

# Platform

September 2023 No.4

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 entire illustration is framed by a thin white border.



# Contents

---

<b>Work</b>	<b>Marxism and Revisionism</b> ······02 V.I. Lenin   March-April 1908
<b>Article</b>	<b>Long live Leninism!</b> ······07 Harpal Brar   Communist Party of Great Britain (Marxist-Leninist)
	<b>The Communist Party of Belgium is 100 years young</b> ······19 Jozef Bossuyt   Communist Party of Belgium
	<b>Fascism - Attribute and Way of Existence of Imperialism</b> ······21 Klara Azhybekova   Communist Party of Kyrgyzstan
	<b>I'm back from Xinjiang</b> ······25 Aymeric Monville   Pole of Communist Revival in France
	<b>The political stance of the Communist Party of Greece ... a communist stance?</b> ······29 Chilean Communist Party (Proletarian Action)
	<b>"Multipolarity" or internationalist anti-imperialism?</b> ······42 Dimitrios Patelis   Collective for Revolutionary Unification (Greece)
	<b>Disappearing context: West created and backed Ukrainian fascists for 85 years</b> ······56 Joti Brar   Communist Party of Great Britain (Marxist-Leninist)
	<b>The Character of the War</b> ······62 Stephen Cho   Coordinator of the Korean International Forum

# Marxism and Revisionism

V.I. Lenin | March–April 1908

There is a well-known saying that if geometrical axioms affected human interests attempts would certainly be made to refute them. Theories of natural history which conflicted with the old prejudices of theology provoked, and still provoke, the most rabid opposition. No wonder, therefore, that the Marxian doctrine, which directly serves to enlighten and organise the advanced class in modern society, indicates the tasks facing this class and demonstrates the inevitable replacement (by virtue of economic development) of the present system by a new order — no wonder that this doctrine has had to fight for every step forward in the course of its life.

Needless to say, this applies to bourgeois science and philosophy, officially taught by official professors in order to befuddle the rising generation of the propertied classes and to “coach” it against internal and foreign enemies. This science will not even hear of Marxism, declaring that it has been refuted and annihilated. Marx is attacked with equal zest by young scholars who are making a career by refuting socialism, and by decrepit elders who are preserving the tradition of all kinds of outworn “systems”. The progress of Marxism, the fact that its ideas are spreading and taking firm hold among the working class, inevitably increase the frequency and intensity of these bourgeois attacks on Marxism, which becomes stronger, more hardened and more vigorous every time it is “annihilated” by official science.

But even among doctrines connected with the struggle of the working class, and current mainly among the proletariat, Marxism by no means consolidated its position all at once. In the first half-century of its existence (from the 1840s on) Marxism was engaged in combating theories fundamentally hostile to it. In the early forties Marx and Engels settled accounts with the radical Young Hegelians whose viewpoint was

that of philosophical idealism. At the end of the forties the struggle began in the field of economic doctrine, against Proudhonism. The fifties saw the completion of this struggle in criticism of the parties and doctrines which manifested themselves in the stormy year of 1848. In the sixties the struggle shifted from the field of general theory to one closer to the direct labour movement: the ejection of Bakuninism from the International. In the early seventies the stage in Germany was occupied for a short while by the Proudhonist Mühlberger, and in the late seventies by the positivist Dühring. But the influence of both on the proletariat was already absolutely insignificant. Marxism was already gaining an unquestionable victory over all other ideologies in the labour movement.

By the nineties this victory was in the main completed. Even in the Latin countries, where the traditions of Proudhonism held their ground longest of all, the workers’ parties in effect built their programmes and their tactics on Marxist foundations. The revived international organisation of the labour movement — in the shape of periodical international congresses — from the outset, and almost without a struggle, adopted the Marxist standpoint in all essentials. But after Marxism had ousted all the more or less integral doctrines hostile to it, the tendencies expressed in those doctrines began to seek other channels. The forms and causes of the struggle changed, but the struggle continued. And the second half-century of the existence of Marxism began (in the nineties) with the struggle of a trend hostile to Marxism within Marxism itself.

Bernstein, a one-time orthodox Marxist, gave his name to this trend by coming forward with the most noise and with the most purposeful expression of amendments to Marx, revision of Marx, revisionism. Even in Russia where — owing to the economic backwardness of the country and

the preponderance of a peasant population weighed down by the relics of serfdom — non-Marxist socialism has naturally held its ground longest of all, it is plainly passing into revisionism before our very eyes. Both in the agrarian question (the programme of the municipalisation of all land) and in general questions of programme and tactics, our Social-Narodniks are more and more substituting “amendments” to Marx for the moribund and obsolescent remnants of their old system, which in its own way was integral and fundamentally hostile to Marxism.

Pre-Marxist socialism has been defeated. It is continuing the struggle, no longer on its own independent ground, but on the general ground of Marxism, as revisionism. Let us, then, examine the ideological content of revisionism.

In the sphere of philosophy revisionism followed in the wake of bourgeois professorial “science”. The professors went “back to Kant” — and revisionism dragged along after the neo-Kantians. The professors repeated the platitudes that priests have uttered a thousand times against philosophical materialism — and the revisionists, smiling indulgently, mumbled (word for word after the latest Handbuch) that materialism had been “refuted” long ago. The professors treated Hegel as a “dead dog”<sup>\*)</sup> and while themselves preaching idealism, only an idealism a thousand times more petty and banal than Hegel’s, contemptuously shrugged their shoulders at dialectics — and the revisionists floundered after them into the swamp of philosophical vulgarisation of science, replacing “artful” (and revolutionary) dialectics by “simple” (and tranquil) “evolution”. The professors earned their official salaries by adjusting both their idealist and their “critical” systems to the dominant medieval “philosophy” (i.e., to theology) — and the revisionists drew close to them, trying to make religion a “private affair”, not in relation to the modern state, but in relation to the party of the advanced class.

What such “amendments” to Marx really meant in class terms need not be stated: it is

self-evident. We shall simply note that the only Marxist in the international Social-Democratic movement to criticise the incredible platitudes of the revisionists from the standpoint of consistent dialectical materialism was Plekhanov. This must be stressed, all the more emphatically since profoundly mistaken attempts are being made at the present time to smuggle in old and reactionary philosophical rubbish disguised as a criticism of Plekhanov’s tactical opportunism.<sup>1)</sup>

Passing to political economy, it must be noted first of all that in this sphere the “amendments” of the revisionists were much more comprehensive and circumstantial; attempts were made to influence the public by “new data on economic development”. It was said that concentration and the ousting of small-scale production by large-scale production do not occur in agriculture at all, while they proceed very slowly in commerce and industry. It was said that crises had now become rarer and weaker, and that cartels and trusts would probably enable capital to eliminate them altogether. It was said that the “theory of collapse” to which capitalism is heading was unsound, owing to the tendency of class antagonisms to become milder and less acute. It was said, finally, that it would not be amiss to correct Marx’s theory of value, too, in accordance with Böhm-Bawerk.<sup>2)</sup>

The fight against the revisionists on these questions resulted in as fruitful a revival of the theoretical thought in international socialism as did Engels’s controversy with Dühring twenty years earlier. The arguments of the revisionists were analysed with the help of facts and figures. It was proved that the revisionists were systematically painting a rose-coloured picture of modern small-scale production. The technical and commercial superiority of large-scale production over small-scale production not only in industry, but also in agriculture, is proved by irrefutable facts. But commodity production is far less developed in agriculture, and modern statisticians and economists are, as a rule, not very skilful in picking out the special branches (sometimes even the

operations) in agriculture which indicate that agriculture is being progressively drawn into the process of exchange in world economy. Small-scale production maintains itself on the ruins of natural economy by constant worsening of diet, by chronic starvation, by lengthening of the working day, by deterioration in the quality and the care of cattle, in a word, by the very methods whereby handicraft production maintained itself against capitalist manufacture. Every advance in science and technology inevitably and relentlessly undermines the foundations of small-scale production in capitalist society; and it is the task of socialist political economy to investigate this process in all its forms, often complicated and intricate, and to demonstrate to the small producer the impossibility of his holding his own under capitalism, the hopelessness of peasant farming under capitalism, and the necessity for the peasant to adopt the standpoint of the proletariat. On this question the revisionists sinned, in the scientific sense, by superficial generalisations based on facts selected one-sidedly and without reference to the system of capitalism as a whole. From the political point of view, they sinned by the fact that they inevitably, whether they wanted to or not, invited or urged the peasant to adopt the attitude of a small proprietor (i.e., the attitude of the bourgeoisie) instead of urging him to adopt the point of view of the revolutionary proletariat.

The position of revisionism was even worse as regards the theory of crises and the theory of collapse. Only for a very short time could people, and then only the most short-sighted, think of refashioning the foundations of Marx's theory under the influence of a few years of industrial boom and prosperity. Realities very soon made it clear to the revisionists that crises were not a thing of the past: prosperity was followed by a crisis. The forms, the sequence, the picture of particular crises changed, but crises remained an inevitable component of the capitalist system. While uniting production, the cartels and trusts at the same time, and in a way that was obvious to all, aggravated the

anarchy of production, the insecurity of existence of the proletariat and the oppression of capital, thereby intensifying class antagonisms to an unprecedented degree. That capitalism is heading for a break-down — in the sense both of individual political and economic crises and of the complete collapse of the entire capitalist system — has been made particularly clear, and on a particularly large scale, precisely by the new giant trusts. The recent financial crisis in America and the appalling increase of unemployment all over Europe, to say nothing of the impending industrial crisis to which many symptoms are pointing — all this has resulted in the recent “theories” of the revisionists having been forgotten by everybody, including, apparently, many of the revisionists themselves. But the lessons which this instability of the intellectuals had given the working class must not be forgotten.

As to the theory of value, it need only be said that apart from the vaguest of hints and sighs, à la Böhm-Bawerk, the revisionists have contributed absolutely nothing, and have therefore left no traces whatever on the development of scientific thought.

In the sphere of politics, revisionism did really try to revise the foundation of Marxism, namely, the doctrine of the class struggle. Political freedom, democracy and universal suffrage remove the ground for the class struggle — we were told — and render untrue the old proposition of the Communist Manifesto that the working men have no country. For, they said, since the “will of the majority” prevails in a democracy, one must neither regard the state as an organ of class rule, nor reject alliances with the progressive, social-reform bourgeoisie against the reactionaries.

It cannot be disputed that these arguments of the revisionists amounted to a fairly well-balanced system of views, namely, the old and well-known liberal-bourgeois views. The liberals have always said that bourgeois parliamentarism destroys classes and class divisions, since the right to vote and the right to participate in the government of the country are shared by all citizens without distinction. The whole history of Europe in the

second half of the nineteenth century, and the whole history of the Russian revolution in the early twentieth, clearly show how absurd such views are. Economic distinctions are not mitigated but aggravated and intensified under the freedom of “democratic” capitalism. Parliamentarism does not eliminate, but lays bare the innate character even of the most democratic bourgeois republics as organs of class oppression. By helping to enlighten and to organise immeasurably wider masses of the population than those which previously took an active part in political events, parliamentarism does not make for the elimination of crises and political revolutions, but for the maximum intensification of civil war during such revolutions. The events in Paris in the spring of 1871 and the events in Russia in the winter of 1905 showed as clearly as could be how inevitably this intensification comes about. The French bourgeoisie without a moment’s hesitation made a deal with the enemy of the whole nation, with the foreign army which had ruined its country, in order to crush the proletarian movement. Whoever does not understand the inevitable inner dialectics of parliamentarism and bourgeois democracy — which leads to an even sharper decision of the argument by mass violence than formerly — will never be able on the basis of this parliamentarism to conduct propaganda and agitation consistent in principle, really preparing the working-class masses for victorious participation in such “arguments”. The experience of alliances, agreements and blocs with the social-reform liberals in the West and with the liberal reformists (Cadets) in the Russian revolution, has convincingly shown that these agreements only blunt the consciousness of the masses, that they do not enhance but weaken the actual significance of their struggle, by linking fighters with elements who are least capable of fighting and most vacillating and treacherous. Millerandism in France — the biggest experiment in applying revisionist political tactics on a wide, a really national scale — has provided a practical appraisal of revisionism that will never be forgotten by the proletariat all

over the world.

A natural complement to the economic and political tendencies of revisionism was its attitude to the ultimate aim of the socialist movement. “The movement is everything, the ultimate aim is nothing” — this catch-phrase of Bernstein’s expresses the substance of revisionism better than many long disquisitions. To determine its conduct from case to case, to adapt itself to the events of the day and to the chopping and changing of petty politics, to forget the primary interests of the proletariat and the basic features of the whole capitalist system, of all capitalist evolution, to sacrifice these primary interests for the real or assumed advantages of the moment — such is the policy of revisionism. And it patently follows from the very nature of this policy that it may assume an infinite variety of forms, and that every more or less “new” question, every more or less unexpected and unforeseen turn of events, even though it change the basic line of development only to an insignificant degree and only for the briefest period, will always inevitably give rise to one variety of revisionism or another.

The inevitability of revisionism is determined by its class roots in modern society. Revisionism is an international phenomenon. No thinking socialist who is in the least informed can have the slightest doubt that the relation between the orthodox and the Bernsteinians in Germany, the Guesdists and the Jaurèsists (and now particularly the Broussists) in France, the Social Democratic Federation and the Independent Labour Party in Great Britain, Brouckère and Vandervelde in Belgium, the Integralists and the Reformists in Italy, the Bolsheviks and the Mensheviks in Russia, is everywhere essentially similar, notwithstanding the immense variety of national conditions and historical factors in the present state of all these countries. In reality, the “division” within the present international socialist movement is now proceeding along the same lines in all the various countries of the world, which testifies to a tremendous advance compared with thirty

or forty years ago, when heterogeneous trends in the various countries were struggling within the one international socialist movement. And that “revisionism from the left” which has taken shape in the Latin countries as “revolutionary syndicalism”,<sup>3)</sup> is also adapting itself to Marxism, “amending” it: Labriola in Italy and Lagardelle in France frequently appeal from Marx who is understood wrongly to Marx who is understood rightly.

We cannot stop here to analyse the ideological content of this revisionism, which as yet is far from having developed to the same extent as opportunist revisionism: it has not yet become international, has not yet stood the test of a single big practical battle with a socialist party in any single country. We confine ourselves therefore to that “revisionism from the right” which was described above.

Wherein lies its inevitability in capitalist society? Why is it more profound than the differences of national peculiarities and of degrees of capitalist development? Because in every capitalist country, side by side with the proletariat, there are always broad strata of the petty bourgeoisie, small proprietors. Capitalism arose and is constantly arising out of small production. A number of new “middle strata” are inevitably brought into existence again and again by capitalism (appendages to the factory, work at home, small workshops scattered all over the country to meet the requirements of big industries, such as the bicycle and automobile industries, etc.). These new small producers are just as inevitably being cast again into the ranks of the proletariat. It is quite natural that the petty-bourgeois world-outlook should again and again crop up in the ranks of the broad workers’ parties. It is quite natural that this should be so and always will be so, right up to the changes of fortune that will take place in the proletarian revolution. For it would be a profound mistake to think that the “complete” proletarianisation of the majority of the population is essential for bringing about such a revolution. What we now frequently experience only in the domain of ideology, namely, disputes

over theoretical amendments to Marx; what now crops up in practice only over individual side issues of the labour movement, as tactical differences with the revisionists and splits on this basis — is bound to be experienced by the working class on an incomparably larger scale when the proletarian revolution will sharpen all disputed issues, will focus all differences on points which are of the most immediate importance in determining the conduct of the masses, and will make it necessary in the heat of the fight to distinguish enemies from friends, and to cast out bad allies in order to deal decisive blows at the enemy.

The ideological struggle waged by revolutionary Marxism against revisionism at the end of the nineteenth century is but the prelude to the great revolutionary battles of the proletariat, which is marching forward to the complete victory of its cause despite all the waverings and weaknesses of the petty bourgeoisie.

## Notes

\*) Lenin quotes from K. Marx’s afterword to the second edition of Volume One of Capital (see K. Marx and F. Engels, Selected Works, Vol. I, Moscow, 1958, p. 456).

