/buyout of the RF by the USA and the

consequent undermining of the pole of the forces of anti-imperialism and socialism. It will only lead to a temporary postponement of a new attack on a Russian Federation that has irreparably lost its credibility and will end up isolated from the allies it had, much weaker and more fragile. There is no need to remind how often President Putin himself has said in recent years: “they have deceived us,” “they have lied to us,” “they have deceived us again,” “they have broken their word,” etc. Every deception presupposes the existence of at least one deceiver manipulating some gullible people. How “gullible” can one be when, in repeated instances, one shows a readiness and willingness to succumb to the temptations of the a priori swindling enemy?

Repeating from time to time “They have sold me out again, they have cheated me...” does not absolve one from the role of object or intermediary in a crude swindle, if not of the masochistic rent collector...

Unfortunately, a significant part of the ruling class, the political leadership and the media of the RF are once again showing their susceptibility to such bargains. In a country whose ruling class emerged from the bourgeois counterrevolution/capitalist restoration and relates to comprador thieving practices of unprecedented magnitude against the achievements of early socialism, there are clearly greenhouse conditions for the 5th column in WWIII.

How many more supposed “negotiations”, “gestures of goodwill” and belated realisations of deception will it take to understand where national/popular sovereignty ends and subservience and betrayal to the 5th Column axis begins?

Some Conclusions

Recent developments in WWIII are making things increasingly clear:

1. There is not the slightest chance of pacification or ceasefire. On the contrary, the deepening contradictions that gave rise to WWIII, together with the new ones it is bringing to the surface, ARE LEADING TO THE MOST TOTAL AND DESTRUCTIVE PLANETARY WAR IN HISTORY.

The widening and deepening of the conflict is an existential one-way street for the axis. The destruction of the axis is a one-way street for the survival of humanity.

2. The strategic objective of the axis remains unchanged: to limit the rates of its decline in the global balance, through the takeover, deception, fragmentation, attrition, blackmail or even the defeat/destruction of the anti-imperialist, socialist and revolutionary forces of the planet, of any formation or plan that could oppose the monopoly of imperialism.

3. The only certainty today is the clear ineffectiveness of the tactics used so far in the theatres of operations, both by the imperialist axis and by the RF and its allies.

4. With the change in the political representation of the US financial oligarchy, some urgent “corrective” changes in tactics are being attempted to achieve this strategic objective, i.e. partial rearrangements in coordination, distribution of positions, roles and emphases of objectives, changes in means, methods, subjects and lethal effectiveness.

5. The new US leadership under President Donald Trump, which expresses the new consensus of the most aggressive circles of the financial oligarchy of imperialism, is attempting to force developments by changing its plans, seizing the strategic initiative (trying to split the front of anti-imperialist and socialist forces by buying/co-opting the Russian bourgeois class, crushing the “weak links” of the pole of resistance, etc.),

6. The USA seems to be reluctant to continue to bear the main burden of the further escalation of the war in the Ukrainian theatre of operations, with the clear intention of reducing its presence or even withdrawing from Europe and transferring the obligations to the UK and the EU at all levels: economic, military, human lives, the fascisation of the EU in order to respond to the new tasks of transition to a “war economy”, the militarisation of society, etc.

7. Thus, the cannibalisation of whatever can be a

field of extraction of monopoly super-profits and/or a potential competitor to the USA in Europe and everywhere is being planned.

8. The US imperialists dream of regaining their global hegemony, with the old reliable recipe of WWI and WWII: setting Europe to a massacre with Russia, etc., so that they can belatedly intervene on this front as overlords, to reap the fruits of the “reconstruction” (à la “Marshall Plan” after WWII) on whatever still stands after the carnage, to reap new superprofits, and to re-establish their global hegemony.

9. The US focuses on its №1 existential enemy: the PRC, which “stands out as the actor most capable of threatening U.S. interests globally”, according to the US intelligence report “Annual Threat Evaluation” published on 25 April 2025. “China presents the most comprehensive and robust military threat to U.S. national security”. “Beijing will continue to expand its coercive and subversive malign influence activities to weaken the United States internally and globally”

The report’s authors believe that the Chinese leadership will resist what it sees as “a campaign orchestrated (by Washington) to tarnish China’s international relations and overthrow the Communist Party of China”.

The same is being planned for the DPRK, Iran, Vietnam, Cuba, Laos, etc. Similarly willing fools are being prepared for slaughter in the Indo-Pacific region, Latin America, Africa, etc.

10. The stagnation in Ukraine and the strategically significant tactical successes of the axis in West Asia and Transcaucasia show the decline and exhaustion of the limits of the power, traditional relations and prestige that the RF drew from some achievements (technological, military, ideological, etc.) of the USSR and the internationalist anti-imperialist policy of early socialism in the 20th century. Even the existence of thousands of cadres in key positions from dependent countries of all continents who studied in the universities of the USSR, an irreplaceable bond of “soft cultural power”, a channel of communication and cooperation, was systematically

vilified and ignored by the new counterrevolutionary bureaucracy of the RF imbued with anti-Soviet and anti-communist ideology. Moreover, this link is gradually diminishing due to demographic reasons.