1) See Studies in the Philosophy of Marxism by Bogdanov, Bazarov and others. This is not the place to discuss the book, and I must at present confine myself to stating that in the very near future I shall prove in a series of articles, or in a separate pamphlet, that everything I have said in the text about neo-Kantian revisionists essentially applies also to these “new” neo-Humist and neo-Berkeleyan revisionists. (See present edition, Vol. 14.— Ed.) — Lenin

2) Böhm-Bawerk, E. — an Austrian bourgeois economist.

3) “Revolutionary syndicalism” — a petty-bourgeois semi-anarchist trend that made its appearance in the labour movement of a number of West-European countries at the close of the nineteenth century.

The syndicalists saw no need for the working class to engage in political struggle, they repudiated the leading role of the Party and the dictatorship of the proletariat. They believed that by organising a general strike of the workers the trade unions (in France — syndicats) could, without a revolution, overthrow capitalism and take over control of production.



# Long live Leninism!

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

26 April 2020 <sup>1)</sup>

*Why does Lenin hold such an honoured position in the lexicon of socialist leaders? A century later, what can we learn from his teachings?*

VI Lenin fought all his life against opportunism in the working-class movement, in Russia as well as in the west. He exposed and fought against the German socialist Kautsky's degeneration into opportunism, making a concrete analysis of every important question at issue, drawing clear and definite lines of demarcation between Marxism and Kautskyism, between the Marxist position and the plethora of tendencies within the socialist movement that conciliated with opportunism and thus stood in the way of successfully making a socialist revolution.

Lenin delved deep into the root causes of the emergence of Kautsky's degeneration, bringing them into the broad light of day — not allowing any considerations of diplomacy (for Kautsky was the acknowledged leader of world socialism at that time), tactics or expediency to inhibit his thorough exposure of this dangerous trend, for he knew only too well that any gains made by 'tactical' manoeuvres are not worth a farthing if into the bargain they bring strategic losses and even the negation of basic principles.

Had it not been for Lenin's exposure of Kautsky's opportunism during the first world war, the gigantic proletarian opposition to social democracy a few years later would have been out of the question. The result would have been widespread confusion in the working-class movement, accompanied by organisational stagnation.

After Lenin's death, Josef Stalin maintained that because of Lenin's services in the defence of Marxism against social-democratic opportunism, because of his development of Marxism on such

questions as proletarian revolution, the dictatorship of the proletariat, party organisation, etc, the science of Marxism should be called Marxism-Leninism; and in this Stalin was absolutely right, for such was Lenin's contribution to Marxism — to its general treasury.

Leninism, far from being merely a Russian phenomenon, became an international phenomenon rooted in the entire international development.

Lenin applied Marxism to Russian conditions in a masterly way. He helped restore the revolutionary content of Marxism, which had long been suppressed by the opportunists of the Second International. Above all, he took a giant leap forward, developing Marxism further under the new conditions of capitalism and proletarian class struggle.

This is how Stalin defined Leninism: "Leninism is Marxism of the era of imperialism and the proletarian revolution. To be more exact, Leninism is a theory of proletarian revolution in general, the theory and tactics of the dictatorship of the proletariat in particular." (JV Stalin, *The Foundations of Leninism*, 1924, Introduction)

Leninism is characterised by its exceptionally militant and revolutionary spirit, which can be explained by two causes: first, that Leninism was born of the proletarian revolution, the imprint of which it could not but bear; second, that it grew and gained strength in the struggle against the opportunism of the Second International.

The Second International followed the line of opportunism in practice, while paying lip service to Marxism in theory. As Stalin put it: "The opportunists adapted themselves to the bourgeoisie because of their adaptive, petty-bourgeois nature; the 'orthodox', in turn adapted themselves to the opportunists in order to 'preserve' unity with them,

in the interests of ‘peace within the party’. Thus the link between the policy of the bourgeoisie and the policy of the ‘orthodox’ was closed, and, as a result, opportunism reigned supreme.” (Ibid, chapter 2)

Instead of an integral revolutionary theory, there prevailed eclectic, contradictory propositions and scraps of theory. Instead of a revolutionary policy, there was flabby philistinism and contemptible parliamentary scheming and diplomacy. Instead of a correction of mistakes and of tactics on the basis of the party’s own mistakes, every attempt was made to evade difficult questions and to gloss over them.

As a new era of imperialist wars and of revolutionary proletarian battles drew nearer, the old methods, parliamentary and trade union, were patently useless and powerless “in the face of the omnipotence of finance capital”. (Ibid)

It thus became a matter of the utmost importance to “overhaul the entire activity of the Second International, its entire method of work” and to drive out all philistinism, renegacy, social-pacifism and social-chauvinism; to throw out all that was rusty and antiquated in the arsenal of the Second International and to forge new weapons.

Without the fulfilment of this task, the proletariat would have been completely unarmed in its struggle against imperialism. Stalin added: “The honour of bringing about this general overhauling and general cleansing of the Augean stables of the Second International fell to Leninism.” (Ibid)

Leninism insisted on restoring the breach between theory and practice, through testing the theoretical dogmas of the Second International in the crucible of living practice. It insisted that the policy of the parties belonging to the Second International be tested, not by their slogans and resolutions, but by their actions.

And it insisted on the reorganisation of all party work around new revolutionary lines, in order to train and prepare the masses for the revolutionary struggle.

Finally, it insisted on the necessity of self-criticism within the proletarian parties, in order that

they may learn from their own mistakes. In this context, Lenin wrote in his pamphlet *Left-Wing Communism: an Infantile Disorder*:

“The attitude of a political party towards its own mistakes is one of the most important and surest ways of judging how earnest the party is and how it in practice fulfils its obligations towards its class and the toiling masses.”

“Frankly admitting a mistake, ascertaining the reasons for it, analysing the circumstances which gave rise to it, and thoroughly discussing the means of correcting it — that is the earmark of a serious party; that is the way it should perform its duties, that is the way it should educate and train the class, and then the masses.” (1920, chapter 7)

A party, according to Leninism, is to be judged not by its pompous slogans and declarations but by its practice.

On the eve of the first world war, at its conference in Basel, the Second International, knowing full well that war was then impending, passed a resolution declaring “war against war”. A little later, as the war began, the parties of the Second International gave the workers a new slogan — to slaughter each other at the altar of the glory of their imperialist fatherlands.

The contrast between the policy of the Second International and that of the Leninist policy of transforming the imperialist war into a civil war for the overthrow of one’s own bourgeoisie makes starkly clear not only the baseness of the opportunism of the leaders of the Second International but also the magnificent grandeur of the method of Leninism.

The Bolsheviks generally, and Lenin in particular, were often accused by their opportunist opponents in Russia, as well as in the Second International, of being guided by their factional struggles and always putting fundamental problems of the Russian revolution in the forefront.

Doubtless, the Bolsheviks put in the forefront the fundamental problems of the Russian revolution. These, however, were the fundamental problems of

the revolution everywhere — not just Russia.

Problems such as the question of theory, the attitude of the Marxist party towards the bourgeois-democratic revolution, of the alliance between the working class and the peasantry, of the hegemony of the proletariat, of the significance of parliamentary and extra-parliamentary struggles, of general strike, of the passing of the bourgeois-democratic revolution into the socialist revolution, of the dictatorship of the proletariat, of imperialism, of the self-determination of nations, of the liberation movements of the colonial and oppressed peoples and of the necessity for the proletariat to support these movements.

The Bolsheviks put forward these problems as the touchstone on which to judge the revolutionary consistency of the parties of the Second International.

They were right to do so. Nay, they had a duty to do so, because all these problems were also the fundamental problems of the world proletarian revolution, to which the Bolsheviks subordinated their policy.

The Russian revolution was no private affair of the Bolsheviks or the Russian proletariat. Lenin had realised very early on that the revolutionary centre was beginning to shift from the west to Russia, and that the outcome of the Russian revolution would have world-historic significance.

As early as 1902, in his pamphlet *What Is to be Done?*, Lenin wrote:

“History has now confronted us with an immediate task which is the most revolutionary of all the immediate tasks that confront the proletariat of any country. The fulfilment of this task, the destruction of the most powerful bulwark not only of European but (it may now be said) of Asiatic reaction, would make the Russian proletariat the vanguard of the international revolutionary proletariat.” (Chapter 1A)

Nearly 120 years have passed since these words were written and history has eloquently confirmed Lenin’s words. However, it does follow from this that the Russian revolution was “the nodal point of

world revolution; that the fundamental problems of the Russian revolution were ... the fundamental problems of the world revolution”. (JV Stalin, *Some questions concerning the history of Bolshevism*, January 1934)

Let us now briefly look at some of these fundamental problems of Leninism.

### **Marxist theory**

Lenin constantly insisted that the proletariat should recognise the role of revolutionary theory. “Without a revolutionary theory there can be no revolutionary movement,” he wrote in *What Is to be Done?* (Chapter 1D)

He understood better than anyone else the importance of theory, for theory alone can give the movement confidence, purpose and direction. As early as 1902 he pointed out: “The role of vanguard fighter can be fulfilled only by a party that is guided by the most advanced theory.” (Ibid)

This does not mean that theory should be separated from practice, for “theory becomes purposeless if it is not connected with revolutionary practice, just as practice gropes in the dark if its path is not illumined by revolutionary theory”. (JV Stalin, *Foundations of Leninism*, 1924, chapter 3)

Lenin waged a merciless struggle against the ‘theory’ of spontaneity, the ‘theory’ of worshipping the spontaneity of the labour movement, as an opportunist theory which repudiated the leading role of the party of the proletariat, a ‘theory’ which dragged the party of the proletariat to tag along at the tail end of the spontaneous working-class movement.

The leading proponents of this ‘theory’, the Economists, went to the extent of denying the need for an independent party of the proletariat. Lenin’s *What is To Be Done?* demolished this ‘theory’ and furnished the theoretical foundations for a genuinely revolutionary movement of the Russian proletariat.

### **Lenin’s theory of proletarian revolution**

According to Lenin, imperialism (monopoly capitalism) intensifies all the contradictions of capitalism to the extreme. In the heartlands of capitalism, finance capital makes the yoke of monopolies unbearable, thus serving to exacerbate the resentment of the working class against the foundations of capitalism, and bringing the masses to the proletarian revolution as their only salvation.

Second, the export of capital, which is such a characteristic feature of monopoly capital (finance capital), leads to the transformation of capitalism into a world system of financial enslavement and colonial oppression of the overwhelming majority of the population of the world by a handful of 'advanced' countries, thus splitting the global population into two camps: the handful of countries that exploit and oppress the vast masses of dependent and colonial countries, and the huge majority inhabiting the oppressed world.

All this leads to the intensification of the contradiction between imperialism and the oppressed countries, resulting in the growth of the movements of revolt against imperialism on the external front.

Third, the uneven development of capitalist countries, and the resultant frenzied struggle for the redivision of the world between those countries that already possess territories and those claiming a 'fair share', leads to imperialist wars as the sole means for restoring the disturbed 'equilibrium' — the intensification of the struggle on the third front, the interimperialist front.

Hence Lenin's conclusion: that wars cannot be averted under imperialism. Hence also the inevitability of a coalition between proletarian revolution in the imperialist countries and the anti-imperialist movements in the oppressed countries in a united revolutionary front against the world front of imperialism.

Combining all these conclusions into one general conclusion, Lenin observed that: "Imperialism is the eve of the socialist revolution." (Preface to *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*, April 1917)

According to Lenin's theory, with the development of capitalism into imperialism, individual national economies have ceased to be self-sufficient units; they have become links in a single chain of the world economy; that imperialism is a global system of financial enslavement and oppression of the vast majority of the world's population by a handful of imperialist countries.

This creates the objective conditions for revolution to break out in countries that are not particularly advanced in terms of industrial development because the system in its entirety is ripe for revolution.

As a result, the chain of the world imperialist front may break in any one country or another depending on where the chain is at its weakest. Hence the victory of the revolution is possible in one country, even a relatively backward country (as for instance Russia in 1917).

### **Dictatorship of the proletariat**

"The fundamental question of every revolution is the question of power," said Lenin. The aim of the dictatorship of the proletariat is to overthrow the bourgeoisie and break its resistance; to organise construction; and to arm the revolution, organising the army against foreign enemies in the struggle against imperialism.

The dictatorship of the proletariat spans a whole historical epoch. It cannot result in complete democracy for all — it institutes democracy for the majority and dictatorship over the minority. The dictatorship of the proletariat cannot result from peaceful development of bourgeois society and bourgeois democracy; it can only arise as a result of the smashing of the bourgeois state machine.

With the appearance of Soviet power, the era of bourgeois-democratic parliamentarism draws to a close and a new chapter in world history — the era of proletarian dictatorship — is ushered in.

The Republic of Soviets is thus the political form so long sought and finally discovered, within the framework of which the economic emancipation of the proletariat, the complete victory of socialism,

must be accomplished. (Theses on the constituent assembly, December 1917)

### **The peasant question**

Leninism has three slogans on the peasant question, each corresponding to a different stage of the revolution: (a) the peasantry during the bourgeois-democratic revolution; (b) the peasantry during the proletarian revolution; and (c) the peasantry after the consolidation of Soviet power.

Those who are marching and preparing to assume power cannot but be interested in the question of who are their real allies. In this sense, the peasant question is part of the general question of the dictatorship of the proletariat, and is thus one of the most important problems of Leninism.

Some people maintain that what is special about Leninism is its stance on the peasantry. This is not true. “The fundamental question of Leninism, its point of departure, is ... the dictatorship of the proletariat, of the conditions under which it is to be achieved, of the conditions under which it can be consolidated.” (JV Stalin, Foundations of Leninism, chapter 5)

The peasant question, since it concerns the question of who are the allies of the proletariat in its struggle for power, is a secondary question, deriving from the question of state power.

During the bourgeois-democratic revolution, the struggle was between the Cadets (the liberal bourgeoisie) and the Bolsheviks (the proletariat) for influence over the peasantry. The Cadets were attempting to win over the peasantry and to reconcile it to tsarism. During this stage of the revolution, therefore, the Bolsheviks concentrated their fire on the Cadets.

During the proletarian revolution, the struggle was between the so-called Socialist Revolutionaries (petty-bourgeois democrats) and the Bolsheviks for influence over the peasantry — a struggle to win over the majority of the people by ending the war. But to end the war it was necessary to overthrow the provisional government — to overthrow the power of the bourgeoisie and the power of the

Socialist-Revolutionaries and the Mensheviks who were compromising with the bourgeoisie.

After the consolidation of Soviet power, the task was to win over the majority of the peasantry for socialist construction. Lenin was correctly of the view that a peasantry that had received peace and land at the hands of the proletariat could be mobilised to build socialism through the cooperatives.

“State power over all large-scale means of production, state power in the hands of the proletariat, the alliance of this proletariat with many millions of small and very small peasants, the assured leadership of the peasantry by the proletariat, etc — is not this all that is necessary for the building of the complete socialist society from the cooperatives, from the cooperatives alone, which we formerly looked down upon as huckstering and which from a certain aspect we have the right to look down upon as such now un?”

“Is this not all that is necessary for building a socialist society? This is not yet the building of a socialist society, but it is all that is necessary and sufficient for this building.” (On cooperation, January 1923)

### **The national question**

In the period of the Second International, the national question was seen as being confined to a few European countries — i.e., Poland, Hungary, Ireland, etc. The vast majority of subjugated peoples in Asia and Africa remained outside the purview of the Second International.

Leninism broke down the wall between whites and blacks, Europeans and Asians and Africans; between the ‘civilised’ and ‘uncivilised’ slaves of imperialism. With this, the national question was transformed from being an internal state problem into a general international problem — a problem of the liberation of oppressed peoples in the colonial and dependent countries from the yoke of imperialism through self-determination and complete secession.

With this slogan of self-determination, Leninism educated the masses in the spirit of internationalism. It brought the national question from the realm of high-sounding declarations to the solid ground of the utilisation of the revolutionary potentialities of the national movements for advancing the movement of the proletariat for the overthrow of imperialism.

It thus transformed the revolutionary national-liberation movements into a reserve of the revolutionary proletariat.

The revolutionary character of the national movements does not presuppose the existence of proletarian elements in the movement or a republican programme.

Thus, according to Leninism, the world is divided into two camps: (1) the camp of a handful of imperialist exploiting and oppressing nations, which possess finance capital and exploit the majority of the population of the globe; (2) the camp of the oppressed and exploited hundreds of millions around the world.

The interests of the proletarian movement in the developed countries and the national-liberation movement call for a union of these two forms of revolutionary movement in a common front against imperialism — against the common enemy.

Without such a front, the victory of either is impossible. “No nation can be free if it oppresses other nations.” (Speech by Friedrich Engels, November 1847)

The union between the revolutionary proletarian movement and the national-liberation movements can only be voluntary — on the basis of mutual confidence and fraternal relations amongst the people.

“If a [Marxist] belonging to a great, oppressing, annexing nation, while advocating the amalgamation of nations in general, were to forget even for one moment that ‘his’ Nicholas II, ‘his’ Wilhelm, George, Poincaré, etc, also stands for amalgamation with small nations (by means of annexations) ... such a Marxist would be a ridiculous doctrinaire in theory and an abettor of

imperialism in practice.

“The weight of emphasis in the internationalist education of the workers in the oppressing countries must necessarily consist in their advocating and upholding freedom of secession for oppressed countries. Without this there can be no internationalism.

“It is our right and duty to treat every Marxist of an oppressing nation who fails to conduct such propaganda as an imperialist scoundrel.” (The discussion on self-determination summed up, July 1916)

The wars of national liberation against imperialist domination are just wars, and it is the duty of every proletarian revolutionary in the imperialist countries to support such wars and to work for the defeat of his own ruling class. Any other stance would be a total betrayal of the principles and ideals of socialism, for:

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

### **Strategy and tactics**

The period of domination of the Second International was characterised by parliamentary forms of struggle, whose importance it overestimated. Only in the period of revolution could an integral strategy and elaborated tactics for the struggle of the proletariat be worked out.

It was in this period that Lenin brought out into the light of day the brilliant ideas of Marx and Engels on strategy and tactics, which had been suppressed by the opportunists of the Second International. He developed them further and supplemented them with new provisions, working them all into a system of rules and guiding

principles for the leadership of the class struggle of the proletariat.

His works such as *What Is to be Done?*, *Two Tactics of Social Democracy in the Democratic Revolution*, *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*, *The State and Revolution*, *The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky* and *'Left-Wing' Communism: an Infantile Disorder* constitute priceless contributions to the general treasury of Marxism, to its general arsenal.

The strategy and tactics of Leninism constitute the science of leadership in the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat.

### **Stages of the revolution and strategy**

Strategy is the determination of the direction of the main blow of the proletariat at a given stage of the revolution; the elaboration of a corresponding plan for the disposition of the revolutionary forces. This is how Lenin's teachings on strategy and tactics worked during the various stages of the Russian revolution:

First stage: 1903 to February 1917

The objective at this stage was the overthrow of tsarism and the destruction of the survivals of medievalism. The main force of the revolution in this period was the proletariat and its immediate reserves, the peasantry.

In this stage, the direction of the blow was the isolation of the liberal-monarchist bourgeoisie, which was attempting to bring the peasantry under its wing and liquidate the revolution by a compromise with tsarism.

"The proletariat must carry to completion the democratic revolution, by allying to itself the mass of the peasantry in order to crush by force the resistance of the autocracy and paralyse the instability of the bourgeoisie." (*Two Tactics of Social Democracy in the Democratic Revolution*, 1905, chapter 12)

Second stage: March 1917 to October 1917

The objective during this stage was to overthrow

imperialism and withdraw from the imperialist war. During this period, the proletariat was the main force of the revolution and its immediate reserves were the poor peasantry.

The direction of the blow in this period was the isolation of the petty-bourgeois parties — the Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks — which were trying to win over the toiling masses of the peasantry and liquidate the revolution by a compromise with imperialism.

"The proletariat must accomplish the socialist revolution, by allying to itself the mass of the semi-proletarian elements of the population in order to crush by force the resistance of the bourgeoisie and to paralyse the instability of the peasantry and the petty-bourgeoisie." (Ibid)

Third stage: After the October Revolution

The objective of the revolution during this stage was to consolidate the dictatorship of the proletariat in one country, using it as a base for the defeat of imperialism in all countries. The main forces of the revolution in this period were the dictatorship of the proletariat in one country and the revolutionary movement of the proletariat in all countries. The main reserves of the revolution were the semi-proletarian and small peasant masses in the developed countries and liberation movements in colonial and dependent countries.

The direction of the main blow in this period was the isolation of petty-bourgeois democrats and isolation of the parties of the Second International, which formed the main support for compromise with imperialism. The plan for the disposition of forces in this period was the alliance of the proletarian revolution with the liberation movements of the oppressed peoples.

Tactics determine the line of conduct of the proletariat over a comparatively short period of the ebb or flow of the movement. They are a part of the strategy, subordinated to it and serving it.

Changes in the form of struggle are accompanied by corresponding changes in the form of organisation. The point is to put to the fore precisely

those forms of struggle and organisation which are best suited to the conditions during the ebb or flow of the movement, and thus facilitate and ensure the bringing of the millions to the revolutionary front, organising also their disposition at the revolutionary front.

The aim must be to locate at any given moment the particular link in the chain of processes which, if grasped, will enable the proletariat to keep hold of the whole of the chain and to prepare the conditions for achieving strategic success.

“It is not enough to be a revolutionary and an adherent of socialism or a communist in general. One must be able at each particular moment to find the particular link in the chain which one must grasp with all one’s might in order to keep hold of the whole chain and prepare firmly for the transition to the next link.” (The importance of gold now and after the complete victory of socialism, November 1921)

The revolutionary party of the proletariat must know not only how to advance, but also how to retreat in good order when the circumstances so require.

“The revolutionary parties,” said Lenin, “must complete their education. They have learnt to attack. Now they have to realise that this knowledge must be supplemented with the knowledge of how to retreat properly.

“They have to realise — and the revolutionary class is taught to realise it by its own bitter experience — that victory is impossible unless they have learnt both how to attack and how to retreat properly.” (‘Left-wing’ Communism, chapter 3)

The purpose of any retreat is to gain time, to disrupt the enemy, and to gather force in order later to assume the offensive. The signing of the Brest peace treaty in 1917 is a model of this strategy as it gained the Bolshevik party time to take advantage of the conflicts in the imperialist camp, to disrupt the enemy forces, to maintain the support of the peasantry, and to gather sufficient forces in

preparation for the offensive against the counter-revolutionary generals Kolchak and Denikin.

“In concluding a separate peace,” said Lenin at the time, “we free ourselves as much as is possible at the present moment from both warring imperialist groups, we take advantage of their mutual enmity and warfare, which hinder them from making a deal against us, and for a certain period have our hands free to advance and consolidate the socialist revolution.” (On the history of the question of the unfortunate peace, January 1918)

Three years after the Brest peace, Lenin returned to the subject, saying: “Now even the biggest fool [Trotsky being the chief of these fools] can see that the ‘Brest peace’ was a concession that strengthened us and broke up the forces of international imperialism.” (New times and old mistakes in a new guise, August 1921)

### **The workers’ party**

According to Leninism, the party of the proletariat is the advanced detachment of the working class, possessed of the best elements and an advanced theory.

It must be ahead of the masses and see further than the working class; it must lead the proletariat and not drag at the tail end of the spontaneous movement. Only such a party can divert the working class from the path of trade unionism.

No army at war can do without an experienced general staff if it does not want to be doomed to defeat. The revolutionary party of the proletariat constitutes precisely such a general staff. The working class without a revolutionary party is an army without a general staff.

“We,” said Lenin, “are the party of a class, and therefore almost the whole class ... should act under the leadership of our party, should adhere to our party as closely as possible.

“It would be Manilovism [smug complacency] and ‘khvostism’ [tailism] to think that any time under capitalism almost the whole class, or the whole class, would be able to rise to the level



of consciousness and activity of its advanced detachment ... No sensible Marxist has ever yet doubted that under capitalism even the trade union organisations (which are more primitive and more comprehensible to the undeveloped strata) are unable to embrace almost the whole, or the whole, working class.

“To forget the distinction between the advanced detachment and the whole of the masses which gravitate towards it, to forget the constant duty of the advanced detachment to raise ever-wider strata to this advanced level, means merely to deceive oneself, to shut one’s eyes to the immensity of our task, and narrow down these tasks.” (One Step Forward, Two Steps Back, 1904, Chapter I)

The party is the organised detachment of the working class. It must imbue the millions of unorganised non-party workers with the spirit of discipline in the struggle, with the spirit of organisation and endurance. But the party can fulfil these tasks only if it is itself the embodiment of discipline and organisation.

Lenin’s formulation of the first paragraph of the Bolshevik party rules embodies this concept. According to it, the party is the sum total of its organisations, and the party member is a member of one of the organisations of the party.

It denies self-enrolment so as to prevent the party from being inundated with professors and high-school students and thus degenerate into a loose, amorphous, disorganised body lost in a sea of ‘sympathisers’ that would obliterate the dividing line between the party and the class and thus thwart the party’s task of raising the unorganised masses to the level of the advanced detachment.

“From the point of view of Comrade Martov,” said Lenin, “the borderline of the party remains quite indefinite, for ‘every striker’ may ‘proclaim himself a party member’. What is the use of this vagueness? A wide extension of the ‘title’. Its harm is that it introduces a disorganising idea, the confusing of class and party.” (Ibid)

The Leninist party is a single system of these organisations, with higher and lower bodies, with subordination of the minority to the majority.

“Formerly,” said Lenin, “our party was not a formally organised whole, but only the sum of separate groups, and therefore no other relations except those of ideological influence were possible between these groups. Now we have become an organised Party, and this implies the establishment of authority, the transformation of the power of ideas into the power of authority, the subordination of lower Party bodies to the higher Party bodies.” (Ibid, Chapter O)

Fighting against wavering elements like Martov, who at the second congress of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party (RSDLP) opposed Lenin’s formulation of the party rules, he wrote:

“This aristocratic anarchism is particularly characteristic of the Russian nihilist. He thinks of the party organisation as a monstrous ‘factory’, he regards the subordination of the part to the whole and of the minority to the majority as ‘serfdom’ ... division of labour under the direction of a centre evokes from him a tragicomical outcry against people being transformed into ‘wheels and cogs’ ...

“Mention of the organisational rules of the party calls forth a contemptuous grimace and the disdainful remark that one could very well dispense with rules altogether.

“It is clear, I think, that the cries about this celebrated bureaucracy are just a screen for dissatisfaction with the personal composition of the central bodies, a figleaf ...

“You are a bureaucrat because you were appointed by the congress, not by my will, but against it; you are a formalist because you rely on the formal decisions of the congress, and not on my consent; you are acting in a grossly mechanical way because you plead the ‘mechanical’ majority at the party congress and pay no heed to my wish to be co-opted; you are an autocrat because you refuse to hand over the power to the old gang [the ‘gang’ referred to was composed of Axelrod, Martov,

Potresov and others, who would not submit to the decisions of the second congress and accused Lenin of being a ‘bureaucrat’].” (Ibid)

The Leninist party is the highest form of class organisation of the proletariat. It is the rallying centre of the finest elements of the working class, whose political leadership must extend to every other form of organisation of the proletariat.

That is why the opportunist theory of the ‘independence’ and ‘neutrality’ of non-party organisations, which breeds independent members of parliament and journalists isolated from the party, narrow-minded trade-union functionaries and cooperative officials who have become philistines, is wholly incompatible with the theory and practice of Leninism.

The party is the instrument of the dictatorship of the proletariat — an instrument in the hands of the proletariat for achieving and consolidating state power.

“The dictatorship of the proletariat,” said Lenin, “is a stubborn struggle — bloody and bloodless, violent and peaceful, military and economic, educational and administrative — against the forces and traditions of old society.

“The force of habit of millions and tens of millions is a most terrible force. Without an iron party tempered in the struggle, without a party enjoying the confidence of all that is honest in the given class, without a party capable of watching and influencing the mood of the masses, it is impossible to conduct such a struggle successfully.” (‘Left-wing’ Communism, chapter 5)

The party is the embodiment of the unity of will of the workers, unity incompatible with the existence of factions. Hence Lenin’s insistence on the “complete elimination of all factionalism” and the “immediate dissolution of all groups, without exception, that have been formed on the basis of various platforms”, on pain of “unconditional and immediate expulsion from the party”. (Resolution on party unity, 1921)

Elsewhere, he wrote: “In the present epoch of acute civil war, the Communist party will be able to perform its duty only if it is organised in the most centralised manner, if iron discipline bordering on military discipline prevails in it, and if the party centre is a powerful and authoritative organ, wielding wide powers and enjoying the universal confidence of the members of the party.” (The terms of admission into the Communist International, 1920)

And further: “Whoever weakens in the least the discipline of the party of the proletariat (especially during the time of its dictatorship) actually aids the bourgeoisie against the proletariat.” (‘Left-wing’ communism, chapter 5)

The party becomes strong by purging itself of opposition elements. A source of factionalism is its opportunist elements — the “stratum of bourgeoisified workers or the ‘labour aristocracy’ who are quite philistine in their mode of life, in the size of their earnings and in their entire outlook, is ... the principal social (not military) prop of the bourgeoisie.

“For they are the real agents of the bourgeoisie in the working-class movement, the labour lieutenants of the capitalist class, the real channels of reformism and chauvinism. (Preface to the French and German editions of Imperialism, 1920)

### **Style of work**

The Leninist style of work represents a specific and peculiar feature in the practice of Leninism, which creates a special type of Leninist worker.

Leninism is the school of theory and practice that trains a special type of worker and creates a special Leninist style of work. It combines Russian revolutionary sweep with American efficiency. Revolutionary sweep is the life-giving force that stimulates thought and propels things forward, opening up new perspectives. Without such revolutionary sweep, no progress is possible.

However, on its own revolutionary sweep stands every chance of degenerating into empty phrasemongering if it is not combined with

professionalism and efficiency. That is why Lenin emphasised: “Fewer pompous phrases, more plain, everyday work ... less political fireworks and more attention to the simplest but vital facts of communist construction.” (A great beginning, June 1919)

On the other hand, such workaday efficiency stands every chance of degenerating into narrow and unprincipled practicalism if it is not combined with a wide revolutionary sweep.

“The combination of Russian revolutionary sweep with American efficiency is the essence of Leninism in party and state work.” (JV Stalin, Foundations, chapter 9)

### **Lenin’s fight against opportunism**

Leninism was born, grew up and became strong in its relentless struggle against opportunism of every variety.

As early as 1903-4, when the Bolshevik group took shape in Russia, Lenin pursued the line aimed at a rupture, a split, with the opportunists both in Russia and in the Second International. Not surprisingly, then, the Bolsheviks were abused by their opportunist opponents as ‘splitters’ and ‘disrupters’.

The Bolsheviks pursued this line long before the imperialist war (from 1904-12). In 1903, the left-wingers in the German social-democratic party, Rosa Luxemburg and Alexander Parvus, came out against the Bolsheviks on the question of the party rules, accusing them of betraying ultra-centralist and Blanquist tendencies.

In 1905, on the question of the character of the Russian revolution, Luxemburg and Parvus invented the semi-Menshevik scheme of permanent revolution (a distorted version of the Marxian scheme of revolution), characterised by the Menshevik repudiation of an alliance between the working class and the peasantry, opposing the Bolshevik scheme of the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry.

Subsequently, this semi-Menshevik scheme was picked up by Leon Trotsky and turned into a

weapon of struggle against Leninism.

The Bolshevik support for the liberation movement of the oppressed and colonised nations on the basis of self-determination, and the creation of a united front between the proletarian revolution in the advanced countries and the revolutionary-liberation movement of the peoples of colonies and oppressed countries invited abuse from the opportunists of the Second International.

For this line of theirs, the Bolsheviks were baited like mad dogs. Even the German lefts opposed the Bolsheviks on this. Naturally, the Bolsheviks, led by Lenin, strongly criticised the German lefts for this approach of theirs; any other course of action would have been a betrayal of the working class, a betrayal of the interests of the revolution, a betrayal of communism.

The consistent and thoroughly revolutionary internationalism of the Bolsheviks is a model of proletarian internationalism for the workers of all countries.

The alliance between the proletariat of the advanced countries and the oppressed peoples of the enslaved countries is a question of emancipating the oppressed peoples, a question of emancipating the labouring masses of non-proletarian classes from the oppression and exploitation of finance capital.