11. The same is true of the remnants/shadows of those who were once associated with the system of early socialism, the “non-aligned movement” and anti-imperialism. Characteristic is the decay, corruption and eventual disappearance of the versions of Arab secular anti-imperialism of socialist orientation like Baathism (in Egypt, Libya, Iraq, Syria, Lebanon, Yemen, Palestine, etc.).

12. It has been replaced by a regressive revival of ideologies and practices based on pre-capitalist or/and primitive communities, in religious confessions and sects of Islam, Christianity, etc. Religious fundamentalism is also divided into

a) right-wing gangs in the service of imperialism, and

b) currents of radical anti-imperialist and plebeian communalism, with tendencies towards pan-Arabism or Islamic anti-imperialism (mainly within the Shiite tradition).

13. Moreover, the containment and cancellation of the dynamic efforts of the USA to seize the strategic initiative is categorically impossible within the framework of the tactic of “figuring things out as you go”, with the current level of largely spontaneous, loose and unstructured relations prevailing in the forming pole of the forces of socialism and anti-imperialism.

14. Mere negation, the rejection of the domination of the imperialist axis is not enough. The generic and vague, abstract anti-imperialism, which in reality leaves the strategic initiative to the enemy, is no longer enough. A conscious scientific foundation and formulation of the positive prospect, the alternative strategy and tactics of the pole of socialism and anti-imperialism is what is needed.

15. On this basis, the organisational-institutional upgrade, the total reorganisation of the pole of the forces of anti-imperialism on a consciously planned basis, with the conditions of the ideological-political

vanguard/hegemony of scientific socialism, is also necessary.

16. Now that the axis targets the “weak links” of this pole, it is at least necessary to establish and proclaim bilateral and multilateral conditions of collective security binding on all countries, starting from the minimum position: any attack on one of the countries of the pole of resistance will mean immediate military assistance from the other countries. The example of similar alliance commitments between the PRC and the DPRK and between the RF and the DPRK can serve as a model for the spread of such deterrent alliance relations for collective security. The argument that presents the very existence of such an alliance-collective security system as a challenge to greater axis aggression does not hold water. It is not even consistent with the fact that in wartime conditions it is better for the insolent enemy to fear you than to respect you.

17. The venture of the radical change of strategy of the USA, of the seizure of the strategic initiative in WWII, constitutes a tragic anti-utopia in its desperation. It remains unclear what will be more lethal/destructive in the end: the success or the failure of this macabre plan?

18. Special emphasis must be placed on exposing the dangers of any divisive agreement signed by the newly formed ruling class of the RF with the USA. The consistent progressive forces must make it clear to the people that in the conditions of rapid escalation of WWII, in the RF and in the world, there exists and acts subversively a 5th column. This 5th column is comprised of two interconnected, alternating and cooperating on the basis of their strategic unity components/tendencies: 1. Cosmopolitan neo-liberalism and 2. Aggressive conservative nationalism. The 2nd tendency is placed today under the hegemony of Trump and “Trumpism”, rallying in the “far right international” the most reactionary and obscurantist elements brought to the surface by the crisis and war, everything that is instrumentalised today in the service of the lethal mechanism of imperialism: from the “anarcho-liberalism” of Javier

Milei, to the Nazism of the Kiev junta, the Zionism of Netanyahu and the monarcho-fascism of Dugin...

19. It is therefore necessary to expose and unmask versions of a malignant deception based on vulgar illusions, educational deficits and prejudices. A deception peddled by opportunist profiteers as “anti-imperialism”. The nonsense about the “radical, anti-establishment revolutionary” Trump, who—riding on a white horse together with his mate, the saviour Putin, in blissful collaboration with the fascist international—“will crush the globalists and contribute to the prosperity of the multipolar paradise of the anti-globalists on earth”, with or without compensation, has already caused inordinate damage to many. Detoxification from the extremely destructive disease of necrophilia-Trumpophilia will take time and effort. However, we must make systematic and scientifically documented efforts to prevent the destructive influence of this kind of deadly to the movement poison as well...

20. History is not repeating itself. The existing possibilities of mass annihilation of every form of life on the planet favour the most macabre predictions. Everything will depend on the balance of forces, with the global anti-imperialist front promoted by the World Anti-Imperialist Platform becoming the decisive factor for the survival and revolutionary prospect of humanity.

Interview on the World Anti-Imperialist Platform

Stephen Cho | Coordinator of the Korean International Forum

This article is in response to an interview requested by the comrades of the Café Marxiste on February 21, 2025

Q1: What is your analysis of the current world situation?

(If we do not scientifically analyze the political situation, we cannot establish a revolutionary strategy. A revolutionary force must examine the current situation from a historical and structural point of view and clarify the objectives, means and methods of the revolution...).

The storm of World War 3 caused by imperialism is blowing from Eastern Europe towards Western Asia (Middle East), then towards Eastern Asia and the Western Pacific. As part of the strategy of a “new cold war”, imperialism is trying to maintain its world hegemony and to emerge from its political and economic crisis by regulating the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea (DPRK, North Korea), China, Russia and Iran as the “new axis of aggressors” through World War 3. Marxists should analyze the national and world situation from a historical and structural point of view, based on dialectical materialism, historical materialism, political economy and scientific revolutionary theory. On this basis, they should be able to establish strategies and tactics for the revolution and define objectives, means and methods of the revolution. The fundamental concepts of the scientific analysis of the current world situation are “World War 3,” which began with the war in Ukraine; the “three battlefields” in Eastern Europe, Western Asia, and Eastern Asia; and the “proxy war” in which imperialism manipulates and directs local fascist

forces. The central term of the revolutionary strategy based on this analysis of the situation is the strategy of the “world anti-imperialist front”, which is an innovation inherited from the strategy of the world anti-fascist front during World War 2. The world anti-imperialist strategy has concrete content regarding the objectives, means, and methods of the struggle, namely the “causes,” “capabilities,” and “operations” of the world anti-imperialist camp.

Q2: What is the nature of the war in Ukraine?

(Theory of “inter-imperialist war” VS “theory of liberation and preventive war”. Theory of “Russian imperialism” VS “theory of Russian capitalism”. Same mistake regarding China, which is supposedly imperialist).

Everything contains two dialectical sides. From the imperialist and fascist point of view, in particular from the point of view of the imperialism represented by NATO, the US, the EU and the fascist authorities in Kiev, the war in Ukraine is essentially an imperialist war, and more specifically an anti-Russian war, a fascist war and a war of injustice. Conversely, from an anti-imperialist and anti-fascist point of view, and more specifically from Russia’s point of view, the war in Ukraine is essentially an anti-imperialist war, and more specifically, a war against NATO, an anti-fascist war, and a just war. It is, therefore, wrong to define Russia as an imperialist country and to consider it an inter-imperialist war. Although there is monopoly capital in Russian society, it has social characteristics that cannot be defined as imperialist, and these predominate. For example, Russia exports resources rather than capital, and it is far from the imperialist method of invasion and plunder, which consists

of military occupation, political domination, and economic exploitation. Furthermore, as a country with a socialist heritage and a long socialist history, it has a strong anti-imperialist stance, allying itself with and supporting anti-imperialist countries, as can be seen in Syria, West Asia, and the Sahel in Africa. Some communist parties that consider Russia to be an imperialist country also defend the so-called “imperialist pyramid” theory, which considers China and its socialism with Chinese characteristics, and even the DPRK, a staunch socialist country, to be imperialist countries. This pseudo-theory is a revisionist theory that surpasses Kautsky’s theory of “ultra-imperialism” just before World War 1. It is a typical opportunist and sectarian theory that divides the international communist movement and serves imperialist forces. Like all revisionist-opportunist theories, this “theory” uses concepts and logic that are unscientific and is full of contradictions, so that it is increasingly rejected by the solid communist forces and is dying.

Q3: What role did the fascist coup d’état on Maidan in 2014 play in triggering this war?

(The war in Ukraine began with the Maidan coup in 2014, an operation born of Zbigniew Brzezinski’s “Grand Chessboard” strategy and a new episode of the “color revolutions” orchestrated under U.S. control. The conflict worsened over the next eight years with the massacre of 14,000 people in the Donbass, before entering fully into Russia’s special military operation in 2022).

Although different opinions remain on the start of World War 3, the anti-imperialist camp generally believes that it is the war in Ukraine. We believe that World War 3 began in February 2022 with the war in Ukraine, escalated in October 2023 with the war in Palestine, and will be in full swing with the conflicts in East Asia and the Western Pacific. The war in Ukraine began with the Maidan coup in 2014, then