Thus Bolshevism is not only a Russian phenomenon; it is “a model of tactics for all”. (Lenin)

### **The international significance of the October Revolution**

In this context, the following points are worthy of note:

1. The October Revolution, unlike all previous revolutions (except for the short-lived Paris Commune) did not merely replace one type of exploitation by another; it put an end to all exploitation.
2. It caused a breach in the front of imperialism and ushered in a new era of proletarian revolution in the countries of imperialism.
3. It ushered in the era of Soviet democracy and

put an end to bourgeois parliamentarism; it showed the world that the proletariat can not only destroy the old but also build a new society, thus setting a contagious example.

4. It shook the rear of imperialism by breaking the chains of national and colonial oppression under the flag of internationalism, thus unleashing an era of colonial revolution.

5. Before the October Revolution, the world was supposed to be divided between inferior and superior races, between blacks and whites, according to which only the superior white races were the bearers of civilisation and were the natural rulers of the world. The October Revolution shattered this legend forever.

6. The October Revolution jeopardised the very existence of world imperialism and created a powerful base for the world revolutionary movement. The result of the October Revolution has been that capitalism can never recover the 'equilibrium' and 'stability' that it possessed before the revolution. The October Revolution created a beacon which has illuminated the path of the labouring masses ever since.

7. The October Revolution was a revolution in minds as well, a revolution in the ideology of the working class; it represented the victory of Marxism over reformism, of Leninism over social-democratism. From then on the only vehicle and bulwark of Marxism has been Leninism.

The above, then, were the achievements of Leninism and of the October Revolution. These were badly damaged by the triumph of Khrushchevite revisionism at the 20th party congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU), which eventually led to the collapse of the once great and glorious Soviet Union, and brought in its train, albeit temporarily, the destruction of the base of the world revolution, casting over the social and political life of the proletariat and the oppressed peoples the gloom of unbridled reaction.

In marking the 150th anniversary of the great VI

Lenin's birth, that giant of revolutionary thought and action, we must remember Lenin's injunction as to the inevitability and necessity of breaking with opportunism and conducting a ruthless struggle against it:

"Most dangerous are those who do not wish to understand that the fight against imperialism is a sham and a humbug unless it is inseparably bound up with the fight against opportunism." (Imperialism, chapter 10)

Finally, we greet hundreds upon hundreds of millions of proletarian and labouring masses all over the world on Lenin's birthday and join them in their celebrations of this great occasion, and we pledge ourselves to revive the theory and practice of Leninism and devote ourselves to the cause of overthrowing imperialism and ending all exploitation through proletarian revolution.

Our day will come, and there shall be celebrations in our street.

## Notes

1) 22 April this year marked the 150th anniversary of the birth of Vladimir Ilyich Lenin, the inspirer of the great proletarian socialist revolution in Russia, the leader of the Russian and world proletariat. We publish this article in tribute to his earth-shaking contribution to the cause of world proletarian revolution and the struggle for the overthrow of world imperialism.

# The Communist Party of Belgium is 100 years young

Jozef Bossuyt | Communist Party of Belgium

In June 2023 the Communist Party of Belgium held its 37th congress. The party decided to accept a new Political Statement (Program), new Statutes (Charter), and elected a new central committee and a new Political Responsible of the Party.

The party took a standpoint about the actual war in Ukraine: it follows no longer the theory of “an inter-imperialist” war and now appeals to join the worldwide anti-Nato, anti-US imperialist alliance.

The party strives to participate in the international communist movement.

The Communist Party of Belgium, founded in 1922, has a glorious past. It was a member of the Third International. In 1936, it led workers’ strikes for the right to paid holidays. In 1936 in Spain broke out the civil war of the Popular Front government (communists, socialists and republicans) against the putschist general Franco, militarily supported by Nazi Germany and fascist Italy. Many Belgian communists joined the International Brigades in Spain and even led brigades there. From these experiences, in 1940 during the Nazi occupation of Belgium, they took the opportunity to organize the first acts of resistance. During World War II, the party led the armed resistance in Belgium against the Nazi occupation, giving the party enormous authority after the war. During the nazi-occupation of Belgium, in May 1941, the leader of the communist party Julien Lahaut, led the strike of 100,000 workers against the occupation, blocking the production of arms for the Nazi army. After the war, the party led the strikes against the return of the king Leopold III, who had dined with Hitler, capitulated, and then fled to Austria. When his son, king Boudewijn, took the oath as the new king, in 17 July 1950, in the Belgian parliament, communists shouted: “Long live the republic!” For this reason, a few days later the leader of the communists Lahaut was shot at the front door of his house by anti-communists. No-one was ever convicted for the murder.

Already during the war, the Communist Party had

a political line to defeat fascism-Nazism, but not a political line (as in Greece) to conquer power in Belgium after driving out the Nazis. Directly after the war, the armed resistance numbered 40,000 men, and the Belgian gendarmes of the government, returned from London, numbered only 7,000 men. But the leadership of the Communist Party did not oppose the order to disarm the partisans. Resistance fighters opposed, refused to disarm and demonstrated in the streets of Brussels

After the liberation in 1945, the party accepted US-British control over Belgium. In 1944, 1945, 1946 and until March 1947, the Communist Party of Belgium participated in the Belgian government, together with the Belgian Socialist and Liberal Parties. In 1954, the Vilvoorde Congress rejected the concept of the “dictatorship of the proletariat”. The party fell in the utopia of bourgeois democracy and parliamentarism, hoping for an alliance with the social-democracy. This was part of the world revisionist current in the international communist movement, which was represented by Nikita Khrushchev at the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in 1956. This current has abandoned the principles of revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat. In socialist countries, it said that the state was “the state of all the people” and the party “the party of all the people”. In the USSR, market economy reforms were carried out at the expense of socialist planning. In capitalist countries, the peaceful parliamentary way to take power has been promoted.

At the end of February 1961, after the end of the general strike of the winter of 1960-1961 against the Eenheidswet (Law of Unity) of the reactionary government, the leader of the socialist trade union FGTB André Renard, founded the “Walloon Popular Movement”. The aim was to replace the struggle against capitalism and for revolution with “anti-capitalist structural reforms” and “federalism”, understood as the struggle of Wallonia against Flanders. “Direct the struggle towards a Walloon

solution.” The leadership of the Communist Party then admitted the division of the party between a Walloon wing and a Flemish wing. The Communist Party distanced itself from the Soviet Union, and resumed anti-USSR propaganda during the events in Prague (1968) and Afghanistan (1979). Robert Dussart: “I don’t want anything to do with a party that has blood on its hands.”

In March 1989, the PCB-CPB chose to split into two separate parties, the Kommunistische Partij (KP) in the north of the country and the Communist Party Wallonia-Brussels (PC), a federalization that had begun in the years 60-61. In the 1980s and 1990s, at the time of the counter-revolution in the Soviet Union, there was no longer ideological clarity or unity within the PCB-CPB and then, after the linguistic split, within the PCWB and the KP, which ceased to exist in 2009. In the 1980s, some sections supported Solidarnosc in Poland. Some members, including in the leadership, followed Gorbachev or questioned the very usefulness of the party by wanting to change its name or turn it into a left-wing think tank. This led to a disconnection of struggles, ideological confusion in documents on democratization during the counterrevolution. Politically, the Communist Party Wallonia-Brussels participated in electoral fronts without clarity, sometimes with the Social Democrats, sometimes with the Trotskyists, sometimes with the Greens or more difficult with the PTB. The counter-revolution also created disillusionment in the working class and without clarity in the party, few joined us, creating a generational gap with the older generation increasingly disconnected from the struggles. The party was dying little by little. It is a long process that, starting in the 2000s, led to the transformation of the Communist Party into a regional section of the Party of the European Left.

The Communist Party of Belgium has a 100 years history, with splendid pages, but also with 64 years of revisionism, of which we have to make up the balance.

This revisionist line was stopped at the 36th Congress of the Communist Party of Belgium in 2018-2019. The Communist Party of Belgium reaffirmed the original vision of the party of the 1st Congress

of 1921, which aligned itself with the Leninist party principles of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks). The party held the 37th Congress to elaborate the intentions of the 36th Congress politically, ideologically and organizationally.

The Political Document states: “The Communist Party of Belgium remains faithful to the teachings of Marx, Engels and Lenin.

A first fundamental specificity is the revolutionary character of our thought and our political action. The goal of communists is the overthrow of capitalism and the construction of socialism towards communism. We therefore do not share the social-democratic conceptions which claim to organize capitalist society and erase its most harmful effects. It is clear that we support workers in their fight for their demands.

But it is above all a question for communists to make the proletariat aware that it will take more than a reformist policy to change society and that only a political and social movement of great importance, organized in our country but also on an international scale, can launch a revolutionary process of profound transformations towards a socialist society.

Today, the first responsibility of all peoples throughout the world and the international working class is to build a global alliance, to resist the US-led imperialist war and to eliminate US imperialism and NATO. This: in every country, on every continent and all over the world.

We invite all social movements, parties and countries to join us in our efforts to unite the peoples of the world. Together, we have the power to stand up to the US-led imperialist bloc and overthrow the colonial system that brings instability, poverty and human rights violations to the masses through political repression, economic plunder and military coercion. The participants in this alliance must develop broad front organizations in their own countries and concrete and practical mass actions against the United States — imperialism and NATO. As a communist party, we must therefore actively intervene in peace movements, in Belgium and internationally, and contribute to their revival and radicalization by building the anti-imperialist front.”

# Fascism - Attribute and Way of Existence of Imperialism

Klara Azhybekova | Communist Party of Kyrgyzstan

11 August 2023

The problems of imperialism, its systemic colonial policy at any time, the steady fascistization of all spheres of its activities, causes both interest and protest of researchers, political and social organizations, working masses all over the world! The aggravation of antagonistic contradictions of capitalism in its highest stage of development of imperialism at the present stage has been actualized! A legitimate question arises, why have the most developed states of the imperialist West become extremely reactionary and extremely morally decayed and how can this lawlessness be stopped!? FASCISTIZATION is a natural, logical, internally conditioned way of existence of imperialism, which extremely worsens the life of all mankind, especially its developing part!

The classics of Marxism have long ago discovered the patterns of society's development from one type of formation to another. Like a human organism, so any formation arises, develops, reaches maturity, then old age and passes away! In its place, a new, more perfect formation arises, which meets the needs of a particular level of humanity's development! So with the emergence of society, it lived through the primitive communal, slave-holding, feudal, capitalist and the beginning of the socialist stage of formation! In their evolution and transition to a new quality, all the laws of materialistic dialectics apply everywhere! The primitive communal and socialist stage are characterized by public ownership of the means of production! And the others are characterized by private ownership of the means of production! All these forms of property themselves evolve and develop within the formation, modifying in a special way affect the entire system of productive forces and production relations! We will dwell on capitalist relations and the Causes of their

FASCISTIZATION! Marxism proved that surplus value as "appropriation of unpaid labor is the main form of the capitalist mode of production and its exploitation of workers carried out by it .... from which the ever-increasing mass of capital accumulates in the hands of the propertied classes." (F. Engels. The Development of Socialism from Utopia to Science. - K. Marx and F. Engels. Soch, vol. 19, pp. 208-209)! As capitalist relations develop, this surplus value grows and grows, the bourgeoisie grows richer and richer! The exploitation of the working class is also increasing. Social class contradictions are increasing.

One of the manifestations of imperialism and a factor in its fascistization is its MONOPO-LIZATION. The unions of capitalists are increasing in the form of cartels, syndicates, trusts! The XX-XXI centuries are huge transnational corporations, where the productive forces and the number of the working class are concentrated on a large scale. In the sphere of production relations, as before, all property belongs to capitalists, exploitation is increasing and makes the life of the working masses simply unbearable! If at the initial stage of development of capitalism there was still a possibility of development of medium and small business, then in conditions of monopolization almost all spheres are in the hands of a bunch of super-rich owners! After the collapse of the Soviet Union, the new bourgeois authorities, destroying socialist property, giving it away left and right for nothing, were ranting every day about the creation of medium and small businesses. Why? First, to liquidate socialist plants and factories and give them any owner who would bring them to destruction or liquidation! Secondly, the West and the new bourgeois power was afraid of the concentration of a large QUANTITY of the

WORKING CLASS, which could return power to the workers again! But in this short historical period of 31 years, we have all witnessed how the process of monopolization of the most diverse spheres of production has begun again! The truth is that they are still afraid of the restoration of the large STATE industrial enterprises, no matter what happens! They are silent! They are afraid of the return of the socialist type of production, afraid to run a planned economy! As if they had water in their mouths! Scary!

V.I. Lenin in his work “Imperialism as the highest stage of capitalism” (V.I. Lenin. PSS, vol. 27, p.420-423) reveals the essence and manifestations of imperialism. He shows that for imperialism

\* (Imperialism) is characterized by the seizure of the most important sources of raw materials! If we turn to the current developed imperialist states like the USA and European states, then all tragic events in Iraq, Libya, Syria, previously African states were caused by violent seizure of natural resources necessary for them, such as oil, gas, black earth from Ukraine, various metals and other resources necessary for production.

Moreover, these states did not touch the USA, Britain, France or Germany! But they could! Under various far-fetched pretexts, they simply bombed and took everything they needed from there! This undoubtedly causes a natural protest of both the elite and the working masses. Having ruined the Soviet Union, they looted them as much as they could! They are sharpening their teeth on Russia! They have taken everything they could! There is still a lot of wealth there, but they want to seize the whole territory of Russia! They want it so badly! All the former republics of the Soviet Union are after Russia! All the fascism of Western imperialism had to experience by the Soviet people on their own skin! Through the IMF gave proposals to stop enterprises, did not give wages for months and even years, destroyed economic ties between the republics! Pay attention! At the same time, when people were losing their jobs, the republican parliaments passed laws on paid education,

paid medicine, prices for everything were rising at a galloping pace by tens and hundreds of times! Wasn't it FASCISM? Moreover, pediatric faculties in medical schools, children's clinics, kindergartens and nurseries were closed! Wasn't it quite conscious, systematic genocide of the Soviet people and their children? In Kyrgyzstan in the 90s “reforms” went on like that! Western advisers sat next to the Presidents! The Soros Foundation was only realizing the Harvard-Houston project of the West!

\* The classics of Marxism pointed out that the attribute of imperialism is the MONOPOLY OF BANKS! Banking capital, merging with industrial capital, exports capital abroad in enormous amounts! The private and state banks that emerged after the collapse of the Soviet Union gave loans at 40% per annum! How is it possible to develop a normal business for such interest rates and short terms? Think about it, all the money in the world is owned and managed by the Fed/FRS — FINANCIAL RESERVE SYSTEM! All banks report to it. Not only to issue their own national currency you have to pay it with dollars! Amazing lawlessness and lawlessness! Do the peoples of the world know that all the assets of the Fed are assets starting from the Kyrgyz Khaganate, then the Golden Horde, the Russian Empire and the Soviet Union! At one time, Russian Tsar Alexander II, it turns out, gave numerous tons of gold for this Fed for quite other purposes! But the Rothschilds, Rockefellers, Baruchs appropriated them, made such business! But they are obliged to return all the assets of the Fed to the Soviet Union! We hope that we will return the Soviet Union and legally return our assets! We will use them to build a SOCIALIST CIVILIZATION ON OUR PLANET! Before the rich Western imperialist states, realizing their fascist dictatorship, develop the territories of more underdeveloped states, give loans through the IMF and enslave them! Transnational corporations, after having divided the world, have begun to redistribute it!

\* Now we see the following fascist ideology



and policy of the imperialist states is the COLONIZATION of less developed or small states! They dictate their political and economic will to them! These peoples are under double oppression: on the one hand they are exploited by their national bourgeoisie and on the other hand by the transnational bourgeoisie! The working masses are subjected to ruin, misery, and the horrors of exploitation! The struggle of monopoly capital among themselves leads to wars!

V.I. Lenin wrote that: “Only the proletarian, socialist revolution can lead mankind out of the deadlock created by imperialism and imperialist wars. Whatever the difficulties of the revolution and its possible temporary failures or waves of counter-revolution, the final victory of the proletariat is inevitable.” (V.I. Lenin. Materials on the Revision of the Party Program. PSS, vol. 32, pp. 150-151)

If we turn to history, the First Imperialist War of 1914-1916 led in 1917 to the Great October Socialist Revolution, the emergence of socialism and the Soviet Union under the leadership of Lenin and Stalin!