escalated over the next eight years with the Donbass war, before becoming a full-scale war with Russia’s “special military operation” in 2022. The Maidan coup d’état is a typical and most successful “color revolution” and putsch orchestrated by imperialism. For this coup d’état, imperialism has long supported the notorious pro-Nazi imperialist fascist Stepan Bandera in Ukraine, who escaped the Nuremberg war crimes tribunal. The brutality of the fascist clique, controlled and supported by imperialism, is one of total barbarism, as evidenced by the massacre of 14,000 people in Odessa in 2014 and in the Donbass over the next eight years. It is of the same nature as the massacres of Park Chung-hee and Chun Doo-hwan in the “Republic of Korea” (“ROK,” South Korea), of Suharto in Indonesia, and of the military dictatorship of Pinochet in Chile. Imperialism has used fascist forces as an assault force to establish a colonial system or sometimes as an assault force in war. Just as the Korean War of 1950 broke out after the establishment of the fascist regime in the “ROK,” the war in Ukraine of 2022 broke out after the establishment of the fascist regime in Ukraine following the Maidan coup. Although it appears to be a fascist war caused by the fascist clique, it should be considered an imperialist war in the sense that it is essentially controlled and supported by imperialism. Imperialism has focused on linking France and Germany in Western Europe with Poland and Ukraine in Eastern Europe to implement Zbigniew Brzezinski’s infamous “Grand Chessboard” strategy, and ultimately, thanks to the Maidan coup and the Donbass war, it was able to launch the war in Ukraine in earnest in 2022. The imperialist stratagem of defining Russia as a “new aggressor”, exhausting its military and economic power, and building a system of “new cold war” is facing the biggest crisis in its history, due to Russia’s strong anti-imperialist struggle and the anti-imperialist alliance with the DPRK, China, and Iran.

Q4: You say that the war in Ukraine is the beginning of World War 3 and you fear that open conflicts will soon break out in South Korea or Taiwan. Who wants to provoke this World War 3 and why? What are the structural and economic causes of this march to war by the Euro-Atlantic imperialist camp?

(The Atlanticist bloc—USA/EU/Japan (+ Israel/Australia, etc.—under US domination to maintain its hegemony)

The storm of World War 3 caused by imperialism is blowing from Eastern Europe to East Asia and the Western Pacific, passing through Western Asia (Middle East). Eastern Europe, Western Asia, and Eastern Asia are the three battlefields of this war, and the wars in Ukraine, Palestine, and the “ROK” are the catalysts in each area. Having incited the war in Ukraine, imperialism is pushing for the expansion of conflicts in Eastern Europe, including Poland, Romania, and the three Baltic States. After having induced and provoked the war in Palestine, it is also pushing for the expansion of conflicts in Western Asia, particularly in Lebanon, Syria, Yemen, and especially Iran. If we consider that this situation corresponds to the case of Germany and Italy during World War 2, the war in Eastern Asia and the Western Pacific would then correspond to Japan at that time. Imperialism defined them as an “axis”, and today, it is Russia, Iran, the DPRK, and China that constitute a “new axis of aggressors” in its eyes. This means that imperialism has never hidden its plans for war against the DPRK and China in East Asia, and has, in fact, been pursuing this strategy for a long time. The reason why imperialism is pushing for World War 3, a war on three battlefields, is that its political and economic crisis has reached a record level and it is no longer able to maintain its global hegemony. The DPRK—the fiercely staunch socialist country—and China with its socialism with Chinese characteristics,

as well as Russia with a socialist heritage and an “axis of resistance” including Iran are forming an anti-imperialist camp under the anti-imperialist banner, and the economic, political and military alliance of the BRICS and the Shanghai Cooperation Organization is constantly strengthening and expanding. Above all, the political and economic crisis of the G7, centered on the United States and Western Europe, is worsening by the day, the UN Security Council is virtually paralyzed, and NATO is gripped by the fear of collapse. The imperialists’ belief that only a major world war can resolve this crisis is embodied in the strategy of the “new cold war” and the promotion of “World War 3”. In other words, As it cannot maintain its world hegemony, it has launched a final challenge to create a new system of “new cold war” that will dominate the rest of the imperialist camp, that is to say, the imperialist countries and their stooges, other than the anti-imperialist camp that it denounces as the new “axis of aggression,” to achieve final victory thanks to the power of capital and propaganda, just as in the old “cold war” system. After waging wars in Eastern Europe and Western Asia, imperialism is trying to seriously engage in World War 3 by finally launching a decisive war in Eastern Asia and the Western Pacific.

Q5: In this context of a new world war, what are the forces at play and what is at stake in the “Republic of Korea”?

(The characteristics, the possibility and the prospect of a war in the “Republic of Korea”.)

As we know, World War 1 was an inter-imperialist war, and World War 2 was a world anti-fascist war. World War 3 is a world anti-imperialist war. World War means a full-scale war between blocs on a global scale, and the two main camps in the World War 3 are those of imperialism and anti-imperialism. The four main forces of the anti-imperialist camp are the socialist countries of the DPRK and China, Russia

with a socialist heritage, and the “axis of resistance” formed by Iran and other countries. The imperialist camp is led by US imperialism, accompanied by European and Japanese imperialism, as well as Israeli Zionism. World War 3 will take place on three battlefields: Eastern Europe and Western Asia, where confrontations have already begun, and East Asia and Western Pacific, where conflicts are imminent. Like Ukraine and Palestine, respectively, in Eastern Europe and Western Asia, the “ROK” will act as a detonator in East Asia. If war breaks out in the “ROK,” it will simultaneously break out in Taiwan, and if Japan and the Philippines join in, it will escalate into a war throughout East Asia; if Australia and New Zealand join in, it will then become a war throughout the Western Pacific. The DPRK and China agreed in a treaty of friendship, cooperation, and mutual assistance signed in 1961 that they would automatically join any anti-imperialist war anywhere, and this was reaffirmed during President Xi Jinping’s visit to Pyongyang in 2019. At the US-Japan-“ROK” summit in Camp David in August 2023, imperialism has practically formed the “Northeast Asian version of NATO”. With this as a core, they have, in fact, already realized the “Asian version of NATO”, which includes the Philippines, Indonesia, Singapore, Thailand, Australia, and New Zealand, and which extends to Western and Central Asia. Although the name of the organization has not been announced, the three countries of the US-Japan-“ROK” are conducting joint invasion war exercises, and “SQUAD” of the US, the UK, Japan, and the Philippines, and “AUKUS” of the US, the UK, and Australia have been formed and are fiercely carrying out joint invasion war exercises. In particular, after the declaration of “Pacificization of NATO” at the NATO Washington Summit in July 2024, joint multi-domain invasion war exercises such as “Rimpac (Pacific Rim Exercise)”, “Freedom Edge” and “Ulchi Freedom Shield” were conducted repeatedly and intensively between June and August 2024. After creating these

organizations and conducting these war exercises, NATO manipulated and supported the Ukrainian invasion of Kursk in Russia in August 2024. Israel’s invasion of Lebanon, under the control and support of the US, in September 2024, as well as the drone attack on Pyongyang, also under control and with the support of the US, in October of the same year, were carried out. If the DPRK had not shown “strategic patience”, the war in the “ROK” would have broken out in October 2024.

The presumption that a war in the “ROK” in October 2024 had already been written into the imperialist calendar—just like the war in Ukraine in February 2022 and the war in Palestine in October 2023—has now been confirmed in practice. After the failure of US imperialism and the pro-imperialist fascist clique of the “ROK” to launch a conflict with the DPRK in October 2024, they are attempting to relaunch a war against the DPRK, the war in the “ROK”, after completing the fascistization of the “ROK” through the imposition of martial law and the coup d’état of December 3, 2024. Although the coup failed due to the popular uprising, the insurgents still controlled the state’s apparatus of violence and aimed for a second coup under a second martial law, provoking and launching provocations to trigger the war in the “ROK” through a civil war.

Q6: Why was the World Anti-Imperialist Platform created? What are the three main goals of the Platform?

(1. promoting the global anti-imperialist mass struggle; 2. waging the ideological struggle against opportunism; 3. strengthening the international communist movement.)

The World Anti-Imperialist Platform (the Platform) was launched in Paris on October 22, 2022, by communist and anti-imperialist forces from various countries. These forces declared that they could no longer remain silent in the face of attacks on

the international communist movement—attacks stemming from the revisionist, opportunist, and sectarian practices of the Communist Party of Greece, as well as from the so-called “imperialist pyramid” theory, which labels Russia, China, the DPRK, and Iran as imperialist powers. The Platform published the historic Paris Declaration, in which it affirmed its three goals: to strengthen the world anti-imperialist struggle, to intensify ideological battles against revisionism and opportunism, and to consolidate the international communist movement. To this end, starting in Paris, France, in October 2022, we have vigorously promoted conferences, colloquium, anti-imperialist rallies, marches, and meetings with workers, peasants, youth, and women in Belgrade, Serbia, in December 2022; in Caracas, Venezuela, in March 2023; in Gwangju and Seoul, the “ROK,” in May 2023; in Athens, Greece, in November 2023; in Washington, USA, in July 2024; and in Dakar, Senegal, in October 2024. We have also organized various meetings, seminars, and debates in Germany, Italy, Spain, Ireland, Russia, Taiwan, Chile, Kenya, and Guinea-Bissau, and invited a revolutionary Korean musical theater troupe to tour Western and Eastern Europe. The Platform also conducts activities on social media, including YouTube, publishing a monthly theoretical journal called “Platform” and launching the website “Platform News”. All these activities aim to achieve the three goals above. As the launch of the Platform from France shows, the PRCF, a leading French revolutionary political organization, plays an important role as a founding member of the Platform.

Q7: Why and how to promote the anti-imperialist struggle? How to mobilize workers in the anti-imperialist struggle as a priority?

(This is the most important objective of the World Anti-Imperialist Platform. Strengthening the world anti-imperialist struggle means strengthening these

struggles in one’s own country while coordinating them with other anti-imperialist struggles around the world. The anti-imperialist struggle within each country and the anti-imperialist struggle at the global level are part of a dialectical relationship between the national and the international.)