The Second World War and the Great Patriotic War of 1941-1945, directed against the Soviet Union, to enslave it, ended with the victory of the Soviet Red Army over Hitler’s fascism, the creation of the world socialist system, the emergence of the Warsaw Pact, PRC, DPRK, Vietnam, Cuba, etc. This period was marked by the struggle against colonialism and the liberation, with the support of the Soviet Union from the colonial yoke of African and eastern states! After the destruction of the Soviet Union, a new neo-colonization of developing states and the entire territory, all the republics of the Soviet Union began again! A NEW DICTATORY OF FASCISM OF WESTERN IMPERIALISM began! It turned out to be even more brutal than even the previous ones! The fantastic concentration of all the wealth of the world in the private hands of the gangster financial capital of the Rothschilds and Rockefellers, the deep state, all sorts of clubs of the criminalized rich of the world led to insoluble class contradictions between the super-

rich bourgeoisie and the proletariat, the working masses! The division of society into rich and poor has reached tragic proportions! Concentration of private property in a narrow circle of people has led them to extremely PATHOLOGICAL FASCIST FORMS OF PRIVATE PROPERTY PSYCHOLOGY! Their demoralization by consumer psychology has led to a state of self-liquidation of society, an ecological catastrophe! Pedophilia, homosexuality, gambling addiction, drug business and drug addiction, thirst for new seizures of other people’s wealth, sanctions of everyone and everything, desire to take away everything by force from others PHOBIA to this or that ethnos, today it is Russians, attempts to segregate them, genocide of peoples as in Iraq, Libya, Syria and others, consciously initiate inter-religious conflict, prepare Islamic militants and terrorists from believers, in particular from Muslims. The fascistization of imperialism is evident! Black graft as during the war in Syria, now in Ukraine amaze with their inhumanity! The collective BANDERA FASCISM of the West is waging war through Ukraine for the capture of the territory of Russia! We can conclude that FASCISM is the essence, the ATTRIBUTE of IMPERIALISM! FASCISM IS A MECHANISM, A WAY OF EXISTENCE OF IMPERIALISM! As long as there is capitalism in the world, imperialism FASCISM will always exist with them! A THIRD WORLD WAR is underway! To get out of this crisis there is only one way — the way of transition to the rails of SOCIALISM, but the entire CIVILIZATION! HOW? THROUGH THE SOVIET UNION AND SOCIALISM IN IT, THEN IN ALL COUNTRIES OF THE WORLD CONSCIOUSLY BY ALL MANKIND!

The genius of mankind V.I. Lenin wrote that: “the expropriation of the capitalists will inevitably give a gigantic development of the productive forces of society. Capitalism is incredibly delaying its development.” (V.I. Lenin. State and Revolution. PSS, vol. 33, p.96-97)

This Marxist concept has already been proved by the practice of life of the socialist state of the Soviet Union, which, having started its life in many

republics from the wooden plough, reached the highest level of development of industry, social infrastructures, spiritual, scientific, educational level! The USSR was almost catching up with the USA on many parameters! The first, the most educated people in the world went into space, free preventive medicine reached almost the entire population! We defeated all infectious diseases, knew how to treat and prevent them all! Today communist China will also overtake the richest imperialist country! Cuba has one of the best medicines in the world! All other socialist countries are moving forward too, despite all sorts of SANCTIONS! Why do they want to do that? To strangle the socialist countries?

Today fascist imperialism has led mankind to an ecological catastrophe through the predatory use of natural resources! Scientists say that the MAGMA of the EARTH is bursting out! ALL THIS CAN still be stopped! But only by united efforts! This is only possible with socialism on the whole planet! For these states are not sick of private-proprietary pathological psychology, thirst for profit and accumulation, greed, corrupted whims! Indeed being determines consciousness! Public property forms collectivist psychology, altruism, philanthropy, humanism! And private property psychology forms super-individualism, egoism, dependency, parasitism, greed, predatory approach to everything! What kinds of weapons are created by mankind in the competition of systems, states, continents!? Nuclear, bacteriological, chemical, tectonic, electronic and many others! When there is socialism on the whole planet, such necessity will disappear by itself! Therefore, SOCIALISM IS NECESSARY FOR HUMANITY'S EXIT FROM THE IMPERIALIST CRISIS!

Scientists from ISRAEL propose their model of a new society, a SOCIALIST FORMATION ON THE WHOLE PLANET! They call it a CREATIVE SOCIETY to replace the consumer society! What are its main points?

\* Public ownership will include all natural wealth,

private ownership will include house, car, business, but capitalization volumes cannot be higher than 10 million dollars.

- Each citizen will have 10,000 dollars as a baseline
- Planned economy, smart logistics
- Scientific breakthrough, elimination of climate collapses, science funding will be a priority.
- Money, banks will not exist, they will only exist electronically!
- Work only 4 days and 4 hours.
- Free medicine, education, gas, water, electricity
- The highest value will be the human being
- The capsule of life will ensure people's health!

For the beginning of realization they assume it is necessary 5-6 months, for full realization — 5-6 years!

Resources will be enough not for 8 million, but for 800 million people! I think, it is worth to read more, to calculate it yourself! This concept is realized within the framework of the whole civilization and only then it is effective! Indeed, the unity of the world is especially manifested in the era of modern information technologies, the Internet, high-speed transportation links! The higher, the faster society develops, conditioned by a new higher level of consciousness and opportunities for transformation! Then to all on the good way of PLANETARY SOCIALISM AND CONSCIOUS SOCIETY!

# I'm back from Xinjiang

Aymeric Monville | Pole of Communist Revival in France

I AM BACK FROM Xinjiang, where I spent several days in the company of the writer Maxime Vivas, some of whose books I have had the honour of publishing. We visited Kashgar, a town close to the Afghan border with a 92% Uighur population, then Urumqi, the capital with a population of over 2 million, and finally the new town of Shihezi, developed in the 1950s by the bingtuan (兵团), peasant-soldiers sent by Mao Zedong to develop pioneer areas so as not to have to compete with the local population for water in this semi-desert region. Not forgetting a diversion to sublime Lake Tianchi, to the east of the Celestial Mountains.

Xinjiang has around 25 million inhabitants in an area three times the size of France, but only 9.7% of the territory is inhabitable, so I think that this visit to the major urban centres and the main roads used to reach them gives me a sufficiently representative overview to be able to talk about this region with more authority than many French journalists who have never been there, certainly not recently, and particularly since the slander campaign orchestrated by Mike Pompeo and the CIA since 2019.

It was my first visit, and the third for Maxime Vivas.

Having long understood that the campaign on the alleged “genocide of the Uyghurs”, the “genocide in progress” (according to the French daily *Libération*) or the “cultural genocide”, the forced sterilisation of women and so on, which has even been voted on by the French National Assembly, is nothing more than a copy and paste of the same campaign that took place ten or fifteen years earlier on Tibet, I was obviously expecting to meet many Uyghurs living in perfectly decent conditions. Nevertheless, I was pleasantly struck by the relative prosperity of this remote region of China. Arriving in the bazaar of Kashgar in the middle of the night, a few hours late, was for me a profusion of light, joy, song and

happy people in the streets. In particular, the sight of young women on scooters, their hair blowing in the wind, gave me an impression of great freedom and made me think of what their fate would be on the other side of the Afghan border, where they would lose all their rights. We asked people in the street to pose for photos with us. Everyone, including the women, happily lent themselves to the game.

If it had been a “Potemkin village” type operation (I make this assumption to counter any objections in advance), it would have been an absolute record for a Hollywood production involving literally thousands of people, as I was able to criss-cross the length and breadth of the entire Kashgar bazaar, and later, in the same way, the entire Urumqi bazaar. The city centre of Kashgar has been completely renovated, taking care to preserve its authenticity. The city centre has clearly become a fashionable tourist destination for the rest of the Chinese population, even if there are still few Europeans to be seen there, no doubt because of what Western propaganda tells us. As a general rule, all the roads I crossed, from town to town, were dotted with buildings under construction, factories and tree plantations, attesting to intense economic activity.

While I freely admit that I probably wouldn't have been able to visit so many places without the logistical help of the Chinese authorities, who provided us with a bus and an interpreter, I'd like to say that I was completely free to go where I wanted, to branch off to the right and to the left, and that my knowledge of Mandarin, although very basic — I humbly admit it — makes me sufficiently autonomous to manage on my own, sometimes beating the insomnia caused by jet lag. Maxime Vivas also confirmed that, with jihadist terrorist attacks having been eradicated since December 2016, the security situation is much calmer than before. I was therefore not subject to any

surveillance or banned from going to any particular place.

For instance, as I've got into the habit, wherever I go, of systematically learning the polite formulas so as not to impose English directly like far too many North Americans, I used to start many formal conversations in Uyghur. This elicited amused reactions and indulgent smiles from my interlocutors, but obviously didn't cause any panic that would have resulted from uttering a forbidden, forgotten, persecuted idiom, even in the presence of Han Chinese. In the countryside, a visit to a Uyghur family enabled me to realise that, while the parents needed to have questions asked in Mandarin translated, the children had a good understanding of the language and were therefore at school. The little girl in the family had clearly developed a passion for football and posted photos of her sporting exploits on the walls of part of the house. This reminded me of the liberation of Chinese women by communism, the end of patriarchal oppression and the abolition of footbinding for women, women whom Mao Zedong called "the other half of the sky". So now, in the remotest corners of China, these liberated female feet even play football!

A Chinese television crew took images all along our route, showing the profusion of areas we visited and the people we met. It will shortly be broadcast in China and France on the CGTN channel. So much for the perfectly preposterous accusation of genocide. Maxime Vivas pointed out to me that French Daily Le Monde is already backtracking and in July 2023 will headline "Xinjiang, a Uighur region that must become Chinese like the others". Of course, this is a silly headline, since the region is only half-populated by Uyghurs and includes many other ethnic groups, all of whom are "Chinese", citizens of the People's Republic of China. But in the final analysis, we are now talking about normalisation, certainly not the eradication of a people or a culture.

As for the so-called "cultural" genocide, I visited, among other things, the great theatre of Urumqi,

which organises choreographic performances of the "twelve muqâms", world heritage preserved by UNESCO, and which are performed all over the world. We were lucky enough to attend the performance of three of these muqâms, which Communist China has consistently promoted throughout the ages. I was able to learn about the pioneering role played by the CCP in the recording, as early as the 1950s, of the greatest virtuosos of this learned art, in particular Turdi Akhun, capable of playing all twelve muqâms from memory, a musical marathon lasting over twenty hours and comprising 252 melodies, whose statue stands proudly next to the theatre. AT Urumqi airport, for example, I was able to take a photo of an Uyghur playing the dotâr and singing in his own language, in the midst of many Hans (the majority nationality in China) returning to Beijing.

I visited the mosque in Kashgar, the largest in China, in the company of the imam, who spoke in Uyghur. In Urumqi, it was the madrasah (Koranic university) where the imam-rector spoke in Mandarin, but also taught in Uyghur and Arabic. It was in Arabic, of course, that we heard him chant the Koran. The library stalls are in three languages, with Uyghur standing out from Arabic at first glance through its use of diacritical marks to note vowels unknown to the language of the Koran (like what Germans write ü, ö, for example). It should also be noted that although Uyghur was first written in Cyrillic, like the other languages of the region, and then, after the Sino-Soviet break-up, in Latin (as for Pinyin, the phonetic transcription of Mandarin), it was during the time of Deng Xiaoping that the Arabic alphabet was introduced to better respect the particularity of Uyghur culture. We saw a canteen full of seminarians taking their exams to become imams. The imams are paid a salary by the central government. I would remind you that in France, my country, Muslims are also rightly asked to comply with our republican laws.

In Xinjiang, all the official signs, all the road signs, are bilingual Uyghur/Mandarin throughout the territory. In Kashgar, this bilingualism even applies

to the smallest stall. I think that a quick look at the online photo site Google Earth will quickly give you proof of this, in any urban location.

I visited perfectly automated cotton fields and spinning mills. In response to the accusation made by US competitors that the textile industry in Xinjiang uses “slave labour”, I was able to see that the need to save as much water as possible in this largely desert region, not to deplete the water tables but to transport water from the mountains, means that watering is systematically replaced by pipes in the ground that operate automatically to prevent any loss. I was also able to make the logical observation — but sometimes I have doubts as to whether logic can still be invoked, even in the land of Descartes — that a country which today registers 40% of the world’s patents has no interest in employing a servile workforce, not to mention the supervisors to guard them, when what it is seeking is to develop a sufficient number of engineers for each generation. Finally, I visited a spinning mill where the few workers present were mainly occupied with checking the machines.

So what do the Uyghurs do? They seem to be integrating well into society, working in agriculture, commerce, tourism, running shops, some are imams as has been said, and others civil servants, sometimes members of the Communist Party (I saw a whole group of them on the plane back to Beijing) and constitutionally enjoying republican equality and even a system similar to that of positive discrimination as existed in the USSR and as exists, more imperfectly, in the United States. At the time of the one-child policy, the Uyghurs, like all the other 55 non-Han ethnic groups, were exempt from this obligation.

Maxime Vivas specifically wanted to visit one of the de-radicalisation centres that have been portrayed in the media as “concentration camps”. In fact, it was a school where young people who had not committed any crimes but had been influenced by jihadism were taught not only Mandarin so that they could integrate into Chinese society, but also the constitution and a trade. They can play sport,

winning table tennis competitions for example, and can go home at weekends. Recognising the basic characters 图书馆, I realise that this is the school library and ask to enter. I also asked to be shown books in Uyghur as well as Mandarin, which was done. I was also assured that the pupils’ Muslim faith is respected and I have no reason to doubt this.

Teaching these pupils the country’s constitution is presented in our media as “brainwashing”, “communist propaganda”. The Chinese Communist Party does indeed play a role as a constitutional pillar, but let’s not forget that it is the party that liberated the country from foreign invasion and lifted 700 million Chinese out of poverty. Some of my compatriots are free to harbour the anti-communist prejudices that are now too systematically inculcated in my country, but the fact remains that it is much better to be a Muslim in China than a Muslim in Afghanistan. I also note that Tajikistan, itself an almost entirely Muslim country, is also fighting against Islamist fanaticism and Wahhabism, which it rightly sees as foreign interference, since Islam in this region is more influenced by the very tolerant Hanafi legal school. It is also striking to see that the customs of the Uyghurs are marked by dance, which is practised in groups, with no particular separation between men and women. Women often also play instruments. Xinjiang is also China’s largest wine-growing region, and we were able to visit Changyu Manor, which produces a wine whose sunshine is reminiscent of that of the C tes-du-Rh ne. In fact, I tasted a surprising blend of syrah and cabernet-sauvignon that I thought was just right.

We can be sure that Uyghur culture in all its diversity, like that of the other ethnic groups living in the region, would have been perfectly at risk of eradication if the jihadists had taken power. The account of the violence and barbaric acts committed by the jihadists, presented in a museum in Urumqi, shows the nightmarish scenes experienced by the civilian population from 1990 to 2016, from Xinjiang to Tiananmen Square in

Beijing.

The Western media repeatedly show the same photograph of Uighur prisoners, convicted of jihadist terrorism, which the Chinese prison authorities deliberately circulated, no doubt to demonstrate their determination to combat and eradicate terrorism. It shows strict conditions of detention, but certainly not the shocking sensory deprivation of which the United States is guilty at Guantánamo or the torture at Abu Ghraib in Iraq. Moreover, it is not the Muslim countries that are condemning China over Xinjiang, it is the countries of the North Atlantic. The fight against jihadist terrorism should be the object of global solidarity and not another opportunity to stigmatise China in its desire to create shared prosperity and to activate the new Silk Roads in which the Uyghurs, who speak a Turkic language close to Uzbek first and foremost, but also Kyrgyz and Kazakh, have everything to gain.