In the context of World War 3, the anti-imperialist struggle is being waged in two main areas: armed struggle and people’s struggle. The former is being waged mainly by anti-imperialist countries in power, as well as by the “axis of resistance” of Russia and Iran, and potentially by the DPRK and China. People’s struggle is a basic method of struggle for communist and anti-imperialist forces in all other countries. The anti-imperialist camp is naturally and fundamentally opposed to war and terrorism. It is the imperialists who wage wars and provoke acts of terrorism, and the anti-imperialist camp is compelled to retaliate in self-defense. The World Anti-Imperialist Platform is opposed to war and terrorism. Based on mass struggle and ideological struggle, it mainly carries out propaganda projects such as international conferences, colloquiums, lectures, and publications, as well as mass struggles such as popular rallies and marches. The members of the Platform are mostly revolutionary political organizations in their respective countries and are closely linked to revolutionary popular organizations such as trade unions, peasant organizations, student associations, and women’s associations. The Platform launched the World Anti-Imperialist Youth Platform in Greece in November 2023 and has conducted various propaganda campaigns, as well as rallies and demonstrations in Washington and New York in July 2024. In the future, we will form a global organization of workers, peasants, and women, which we will strengthen and expand, thus developing the mass organizing capacity of the Platform. We are convinced that by establishing and propagating the scientific line, by organizing, uniting and building

solidarity, and by fighting unwaveringly in practice, the Platform will be strengthened and the three goals will be achieved more quickly.

Q8: Why and how should the ideological struggle be intensified?

(The targets of the ideological war are revisionism, opportunism and sectarianism.)

As you know, the history of the international communist movement is marked by the ideological struggle against opportunism. The theoretical and ideological achievements of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin are above all the fruit of this ideological battle. On the basis of the great historical experience of ideological struggle, the World Anti-Imperialist Platform has established the ideological struggle against sectarian opportunist forces as one of its three main goals, which are dividing the international communist movement and benefiting the imperialist powers. More specifically, we are very concerned that the Communist Party of Greece, the de facto organizer of Solidnet, is dividing the international communist movement by defining the war in Ukraine as an inter-imperialist war and Russia, China, and the DPRK as imperialist countries, and even preaching the “imperialist pyramid” theory. The Communist Party of Greece’s revisionist history began in the 1950s, when it followed Khrushchev’s revisionist line and expelled Níkos Zachariádis, a committed communist and prominent revolutionary general secretary, and intensified in the 2000s, when it supported Gorbachev’s policies of “Perestroika” and “Glasnost”. It is an open secret that the Communist Party of Greece has divided many communist parties and communist youth organizations around the world, including the Communist Party of the Peoples of Spain (PCPE), and has even dissolved the European Communist Initiative, which played a central role in the European communist movement. Solidnet’s inability to adopt a unified position on the

nature of the war in Ukraine in 2022 and its weak position on the war in Palestine in 2023 can also be explained by the ideological problems of revisionism, opportunism, and sectarianism, including the Communist Party of Greece’s “imperialist pyramid” theory. It is no coincidence that the problems of revisionism, opportunism, and sectarianism became more pronounced during the severe trials of World War 1 and 2, and that the same problems essentially arose during the greatest crisis of World War 3. As Marx said, the harder a flint is struck, the brighter it shines, and the Platform’s ideological struggle against revisionism, opportunism, and sectarianism will only grow in intensity as the situation surrounding World War 3 worsens.

Q9: Why and how should international communist forces be consolidated? Is the objective to rebuild a new communist international?

(Just as the relationship between a party and a united front can be compared to the relationship between the vanguard and the transmission belts in a country, the international communist forces and the world anti-imperialist forces must build the relationship between the locomotive and the wagons of this “train” of struggle on a global scale, metaphorically speaking. In other words, the international communist forces must further develop their role within the world anti-imperialist movement as a vanguard capable of putting forward the correct line and powerfully organizing and mobilizing the people. While the anti-imperialist struggle aims for maximum force against the main enemy, the communist movement aims to build a vanguard for the struggles of the masses, not only against imperialism, but also for socialism, which is the only real solution to the problems facing humanity.)

Historical experience shows that it is useless and impossible for international communist forces

to act in unity, with a single leadership, as the Comintern did in the past, since today, revolution and construction are carried out in each country on the basis of a nation-state. However, it is necessary and possible for communist forces to unite in solidarity, as anti-communist forces do. Over the past two years, the energetic and active work of the World Anti-Imperialist Platform has proven that it is necessary and possible to unite not only the communist forces of each country but also the anti-imperialist forces. In the current situation of World War 3 and the world anti-imperialist war, in which the anti-imperialist and imperialist camps are opposed and a major global war is being waged, communist and anti-imperialist forces must strategically unite and show solidarity under the anti-imperialist banner. First of all, the political organizations must unite and be in solidarity, and then the mass organizations of the workers, peasants, youth, and women, which are closely linked to them, must do the same. If the political organization is the locomotive of a revolution, the mass organizations at all levels are the wagons. Stalin's theory of the transmission belt remains important on an organizational and practical level. The Platform's three main goals are the world anti-imperialist struggle, the ideological battle against opportunism and the strengthening of the international communist movement. In short, the most important and fundamental goal is the victory of the world anti-imperialist bloc in World War 3, a feat of justice.

Q10: What do you think the election of Donald Trump will change in the anti-imperialist struggle?

Donald Trump is a "non-warring imperialist". In the early and mid-20th century, this was the position of the social democrats, but today these forces promote war-provoking policies. On the contrary, we are seeing an astonishing phenomenon: sometimes

mixed forces of republicans, conservatives, the far right, and fascists oppose a war. The division within the imperialist camp—between pro-war imperialist forces and those opposing them—is deepening due to political actors such as Trump. The contradictions within the imperialist camp carry the tactical importance for the anti-imperialist camp. As we know, the anti-imperialist camp has always had as its strategic goal the unity of its own camp and, as its tactical goal, the division of the imperialist camp. Trump's rise to power is clearly bad news for the belligerent imperialist forces. It is no coincidence that a sniper's bullet grazed Trump's ear just after the NATO summit in Washington in July last year. Before Trump's election, there was the invasion of Kursk by NATO-backed Ukrainian forces in Eastern Europe in August, an Israeli strike on Hezbollah in Lebanon in September, and the "ROK"'s drone attack on Pyongyang in October. After Trump's election, there was the lifting of restrictions on long-range missiles against Russia in Ukraine in November, the imposition of martial law and a coup d'état in the "ROK" in December, as well as the collapse of the Assad regime in Syria. The imperialist belligerents cannot afford to let Trump get his hands on their imperialist war policy and back out of the "World War 3 highway". This is why imperialist war provocations have become more frequent, harsh, and forceful since Trump's election. The anti-imperialist camp must advance the broad solidarity between anti-imperialist forces, including unity between world anti-imperialist states, and vigorously lead the world global anti-imperialist struggle while not failing to take tactical measures to deepen divisions within the imperialist camp in precise moment.

The war in the “Republic of Korea” is the ultimate scheme of the desperate imperialist forces to ignite a World War 3

Stephen Cho | Coordinator of the Korean International Forum

March 30, 2025

The war in the “Republic of Korea (ROK)” is the imperialist forces’ most calculated move. As is widely understood, the essence of current global situation is the World War 3 and its essence is an anti-imperialist war. The three major theaters of this world war are Eastern Europe, Western Asia (the Middle East), East Asia (the Western Pacific). While the wars in Eastern Europe and Western Asia are already underway, and a war in East Asia is imminent. The ignition points of these fronts are the wars in Ukraine, Palestine, and the “ROK”, respectively. The war in Ukraine erupted in February 2022, the war in Palestine in October 2023, and the war in the “ROK” nearly erupted in October 2024.

At that time, the imperialist camp, fronting the pro-US fascist warmonger Yoon Suk-yeol, attempted to provoke a “local war against the DPRK” through a drone strike on Pyongyang. However it was thwarted by the DPRK’s “strategic patience”. Subsequently, on December 3, 2024, they attempted a pro-US self-coup through the declaration of martial law, but it was also defeated by the “December Uprising” of the people in the “ROK”. Concrete evidence continues to emerge showing that Yoon’s fascist clique deliberately tried to provoke a local war in order to fulfill the precondition for declaring “wartime martial law”. Yoon directly commanded the Drone Operations Command and led a reckless drone attack against Pyongyang, while continuing extremely dangerous provocations including artillery shelling and missile launches from September to November to instigate a local war with the DPRK.

Between 2003 and 2022, the US and “ROK” militaries conducted a total of 132 joint war exercises aimed at invading the DPRK. That number spiked

to 122 in 2023, then rose even further to 136 in 2024. In just the first half of 2025, the count has already broken the previous year’s record. Yoon Suk-yeol’s coup was meticulously and rapidly prepared amid these US-”ROK” war rehearsals. One representative example is the operation “Loyalty 8000”, a scenario-based drill conducted during the “Freedom Shield” joint military exercise in March 2024, which assumed a coup situation.

The “ROK” is now moving from insurrection to civil war. The insurrectionist, fascist, and reactionary clique is on the verge of death after failing in their coup. For them, civil war remains the only path to survival. Of the three stages leading to civil war—bloody clashes, riots, gunfire—the first two have already taken place, though on a limited in scale. The current ploy is to ignite a “Constitutional Court riot” as soon as the ruling to dismiss Yoon Suk-yeol is delivered. The reactionary clique’s planned uprising, even operating under the codename “Purge Day”, is set to trigger an immediate declaration of a second martial law. Should gunfire erupt before or after this event, it would instantly escalate into a civil war. Yoon Suk-yeol, who was arrested in January and released in March through an unlawful ruling, together with the insurrectionist, fascist, and reactionary clique entrenched throughout the state apparatus, is desperately inciting a civil war.