Back in Beijing, we meet Zheng Ruolin, author of the book *Les Chinois sont des hommes comme les autres*, (The Chinese are men like any others) published by Denoël in 2012. It's true that in the West, the fact that the Chinese live on the same planet as us is a reality that we all too often tend to forget. Mr Zheng is a key player in French studies in China and has lived in our country for a long time. I ask him if he ever plans to return to Paris. He replied that he now prefers to make himself useful by explaining to his compatriots about the outside world, which he feels they still know too little about. I replied that there are worse things than not knowing, there are, as some French people do, not knowing and still giving lessons. Once again, I am brought back to the fundamental contradictions of my country, which counts among its citizens, for example, on the one hand, the soldiers who ransacked the Summer Palace in Beijing in 1860 and, on the other, Victor Hugo who protested loudly against this barbaric act.

I got back on the plane with enthusiasm, but wondering whether my compatriots would understand me enough, or whether, as a Chinese

saying (a *chengyu*, to be precise) goes, I wouldn't have the impression of "playing the lute in front of the buffalo" (对牛弹琴), in other words of speaking for the deaf. Worse still, if I'm not going to be accused of wanting to harm, by virtue of some 'hatred' I've suddenly developed, the Uyghur people whose existence I only learned about a few years ago. I dare to hope that Maxime Vivas and I, who nonetheless enjoy a favourable reputation among progressive and left-wing people in France, will be listened to. I also hope that we will finally come to understand that, after Tibet and Xinjiang, the next campaign launched by the CIA on one or other of the 56 ethnic groups that proudly make up China will no longer be able to reach our compatriots with such blatant lies.

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

## Chilean Communist Party (Proletarian Action)

### Part 3: Imperialism vs. imperialism?

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

### Part 3: Imperialism vs. imperialism?

#### A long work

The first part has shown how inadequately the CPG refutes the opinions of communists who do not share its views. We have seen that it does not attempt fraternal debate, but resorts to misrepresentation of ideas and disqualifications which take the place of arguments.

In the second part, we have shown the main defects of the idea of the "imperialist pyramid" and concluded that this idea can in no way be considered Leninist.

Now it is time to move on to more concrete questions. Unfortunately, there are many questions that concern us but little time and space to develop the answers: Are China, Russia and other countries like Iran or Venezuela imperialist? Are countries like Niger or Argentina imperialist? Can Cuba be considered imperialist? And so on and so forth. However, due to limited time, we will only be able to cover the most important points. Therefore, we will focus on Russia and China and contrast their non-imperialist character with the states that we consider clearly imperialist: the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Germany and Japan. It is possible to include Canada and Italy in the list

of imperialist states. But beyond these 7 countries, it seems to us hardly possible to extend the list of imperialist states according to our criteria, the basis of which we will develop in the following pages.

Furthermore, we will explain why the People's Republic of China is in our opinion socialist, although there is no socialism in it, at least not a mature and consolidated socialism. It could also be said that China is in the first phase of the construction of socialism, that it is, therefore, a primitive, immature and, as such, intrinsically contradictory socialism, with successes and failures, with advances and setbacks.

And we will set out the reasons why the postulates of the CPG and, in general, of so-called "Eurocommunism" are particularly harmful to the communist forces and the proletarian struggle in the world.

As the third part is more extensive than the previous two, it will not be possible to cover it in a single publication. We will have to divide it into several parts.

#### Brief and concise summary of the "imperialist pyramid" and the CPG study method

In part one and especially in part two of this article we have discovered the political purism of the CPG and its remarkable ability to jump from correct ideas (the rejection of opportunist, reformist and claudicative positions) to purist and chimerical ideas in a single paragraph and sometimes even in a single sentence. We have seen that its position divides communists into two absolutely and irretrievably separate groups: the "true communists" (at the top of which, according to the CPG itself, this party is situated) and the "opportunists" (a group made up of all those who

do not share its positions 100%).

We discover that the CPG applies an idealist (in the philosophical and not in the moral sense) logical and not a dialectical-materialist method of analysis. To better substantiate this assertion let us look at what the postulate of Logic says: “a thing is what it is, a thing is or is not, but it cannot be and not be at the same time”<sup>1)</sup>. And now let us look at what the postulate of Dialectics says: In the words of Frederick Engels Dialectics “understands things and their conceptual images essentially in their context, their concatenation, their movement, their formation and decay”<sup>2)</sup>. Georges Politzer adds that from “the dialectical point of view, everything changes, nothing stays where it is, nothing remains what it is”<sup>3)</sup>. Guerrero adds that for Dialectics: “A thing is never what it is. In order to be what it is, a thing has to let itself be what it is”<sup>4)</sup>.

The political purism, the enormous leaps from correct to chimerical ideas, and the use of the logical rather than dialectical method of enquiry are seen in the following quotation:

*“The confrontation within the ICM, as the KKE has highlighted many times, has many aspects. For example, it is taking place:*

Between the parties that support the co-opting of the CPs into “broader left progressive alliances” and those that struggle for the preservation of the ideological-political independence of the CPs and the strengthening of their ties with the working class and the popular strata.

Between the parties that remain entrapped into the old strategy of “stages towards socialism” and support the participation in bourgeois “left”, “anti-neoliberal”, “progressive”, and “centre-left” governments in the framework of capitalism, and those that have rejected the participation in bourgeois governments and the rationale of stages and struggle for the overthrow of capitalist barbarity.

Between the parties that identify imperialism exclusively with the USA or some powerful capitalist countries of Europe or foreign aggressive

policy, and the parties that are based on the Leninist conception that imperialism is monopoly capitalism, the highest and last stage of the exploitative system.

Between the parties that consider that the struggle for peace is inextricably linked to a “multipolar world” that would supposedly tame the USA, fostering illusions about a supposedly “peaceful international architecture”, which is promoted by social democracy and opportunists, and the parties that believe that the capitalist world cannot be “democratized”, that it cannot escape from wars no matter how many “poles” it has, and that it is necessary to strengthen the struggle for the overthrow of capitalism, for the new, socialist society.

Between the parties that consider China to be a country “building socialism with Chinese characteristics” and the parties that believe that socialism has principles that have been violated in China, where capitalist relations of production have now prevailed; that this is a country of the modern capitalist world, which in fact is competing with the United States and threatening its supremacy in the imperialist system.”<sup>5)</sup>

To give a few examples:

**Political idealism (purism):** “[...] and those that have rejected the participation in bourgeois governments and the rationale of stages and struggle for the overthrow of capitalist barbarity”. Remarkable aversion of the CPG to any bourgeois government. The CPG seems unable to distinguish between progressive bourgeois governments, on the one hand, and reactionary and counter-revolutionary (philo-fascist) governments, on the other. Reactionary bourgeois governments often disguise themselves as progressive and revolutionary. Instead of denouncing the “disguise”, the CPG, due to its inability to distinguish between form and substance, refuses to cooperate with any kind of bourgeois governments, even if they seek the nationalisation of enterprises of strategic interest, the reversal of privatisations and the deindustrialisation of the country, the strengthening of



the country's military power, the waging of a real war against the big organised crime capitalists, etc. If they are bourgeois governments, there can be no alliances of communists with them, says the CPG.

**Logical method of analysis:** "Between the parties that identify imperialism exclusively with the USA or some powerful capitalist countries of Europe or foreign aggressive policy, and the parties that are based on the Leninist conception that imperialism is monopoly capitalism, the highest and last stage of the exploitative system."

The CPG cannot conceive in the least that a synthesis between all this is possible, i.e. that it is possible to understand that the USA is the hegemonic country par excellence, that there are other countries which share with it the property of being imperialist, that from such a property emanates its aggressive foreign policy and furthermore that such an understanding means precisely supporting the "Leninist view that imperialism is monopoly capitalism, the highest and last stage of the system of exploitation". The CPG separates the waters and then is incapable of bringing them back together again, which Moses at least succeeded in doing.

**Big jumps:** "Between the parties that support the co-opting of the CPs into "broader left progressive alliances" and those that struggle for the preservation of the ideological-political independence of the CPs and the strengthening of their ties with the working class and the popular strata."

How correct is the CPG's position in rejecting opportunism, reformism and, more generally, those political and ideological positions which seek to alienate the working class and the other social sectors which share its destiny from the struggle for the new society. How correct is also his demand that the communist parties must preserve their "ideological-political" independence. How correct is also the postulate that the communist parties must strengthen their links with the working class and the popular strata. But all these correct ideas lead to an absolute chimerical purism in which the communist parties end up as sects prevented from forming "broader progressive left alliances", and thus the CPG leaves the working class and the popular strata alone in a alone struggle against big national and

imperialist capital, abandoning all possible good allies of the left to reaction.

We consider the term "imperialistic pyramid" used by the CPG to be rather imprecise, as it implies that a thing, in this case a pyramid, has a property, in this case that this pyramid is imperialistic (i.e. "the pyramid is imperialistic", just as saying "the affable ladder" means that "the ladder is affable"). It should be obvious to any reader with average reading comprehension that a pyramid built of stone and surrounded by sand can hardly be imperialistic in itself. Perhaps the pharaohs buried in them were. But the pyramid, incapable of transforming its environment, is nothing more than an inert thing devoid of intellectual or moral qualities that could enable it to be imperialist. We believe that with this term the CPG wants to point out that "the structure of imperialism is pyramidal". At least that is how we have interpreted it. If we are mistaken in our interpretation of the concept, we are grateful for the CPG's fraternal clarification.

We have seen that imprecision of terms is a constant in the texts of the CPG.

We have also seen that the CPG bases its arguments on disqualifications, but above all on a revision of Lenin's theory of imperialism. Now, it seems to us that the idea of the "imperialist pyramid" is not only a revision of Lenin's theory of imperialism, but (in our opinion) a dangerous attempt to replace it.

The CPG's "reasoning" is based on a moral and subjective assumption: "it is capitalist = it is bad". With this idea in mind, it "weaves" a "sack" into which it puts all "imperialist countries", which, given its purist assumption ("it is capitalist = it is bad"), includes practically all countries recognised by the United Nations (because very few, if any, countries today meet the criteria of being "purely socialist-communist"). This CPG argument can be translated into a new equation: "(almost) all countries of the world = imperialist countries = imperialism or international imperialist system".

Countries are neatly placed in the bag according to how much “power” they wield (the CPG does not explain why some countries wield more “power” than others, nor in what sense such countries are or are not “powerful”). Once the “sack” is filled to overflowing, the CPG finds that there are stubbornly a few countries at the top of the sack (those with a lot of “power”) and many at the bottom (those who, conversely, have little “power”). From the shape of the bag, which is narrower at the top and thicker at the bottom, the CPG extracts with “imaginative acuity” and “remarkable capacity for abstraction” the three-dimensional version of the triangle: a pyramid, and gives it the title ‘imperialism’ or ‘international imperialist system’. In short, all the countries of the world recognized by the United Nations (and probably also those not recognized) would be imperialist and together they would form the ‘international imperialist system’, which is also called ‘imperialism’.

This is the “model” of imperialism proposed by the CPG. We have seen that this idea is contrary to Lenin’s theory of imperialism, although the CPG insists with great vigour on claiming to be Leninist, as if by asserting something it makes the assertion that something.

In its essence, this idea seeks to equate all countries in which the capitalist mode of production prevails with imperialism and thus to abolish the dialectical antagonism between the countries of the world postulated by Lenin, an antagonism which exists independently of the character of the mode of production prevailing in these countries and also independently of the orientation of their foreign and domestic policies. The central basis of Lenin’s theory of imperialism is the realisation that there is a very small group of imperialist countries and a large majority of countries which are plundered and exploited by these countries. This constitution comes about because such imperialist countries have huge monopolies and powerful banking systems which enable them to export gigantic amounts of finance capital or banking-industrial monopoly capital.

The expansion of capital is followed by military expansion, which explains, for example, colour revolutions, the economic collapse of states (as in Greece, for example), coups d’état and wars.

In our opinion, it is essential not only to defend the Leninist postulate of a bunch of imperialist countries, but also to reject the attempt to revise and even replace Lenin’s profuse theory of imperialism with the (in our opinion infantile) idea of the “imperialist pyramid”, because the latter, as we have already seen, leads to dangerous and harmful conclusions from the point of view of the anti-imperialist struggle, the anti-fascist struggle and the struggle of the workers of the whole world for the conquest of political power and for their liberation from wage slavery.

One of the most dangerous findings of the CPG, derived from its concept of the “imperialist pyramid”, is the position it has taken on the conflict in Ukraine and how it classifies Russia and China as enemies of the international working class and the peoples of the world, even on the same level as the USA, the imperialist countries of the European Union, Japan and its belligerent spawn NATO.

These are the reasons that have led us to give a response to the CPG.

### **A big mess**

The CPG, in its familiar tone unbecoming of a political debate among communists, claims that the assessment of the World Anti-Imperialist Platform that there is no economic data to justify calling China or Russia imperialist “once again seeks to distort reality”<sup>6)</sup> and “refuses [it refers here to the World Anti-Imperialist Platform] to face reality”.<sup>7)</sup> And to demonstrate “conclusively” that our opinion is wrong, it launches a veritable “hodgepodge” of data supposedly proving that China and Russia are imperialist:

*“The WAP argues that “That there is no economic data to justify characterizing China or Russia as imperialist. These are countries that do not live by superexploiting or looting the world. They do not put other countries into military, technological or*

debt slavery” and that “Russia and China are not aggressive imperialist powers but, on the contrary, are targeted by our enemies because they stand in the way of the USA’s complete global domination”. With these statements, the WAP once again seeks to distort reality. It is as if China and Russia do not participate in the G20 summits, the meetings of the 20 most powerful capitalist states of the world, together with the USA, Germany, the UK, France, etc. It is as if the Chinese and Russian monopolies do not export capital to other countries, aiming for the profit that comes from exploiting the labour power not only of the workers of their own country, but also of many other countries in Europe, Asia, Africa, America, wherever their monopolies develop. It is as if the Russian “Wagner” private army is deployed in Africa for charitable reasons and not to defend the interests of the Russian monopolies operating there. It is as if China is no longer moving in a similar direction to safeguard the Belt and Road Initiative by military means. It is notable that this initiative includes the small but very important in geographical terms state of Djibouti — whose debt to China amounts to 43% of its Gross National Income — where China’s first military base outside its borders was inaugurated in 2017.”<sup>8)</sup>

Here we have just read two paragraphs with a real “hodgepodge” of data. The paragraph begins with an allusion to the G20, then lists some member countries, then alludes to the existence of exploitative Chinese and Russian monopolies, then stumbles over the Russian private army ‘Wagner’, then wanders along the “belt and road” to Djibouti and its 43% debt to China, and finally ends with a visit to the first Chinese foreign military base...

The CPG seems to think that a cascade of disconnected data proves something. In reality, however, what emerges is a gelatinous amalgam of unrelated data that is difficult to “grasp”. Perhaps that is even their intention. We do not know...

To respond to the above assertions, one has to dissect this gelatinous and convoluted paragraph and go step by step through the list of incoherent

facts presented as arguments.

### **China and Russia belong to the G20**

Let’s start with the first statement in the quote: China and Russia are members of the G20.

The attentive reader will surely ask: What does this prove — that these two countries are imperialist by virtue of their membership of the G20?

Let us look at the full list of G20 members (in alphabetical order): Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Canada, China, France, Germany, India, Indonesia, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Republic of Korea, Russia, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Turkey, United Kingdom, United States of America and, the only non-country member, the European Union. The G20 members (the 19 countries and the EU) account for approximately 85 per cent of the world’s gross domestic product, just over 75 per cent of international trade and about two-thirds of the world’s population, according to the G20 website<sup>9)</sup>.

Membership of the G20 alone would make a country imperialist, argues the CPG. It claims this without having made the slightest attempt to prove it. If this were the case, all member countries would be imperialist. Thus, Indonesia, South Africa, Argentina, Australia, Turkey and Brazil (to name but a few) would be as imperialist as the UK, France, the US or Germany (coincidentally, the only countries mentioned in the above quote from the CPG text). This would be a direct deduction from the CPG statement.

In our opinion, the imperialist countries are those listed in the quoted paragraph of the CPG (plus Japan and eventually Canada and Italy). The others are large countries (some with reactionary political systems and governments and others with progressive political systems), but they cannot be called imperialist. The characteristic of being a big country and the characteristic of being an imperialist country are not synonymous. We have pointed out in our statements that “this line [we refer to lines of reasoning such as those of the

CPG] is based on a wrong theoretical premise (that every large economy in the capitalist world must automatically be imperialist).<sup>10)</sup>

Even more curious is the fact that the CPG mentioned the G20 but not the G7. Let us look at the list of G7 countries (in alphabetical order): Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, the United Kingdom and the United States.<sup>11)</sup> Here we have a real list of the “world’s most powerful capitalist states” and it does not include China, nor, today, Russia.