When a local war is added to a civil war, it escalates into a war in the “ROK”. The war in the “ROK” represents the final and the most calculated move of the desperate imperialist forces to spark a Third World War. If a war breaks out in the “ROK”, it will almost immediately trigger a war in Taiwan, rapidly expanding into a broader East Asian and Western

Pacific war. This would mark the full-scale outbreak of World War 3. Just as the war in Ukraine began with the Maidan coup in 2014 and escalated into full-scale war with Russia's "Special Military Operation" in 2022, World War 3 began with the war in Ukraine and is set to enter full swing with the imminent war in the "ROK" and across East Asia. For the imperialist camp, the war in the "ROK"—the decisive trigger of World War 3—is not a matter of choice, but a necessity.

The imperialist camp is becoming increasingly divided and chaotic with the inauguration of the Trump administration. Trump has been called a "non-warring imperialist". This suggests that the imperialist camp is divided between warmongering and non-warmongering factions. Monopoly capital rules through social democracy and fascism internally, and takes the form of imperialism externally. Trump, a representative of monopoly capital within the US, is clearly an imperialist who prioritizes American national interests and aims for global hegemony—yet he is notably characterized by a preference for negotiation over war. This marks a clear distinction from his predecessor Biden, both during Trump's first term and now in his second.

The Trump administration's audacious notion of taking over Gaza and its fascist repression that labels anti-Zionist movements as antisemitic are undeniable examples of its imperialist nature. It is no coincidence that Israeli Zionists, backed by US imperialism, are continuing their bombing and massacres in Gaza and Lebanon. At the same time, Trump's push for US-Russia negotiations to resolve the war in Ukraine, his statement that the US would not intervene in a potential Taiwan conflict, and his reference to the DPRK as a "nuclear-armed state" demonstrate a path distinct from the pro-war forces within the imperialist camp. The formation of a "Coalition of the Willing" led by the UK and France, alongside rising defense budgets and the call for "European self-reliance" among Western European

imperialist states, reflects growing anxiety over the prospect of a NATO without the US.

The imperialist belligerents cannot tolerate the Trump government, which is going against the "World War 3 drive", dividing the imperialist camp and aggravating the crisis. In July 2024, just before the US presidential election, a sniper's bullet whizzed past Trump's ear, followed by the Ukrainian-NATO forces invasion of Russia's Kursk in August 2024, the Israeli Zionist concentrated attack on Lebanese Hezbollah in September, and the "ROK" military's drone attack on Pyongyang in October. Immediately after the US presidential election, a series of major events unfolded: the lifting of restrictions on long-range missiles against Russia and a subsequent attack in November; the declaration of martial law and a coup attempt in the "ROK" in early December; and the collapse of the Assad regime in Syria in mid-December.

This leads to the reasonable prediction that sooner or later, the imperialist belligerents will reach a new stage where they will overwhelm the Trump administration who is "driving backwards on the World War 3 highway" and trigger an enormous event that will decisively set World War 3 into full swing. To cite just a few examples, it could attack Russian or Iranian nuclear facilities, or assassinate Russian and Iranian leadership, and escalate the war in Eastern Europe and Western Asia. Above all, what's most likely is the triggering of a war in the "ROK", the fuse to a broader conflict in East Asia and the Western Pacific. Given the sufficient "buildup" over the past four months—from insurrection to civil war—the war in the "ROK" card appears to be the most probable.

Just as the imperialist camp implemented its "Cold War" strategy in the 1950s through the Korean War, using the "ROK" as a frontline anti-communist outpost, it is now attempting to realize its "New Cold War" strategy in the 2020s through a war in the "ROK", once again deploying it as an anti-communist

outpost. It is time to recall that the painful historical experience of the three-stage war preparation—the civil war in 1948, the local conflict in 1949, and culminating in the full-scale war of 1950—is being reproduced in the “ROK” today in a compressed and rapid manner.

The storm of World War 3 caused by imperialism is blowing from Eastern Europe to Western Asia and then to the Eastern Asia and Western Pacific. In order to deflect the biggest political and economic crisis in history, imperialism has launched the “New Cold War” strategy and is trying to denounce the DPRK, China, Russia, and “Axis of Resistance” including Iran, as a “new axis of aggressors”, shifting the blame on them for the outbreak of World War 3. The war in the “ROK” and Eastern Asia, which will make the World War 3 enter full swing, is imminent.

The key to a scientific analysis on situation lies in identifying the ultimate scheme of the imperialist camp, and the core of establishing revolutionary strategy lies in defining the strategic goal of the anti-imperialist camp. The anti-imperialist forces and anti-imperialist camp around the world are transforming the situation of war into a revolutionary situation by establishing a revolutionary strategy based on scientific analysis of the situation. The imperialist camp is dividing amid its deepening crisis, while the anti-imperialist camp is uniting and strengthening unprecedentedly. On the 80th anniversary of the victory in World War 2, the anti-imperialist camp is scientifically convinced of its final victory.

Platform



The World Anti-imperialist Platform