In 1998, Russia joined the forum, which adopted the new name G8 or sometimes also called G7+1. Wikipedia, a notoriously unreliable source, seems to understand the facts better than the CPG. Its website (in its spanish version) claims that Russia joined the forum ‘because of its political weight and not its financial weight’.<sup>12)</sup> In 2014, imperialist states excluded Russia from the forum over the secession of Crimea and its incorporation into the Russian Federation.

It is striking that the CPG has decided not to mention the G7 as the international forum of the “most powerful capitalist states in the world”, but the G20. The reason seems to us to be that the G7 does not include Russia and China, which the CPG insists on considering among the “most reprehensible” countries in the world, but the G20 does. It should also be noted that of the G20 members, the CPG only mentions those countries that are generally considered imperialist and avoids mentioning those for which there is no such consensus. It is these argumentative quibbles that the idea of the “imperialist pyramid” makes possible. This construction allows the CPG to arbitrarily move an imaginary demarcation line up and down the “imperialist pyramid” and place it wherever it suits them. Apparently, the G7 sits “too” high up in its pyramid, leaving out Russia and China, so the CPG shifts its imaginary demarcation line down a little until it finds “something” that includes both countries. And then it calls this “something” the “most powerful capitalist states in the world”. It is fortunate for the CPG that the G20

is not a G80.....

The CPG always has the possibility of adjusting its imaginary line of demarcation in its “imperialist pyramid” at will. It can raise or lower it even to the base of the pyramid. This shows that his “theoretical” construction is not scientific, since it can be adjusted at will. Science, on the contrary, demands that the analytical system be adjusted according to the objective reality independently of the will.

### **State presence in Russian companies**

The same quote 56 lists a number of large Russian companies, followed by an etcetera and the claim that these companies “exploit millions of workers, not only in Russia”, but also in various parts of the world:

*“They refer to Russia, where giant monopolies (Gazprom, Rosneft, Lukoil, Rosatom, Sberbank, Norilsk Nickel, Rosvooruzhenie, Rostec, Rusal, etc.) exploit millions of workers, not only in Russia but also in the former Soviet Republics, the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS), Africa, South America, Europe, the Middle East, the Persian Gulf, etc.”<sup>13)</sup>*

The authors of the article do not consider it necessary to elaborate on the “data” they present. For example, the CPG list interchangeably mixes companies with and without state participation. However, this distinction is important in assessing Russia’s imperialist or non-imperialist character and cannot be ignored. A state that participates significantly in economic activity is not the same as a state whose main and almost exclusive function is to guarantee private ownership of the means of production.

And Russia is distinguished by a state with relatively high participation in production and distribution.

For example, the Russian state’s share in Gazprom is 50.23%<sup>14)</sup>, in Rosneft it is 50% (indirectly)<sup>15)</sup>, in Sberbank it is 50%<sup>16)</sup>, in Rosatom it is 100%, in Aeroflot it is 73.84%<sup>17)</sup>, in Rostec it is 100%<sup>18)</sup>, in the United Aircraft Corporation (OAK) it is 92.3%

(through Rosimushchestvo)<sup>19)</sup>, in Rosoboronexport (successor company to Rosvooruzhenie and Promexport<sup>20)</sup>) it is 100% (through Rostec<sup>21)</sup>, in the Moscow Stock Exchange it is 30.1% (through the Central Bank of the Russian Federation, Sberbank and VEB. RF)<sup>22)</sup>, in VTB Bank it is 92.2%<sup>23)</sup> and even in companies such as Novatek and VK Group the state is represented, albeit only to a small extent (4.5%<sup>24)</sup> through Gazprom and 5.7%<sup>25)</sup> through Rostec, respectively) and so on and so forth until there are 668 Russian companies with full or partial state participation.

The number and size of state-owned enterprises is higher than in most other countries in the capitalist world. State ownership is concentrated in sectors of strategic interest to the country (energy (oil, gas, nuclear and electricity), banking, defence and transport).<sup>26)</sup>

The Rosimushchestvo report<sup>27)</sup> shows that there are a total of 668 Russian companies in which the state has a more or less significant shareholding. The absolute majority 563 companies are owned by the Russian Federation through Rosimushchestvo. Of the 668, the state has a 100% stake in 299 companies. In other words: In 44.7% of Russian companies with state participation, the state is the full owner. In 36 companies it has a 50-100% stake. In another 49 companies it has a 25-50% stake, and in the remaining 263 companies it has a stake of less than 25%. It should also be noted that only about 40 companies out of the 668 companies listed in the Rosimushchestvo report are listed on the Russian stock exchange.<sup>28)</sup>

These facts, as we have pointed out, must be taken into account in assessing Russia's possible imperialist character.<sup>29)</sup> The bourgeois ideologues, unlike the CPG, understand them very well:

*“In his book ‘Property Rights in Post-Soviet Russia’, UC Berkeley professor Jordan Gans-Morse writes that ‘after the Khodorkovsky incident, everyone’s bureaucrats and law enforcement officials increased government pressure on business. Threats of asset seizures, facilitation of illegal business raids, extortion, unlawful fines or*

*unlawful arrests were threatened’.*

*More and more companies came under state control, especially in the case of banks and companies in the energy industry. Already in 2016, Joshua Kurlantzick, an analyst at the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR), wrote about these issues in his book State Capitalism. How the return of statism is transforming the world. In his opinion, ‘in Russia, state-owned enterprises strangle any potential competitor that might emerge from the private sector. Under Putin, the Kremlin has allowed one or two state-owned companies to dominate almost all leading industries. Each company is staffed by management loyal and faithful to Putin. Companies that have resisted the state takeover have been hit with taxes, regulations and other punishments. Many of the most promising young entrepreneurs have fled the country’.”<sup>30)</sup>*

As indignant as the bourgeois ideologues are about state involvement in the Russian economy, so indifferent is the CPG to it. This quote makes it abundantly clear that state ownership and control, especially in areas of strategic interest to the country, are an obstacle to free capitalist exploitation.

The importance we attach to the participation of the Russian state<sup>31)</sup> in the Russian economy arises from the role Russia plays today in the struggle against imperialism and the resurgence of fascism in Europe. Probably, the present Russian government was not pushed to adopt an anti-imperialist and anti-fascist position by its own decision, good will or anti-imperialist and socialist sentiments, but independently and even in spite of this will because of NATO's relentlessly aggressive policy against Russia. Possibly, it was the desire of Russia's post-Soviet governments to take a different path from that imposed on them by the war policy of imperialism, which never saw Russia as a state that would be part of the sharing of the world, but as another appetizing piece of land to be plundered, like the continents of Africa, Latin America and Asia. From its aspiration to join NATO and become

part of the “Western” system of exploitation, Russia eventually reoriented itself towards the East and South:

*“Russia is turning away from the West and towards the East.*

*‘If there was ever an illusion that one day we could trust our Western partners, that illusion no longer exists,’ Russian Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov told state broadcaster RT on Friday. His country will never accept a world order dominated by the United States.”<sup>32)</sup>*

*“Lavrov announces Russia’s reorientation of economic and foreign policy towards Asia  
Russia’s Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov announced today that Russia will reorient its economic and foreign policy towards Asia as it antagonises the West over the military campaign in Ukraine.”<sup>33)</sup>*

Since the CPG applies an idealistic and logical method of analysis, it is not at all capable of grasping the importance of the fact described above for the international struggle against imperialism.<sup>34)</sup>

It is precisely the presence of the state in the economic affairs of the country that has contributed significantly to the fact that the economy of today’s Russia has not been taken over by imperialist capital. In other words, the point of maintaining a Russian state presence in the production and distribution of the country is to guarantee degrees of national sovereignty, to prevent the full colonisation of the Russian economy by finance capital, or rather imperialist capital, and to enable the Russian state, which has been unwilling to place its sources of strategic raw materials under the direct domination of imperialist enterprises and subordinate its chains of production and distribution to those dominated by imperialist states, to cope with the onslaught of NATO.

And Russia’s ability to stand up to NATO coincides with the independence aspirations of more and more countries in the non-imperialist world:

The World Anti-Imperialist Platform has pointed out in its statements that Russia’s special military operation in Ukraine, carried out against NATO and

the reborn fascism in Europe, was going to open up new possibilities of struggle in the oppressed world, plundered and outraged by imperialism. For us, the militants of the Communist Party of Chile (Proletarian Action), affiliated to the World Anti-imperialist Platform, the beginning of Russia’s special military operation in Ukraine was a welcome surprise.<sup>35)</sup>

Russia’s increasing reorientation towards the East and South has strengthened many of the economies of the countries in these regions and their efforts to become independent from US and EU hegemony.

A weak Russia would be a serious blow to the processes of emancipation against imperialism that are developing in more and more countries. The most recent case is Niger, where the military forces, supported by the broad masses of the people, decided to stage a coup d’état to overthrow the former president of the country, Mohamed Bazoum, a corrupt lackey of France and the USA. On this very important event from the point of view of the struggle against imperialism, the CPG, to our astonishment (again), has maintained a stony silence. On its English-language website not even a negative statement calling for the reinstatement of imperialism’s lackey government can be found.<sup>36)</sup>

Contrary to the CPG’s assumption, we “face reality”. Even if the CPG does not believe it, we are clear enough to agree with it that there is exploitation of the workers by the bourgeoisie in all countries where the bourgeois mode of production prevails. In Russia as well. It is also clear enough to us that the state bureaucracy exploits the workers in its own country and, of course, this is also the case in Russia. Our defence of state involvement in Russian production is not based on the fact that we ignore the existence of exploitation in Russia’s state enterprises or in the Russian economy in general.

We express our support for Russia, even if it is capitalist, for the following reasons:

- (1) The rates of exploitation of the workers by the state enterprises are lower than the rates of exploitation by the big private monopolies.
- (2) The struggle for the final defeat of imperialism

is the central struggle of the present.

(3) A strong state is a good basis for building socialism in a country.

In general, workers in state-owned enterprises enjoy stable jobs, higher levels of qualification and job security and social protection.

The presence of the Russian state in Russian enterprises allows for the influence of the broad masses of the people in Russian politics. A state that (almost) only represents the interests of private capital leaves political decisions exclusively in the hands of big national capital and, through it, foreign capital, as is the case in most dependent countries. But at the same time we recognise the inadequacy of such participation and warn of the vulnerability of the Russian state if it does not become more involved in domestic production and control the supply (distribution) chains more tightly, because we believe that it is in the interests of the struggle for the new society that Russia can continue to stand victoriously against NATO and rising fascism in Europe. This requires a strong, guiding, planning state with greater degrees of political participation of the broad masses of people, particularly the working class. More workers in the state sector also means lower degrees of wage exploitation.

We see that the CPG is unable to recognise the positive importance of the present Russian state for the defence of national interests, for the Russian working class and, at the same time, the obstacle it represents for big imperialist capital. The latter coincides with the aspirations of the peoples of the world for emancipation from imperialism. What the CPG does not achieve, the bourgeois press does. Thus, an article in the “Berliner Zeitung” with the headline “Putin rächt sich am Westen: Konzerne werden verstaatlicht — bevor sie ihr Russland-Geschäft verkaufen” (in english: “Putin takes revenge on the West: nationalises companies before they sell their businesses in Russia”) reads as follows:

*“The Russian government suddenly takes over the business of Danone and Carlsberg in the country. The two companies had already found a buyer.*

*The Russian government has taken control of the Russian subsidiaries of Danone and Carlsberg’s Baltika breweries. It is the first nationalisation since the takeover of energy groups Uniper of Germany and Fortum of Finland, which were put under state supervision in April this year.*

*The Danish brewing group said on Monday that the company had not been officially informed of the move. ‘The Carlsberg Group has acted in accordance with local rules and regulations in Russia and finds this development unexpected,’ Carlsberg said.*

*Carlsberg had already submitted an application for sale in Moscow*

*The decree, signed by Russian President Vladimir Putin on Sunday evening, said Russia was taking the shares in the companies, owned by the French food group and Russia’s leading beer producer, under ‘temporary administration’.*

*The Carlsberg subsidiary Baltika employs 8400 people in eight plants in Russia. Shortly after the Russian attack on Ukraine, Carlsberg had declared that it was ‘seeking a complete divestment of our business in Russia’. The move by the Russian government caused confusion as Carlsberg had only announced at the end of June that it had found a buyer for the Russian plants. In order to complete the sale, Carlsberg said it had already submitted an application to the Russian regulatory commission.*

*If Western companies want to withdraw from Russia, however, they have to accept high discounts. Their Russian assets can only be sold for a maximum of half their price and they have to make a ‘voluntary contribution’ to the Russian state of five to ten percent of the sale proceeds. Ultimately, the sale still requires government approval.”<sup>37)</sup>*

The claim of the article is clear: How could Putin think of nationalising. We welcome these measures and would like to see the nationalised companies remain in state hands. But even if, sooner or later, these nationalised companies will be taken over in whole or in part by the country’s private capital,

at least they are national capital and the economic resources circulate within the country and not abroad.

### **Foreign penetration of the Russian economy**

Although the presence of the state in areas of strategic interest to Russia has been a major obstacle to the penetration of imperialist capital in Russia, this penetration unfortunately exists.<sup>38)</sup>

Let's look at some facts. 16.71% of Gazprom's share capital are ADRs (American depositary receipts)<sup>39)</sup>. The issuing bank of these ADRs is the Bank of New York Mellon, based in the United States, New York.

19.75% of Rosneft's share capital is owned by BP Russian Investments Limited, a British company, and another 18.46% is owned by the Qatari company 'QH Oil Investments LLC'. In other words, 38.21% is non-domestic capital.<sup>40)</sup>

33% of Sberbank's share capital comes from US investors and another 6.24% from European investors. In other words, 39.24% are not national capital.<sup>41)</sup>

The shares of Novatek, a quasi-private company (as we saw above, through Gazprom the state has a 4.5% stake) are distributed among three main shareholders, two individuals (Russian oligarchs) and one company. The two individuals are the CEO, Leonid Mikhelson (25%) and Gennady Timchenko (23%). The company, which ranks third among Novatek's shareholders, is not a Russian company, but a French monopoly: TotalEnergie.<sup>42)</sup>

The case of the Moscow Stock Exchange is equally worrying. From a corporate point of view, 15.8% of the shares of this body are held by the following three companies: European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, State Street Bank & Trust Company and The Capital Group Companies, Inc (each holding just over 5% of the shares). The situation becomes even more worrying if share ownership is broken down by country: the US holds 35.90% in the form of companies and individuals, the UK 9.40%, France 6.20%, Canada 3.00% and Sweden 2.60%. Together these countries

account for 57.1% of the shares of the Moscow Stock Exchange against 39.7% for Russia (including the state's share).<sup>43)</sup>

Accessing information on the ownership structure of companies is not easy. There are companies that provide insufficient information and others that do not. However, these examples show an ownership structure of Russian companies penetrated by foreign capital.

Contrary to CPG claims, Russia is not a plunderer, but a plundered country that tries to limit the subjugation of its companies, production capacities and control over supply chains precisely by a state that assumes responsibility for the economy.

We believe that the Russian state would do well to take over on a larger scale both the enterprises in the hands of large domestic private capital and foreign capital, at least in areas of strategic interest to the country. The Russian state in its present form does not yet seem to us insufficiently strong to confront NATO as a whole in a very possible future direct confrontation.

Unfortunately, the interests of the big capital often, but not always, conflict with national interest<sup>44)</sup>. The current Russian government, while defending Russia's national interests, also defends the private interests of the big capital at home. National interests often clash with the interests of the national, and especially foreign, big capital. This prevents the Russian state from changing its character from a state that serves to defend the private ownership of the means of production (and distribution) to a state with big business and a centrally planned system to govern the national economy. But it is precisely the political forces that demand this that communists outside Russia should support, among them the Communist Party of the Russian Federation.

A formulation that more accurately describes the reality of the exploitation of Russian enterprises is that imperialist capital, through Russian enterprises, exploits the national workers, in unison with Russian big capital. This fact that big national capital joins forces with imperialist capital



to exploit the working class is a common feature of all non-imperialist countries. In this context, the importance of the Russian state is crucial, as it further limits national economic dependence on imperialism.

It is possible to point out then that Russia has a relatively strong state which enables it to counteract economic penetration as well as NATO's military aggression against it. It is also true that Russian enterprises, including those of strategic interest to the country, are affected by the penetration of imperialist capital.

We strongly defend the role of the Russian state in defending national interests and its attempts to advance the strengthening of national industry. We also recognize that Russia's current role against NATO and fascism in Europe is congruent with the struggle of the peoples of the world for national sovereignty and against imperialism. A weakening of Russia would be detrimental to the peoples of the world who want to advance their national sovereignty.

That is why we are very concerned about the penetration of imperialist capital into the Russian economy. We want to see a strengthening of the Russian state, a greater planning role for it and greater interference in national production. In our opinion, the strengthening of the Russian state must necessarily come at the expense of the big oligarchic groups in the country, in whom we see the main problem for Russia and for the rest of the world fighting for freedom. The interests of the owners of big capital are in conflict with the interests of the great majorities of the country. And in the face of the growing danger of a direct NATO confrontation with Russia, we hope that the Russian government will have the wisdom to lower the living standards of the Russian oligarchs in favor of national industry, in favor of the technological development of the country, in favor of the Russian army, in favor of health, housing and education.

The ability to critically analyze reality, i.e. to recognize contradictions, to understand that every

part of reality is contradictory in itself, as is also the case in Russia, and to extract a synthesis from this critical analysis, is absent in the CPG. It recognizes the "bad" or the "good", but is unable to grasp both aspects at the same time and to extract a synthesis from them. Despite the negative aspects of Russia, the synthesis says that Russia's role in the struggle for the emancipation of the peoples of the world from imperialism is relevant and positive. Its failure to recognize this is the basis of the damage the CPG is doing to the international communist movement at present.

In the following parts we will look at issues such as: the export of capital from Russia abroad, Russia's productive and commercial structure, Russian banking and Russia's military presence in the world.

## Notes

1) Guerrero, Patricio, "Campo de estudio de la ciencia económica: algunos aspectos básicos" (in english: "Field of study of economic science: some basics"), (photocopy), 1999, p. 4.

A book version is available at: [https://books.google.de/books/about/Campo\\_y\\_m%C3%A9todo\\_de\\_estudio\\_de\\_la\\_ciencia.html?id=bcaBzgEACAAJ&redir\\_esc=y](https://books.google.de/books/about/Campo_y_m%C3%A9todo_de_estudio_de_la_ciencia.html?id=bcaBzgEACAAJ&redir_esc=y)

2) In the original in German: "die Dinge und ihre begrifflichen Abbilder wesentlich in ihrem Zusammenhang, ihrer Verkettung, ihrer Bewegung, ihrem Entstehen und Vergehen" auffasst.

Engels, Frederick, "Herrn Eugen Dühring's Umwälzung der Wissenschaft" (in english: "Herr Eugen Dühring's Revolution in Science"), in: Karl Marx und Friedrich Engels — Werke, Berlin, DDR: Dietz Verlag, Band 20, 1962, p. 22.

A digital version of the work in English is available from: <https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1877/anti-duhring/index.htm>

3) Politzer, Georges, "Principios elementales y fundamentales de Filosofía" (in english: "Elementary and Fundamental Principles of Philosophy"), Argentina, Colección Eneida, 1971, p. 115.

A book version is available at: <https://www.casadellibro.com/libro-principios-elementales-y-fundamentales-de-filosofia/9788446022107/975911>

4) Guerrero, op. cit. (in footnote 49), p. 4.

5) Communist Party of Greece (CPG), "On the ideological-political confrontation at the 22nd International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties and the "trick" about the "anti-Russian" and "pro-Russian" sentiment", in: <https://inter.kke.gr/en/articles/On-the-ideological-political-confrontation-at-the-22nd-International-Meeting-of-Communist-and-Workers-Parties-and-the-trick-about-the-anti-Russian-and-pro-Russian-sentiment/>

- 6) Communist Party of Greece (CPG), “On the so-called World Anti-Imperialist Platform and its damaging and disorienting position”, in: <https://inter.kke.gr/en/articles/On-the-so-called-World-Anti-Imperialist-Platform-and-its-damaging-and-disorienting-position/>
- 7) Communist Party of Greece (CPG), op. cit.: “On the so-called World Anti-Imperialist Platform...” (in the footnote 54)
- 8) Partido Comunista de Grecia (PCG), op. cit.: “On the so-called World Anti-Imperialist Platform...” (in the footnote 54)
- 9) G20, “About G20”, last updated on 30.06.2023, in: <https://www.g20.org/en/about-g20/>
- 10) World Anti-Imperialist Platform (WAP), “The rising tide of global war and the tasks of anti-imperialists (Full text)”, in: <https://wap21.org/?p=566>
- 11) We would also like to point out a fact. From the statement: “The PAM claims that ‘There would be no economic data to justify calling China or Russia imperialist.’ [...] It is as if China and Russia did not participate in the G20 summits, the meetings of the 20 most powerful capitalist states in the world”, it follows that the member states of the G20 are without exception imperialist countries. This idea contrasts with the idea of the “imperialist pyramid”, according to which almost all or perhaps all countries recognised by the UN would be imperialist. Either all countries in the world are imperialist because they have more or less developed trade relations, or only the G20 countries are imperialist.
- 12) Wikipedia, “Creación y evolución del G7”, in: <https://es.wikipedia.org/wiki/G7>
- 13) Partido Comunista de Grecia (PCG), op. cit.: “On the so-called World Anti-Imperialist Platform...” (in the footnote 54)
- 14) Gazprom, “Growth at Scale, Gazprom Annual Report 2020”, in: [https://www.annualreports.com/HostedData/AnnualReports/PDF/LSE\\_OGZD\\_2020.pdf](https://www.annualreports.com/HostedData/AnnualReports/PDF/LSE_OGZD_2020.pdf), p. 31, in the section “Share Capital”.
- 15) Rosneft, “Shareholder structure”, 1 July 2021, in: [https://www.rosneft.com/Investors/Equity/Shareholder\\_structure/](https://www.rosneft.com/Investors/Equity/Shareholder_structure/)  
Fin-plan, “Компании с государственным участием на российском фондовом рынке” (in english “Empresas con participación estatal en la bolsa rusa”), 11 July 2022, in: <https://fin-plan.org/blog/investitsii/kompanii-s-gosudarstvennym-uchastiem-na-rossiyskom-fondovom-rynke/?ysclid=ll6d6lqh77551810745>
- 16) Smart-Lab, “структура и состав акционеров Сбербанка” (in english “Companies with state participation at the”), 8 May 2020, in: <https://smart-lab.ru/q/SBER/shareholders/>  
Fin-plan, op. cit. “Компании с государственным участием на...” (in the footnote 63)
- 17) Aeroflot, “Shareholder Capital Structure”, last seen on 7 August 2023, in: <https://ir.aeroflot.com/en/securities/shareholder-capital-structure/>
- 18) Smart-Lab, op. cit. “структура и состав ...” (in the footnote 64).  
Fin-plan, op. cit. “Компании с государственным участием на...” (in the footnote 63)  
Rostec, “History”, last seen on 14.08.2023, in: <https://rostec.ru/en/about/history/>
- 19) Gazprombank, “Компании с государственным участием на Московской бирже” (in english: “Companies with state participation on the Moscow Exchange”), 17 February 2023, in: <https://gazprombank.investments/blog/reviews/state-participation-companies/?ysclid=ll6d6fo921147691067>
- 20) The CPG is not distinguished by a high level of rigour. In its list of Russian ‘giant monopolies’ (Gazprom, Rosneft, Lukoil, Rosatom, Sberbank, Norilsk Nickel, Rosvooruzhenie, Rostec, Rusal, etc.) it lists the name of the company ‘Rosvooruzhenie’, which no longer exists because it merged with ‘Promexport’ and together they became ‘Rosoboronexport’.
- 21) “On 10 January 2017, in accordance with the resolution of 26 December 2016 of the sole shareholder, Rostec State Corporation, Alexander Mikheev assumed the position of General Director of JSC Rosoboronexport.”  
Rosoboronexport, “History of the company”, last seen on 14.08.2023, in: <http://roe.ru/eng/rosoboronexport/history/index.php>
- 22) Moscos Exchange, “Shareholders owning over 5 per cent of shares”, data updated as of 4 April 2023, in: <https://www.moex.com/s1352>
- 23) VTB Bank, “VTB Bank Annual Report 2022”, in: [https://www.vtb.com/media-files/vtb.com/sitepages/ir/VTB\\_Annual\\_report\\_2022\\_ENG.pdf](https://www.vtb.com/media-files/vtb.com/sitepages/ir/VTB_Annual_report_2022_ENG.pdf)
- 24) Energy Intelligence, “Gazprom Restructures Minority Ownership in Novatek”, in: <https://www.energyintel.com/0000017b-a7da-de4c-a17b-e7dac5550000>
- 25) Fin-plan, op. cit. “Компании с государственным участием на...” (in the footnote 63)
- 26) Apparently, there is a case of privatisation: the case of Gazprombank. As North Stream II failed to get off the ground, it seems that Gazprom was forced to sell its voting shares in Gazprombank to private individuals. It does not seem to be clear who the new owners of these shares are. At the time of writing, we have not been able to find more precise information.  
Warsaw Institute, “Gazprombank CEO: Gazprom’s Shares Acquired by Russian Entities”, in: <https://warsawinstitute.org/gazprombank-ceo-gazproms-shares-acquired-russian-entities/>
- 27) Rosimushchestvo, “Учет и мониторинг федерального имущества. Состав и структура пакетов акций (долей), находящихся в федеральной собственности по состоянию на 26.11.2021” (in english “Accounting and monitoring of federal property. Composition and structure of blocks of shares (stakes) in federal ownership as of 26.11.2021”, from 03.06.2022, in: <https://rosim.gov.ru/Attachment.aspx?Id=202132>
- 28) Fin-plan, op. cit. “Компании с государственным участием на...” (in the footnote 63)
- 29) The arguments that are usually put forward to refute the importance of state involvement in the Russian economy are similar to the following: “state capitalism is not socialism”, “if the state is capitalist, it makes no difference whether the enterprises are state or private, the exploitation of the working class is one and the same”, “the Russian state bureaucrats exploit the Russian working class and the working class of other countries”.
- 30) MercadoLibre, “Así secuestró Putin la propiedad privada en

Rusia” (in english: “How Putin hijacked private property in Russia”), published on 14/4/2022 - 10:11 hrs., in: <https://www.libremercado.com/2022-04-14/putin-propiedad-privada-rusia-6885221/>

31) It is debatable whether or not the Russian economy can be described as state capitalism. But it is not the purpose of this paper to enter into this debate.

32) Fundscene, “Lawrow - Russland hat alle Illusionen über den Westen verloren” (in english “Lavrov - Russia has lost all illusions about the West”), 18 March, 2014, in: <https://fundscene.com/lawrow-russland-hat-alle-illusionen-uber-den-westen-verloren/>

33) Swissinfo.ch, “Lavrov anuncia que Rusia reorientará política económica y exterior hacia Asia” (in english: “Lavrov announces Russia’s reorientation of economic and foreign policy towards Asia”), published on 07 December 2022 at 11:47 hrs., in: [https://www.swissinfo.ch/spa/ucrania-guerra\\_lavrov-anuncia-que-rusia-reorientar%C3%A1-pol%C3%ADtica-econ%C3%B3mica-y-exterior-hacia-asia/48115656](https://www.swissinfo.ch/spa/ucrania-guerra_lavrov-anuncia-que-rusia-reorientar%C3%A1-pol%C3%ADtica-econ%C3%B3mica-y-exterior-hacia-asia/48115656)

34) The usual arguments to dismiss Russia’s new orientation towards the East and South include: “the Russians do not fight fascism and imperialism on principle”, “they say they fight fascism in Ukraine, but in reality they only want to spread their imperialist wings over new markets (in Ukraine)”, “how naive those who think they see something good in the Russians”, and so on a list of arguments based on moral values and not on objective facts.

35) Our party, a few days after the Russian special military operation began, published a statement of support entitled “Declaration of the Communist Party of Chile (Proletarian Action) in the face of the latest events in the Ukraine” which reads for example:

“We see Russia’s military incursion as a decisive response to the ongoing violations and breaches of international agreements signed by Russia and the ‘West.’”

Communist Party of Chile (Acción Proletaria), “Declaración del Partido Comunista Chileno (Acción Proletaria) ante los últimos sucesos en Ucrania” (in english: “Statement of the Communist Party of Chile (Acción Proletaria) on the latest events in Ukraine”), written on 27.04.2022 and published a few days later, in: <https://accionproletaria.com/declaracion-del-partido-comunista-chileno-accion-proletaria-ante-los-ultimos-sucesos-en-ucrania/>

36) Our party quickly issued a statement on this important development in Niger. The statement reads:

“Russia’s struggle in Ukraine against NATO and fascism opens a space of struggle for all peoples who want to free themselves from the imperialist yoke. The new world must have a sovereign and industrialised Africa!”

Communist Party of Chile (Acción Proletaria), “Los Comunistas, el Partido Comunista Chileno (Acción Proletaria), saludan el despertar de África” (in english:

“The Communists, the Communist Party of Chile (Acción Proletaria), salute the awakening of Africa”), 7 de agosto 2023<sup>7</sup> August 2023, in: <https://accionproletaria.com/los-comunistas-el-partido-comunista-chileno-accion-proletaria-saludan-el-despertar-de-africa/>

37) Berliner Zeitung, “Putin rächt sich am Westen: Konzerne werden verstaatlicht — bevor sie ihr Russland-Geschäft verkaufen” (in english “Putin takes revenge on the West: corporations are nationalised — before they sell their Russia business”), 17 of July 2023, in: <https://www.berliner-zeitung.de/wirtschaft-verantwortung/sanktionen-wladimir-putin-raecht-sich-am-westen-danone-und-carlsberg-werden-von-russland-verstaatlicht-li.370088>

www.berliner-zeitung.de/wirtschaft-verantwortung/sanktionen-wladimir-putin-raecht-sich-am-westen-danone-und-carlsberg-werden-von-russland-verstaatlicht-li.370088

38) Since sanctions against Russia came into force, it has become more difficult to obtain data, at least from some parts of the globe. For several Russian companies, links to annual reports are inaccessible. We do not know why. To obtain the relevant data, we have had to find ingenious ways to get around the obstacles as much as possible.

39) Gazprom, op. cit. “Grwoth at Scale, Gazprom Annual...”, p. 31, in the section “Share Capital”. (in the footnote 62)

40) Rosneft, op. cit. “Shareholder structure” (in the footnote 63) Fin-plan, op. cit. “Компании с государственным участием на российско...” (in the footnote 63)

41) Smart-Lab, “структура и состав акционеров Сбербанк” (in: “Estructura y composición del accionariado de Sberbank”), 8 de mayo de 2020, in: <https://smart-lab.ru/q/SBER/shareholders/>

42) Energy Intelligence, op. cit. “Gazprom Restructures Minority...” (in the footnote 72)

43) Moscos Exchange, “Shareholders owning over 5 percent of shares”, data updated as of 4 April 2023, in: <https://www.moex.com/s1352>

44) National interests are those that transcend social classes and are shared by the majority of the population, such as strong production, national sovereignty, territorial integrity, food and energy security.

# “Multipolarity” or internationalist anti-imperialism?

Dimitrios Patelis | Collective for Revolutionary Unification (Greece)

## Introduction

The ongoing World War III (WWIII) presents the global revolutionary movement with vital tasks. It makes it necessary and imperative to organically interconnect the tactics of the anti-imperialist struggle with the struggle for the strategy of socialist revolution and the perspective of communism.

The urgently needed anti-colonialist, anti-imperialist, national-liberation, national-independence, anti-fascist, etc. tasks can be achieved effectively and consistently by a frontal revolutionary movement, in which the communists play a pioneering and leading role. This is in turn possible to the extent that the communists also spearhead the theoretical and ideological struggle by linking these objectives to the revolutionary perspective of socialism in an organic, substantiated, scientific and convincing way, to revolutionary social transformations that pave the way for the socialist revolution.

In order to best serve these tasks, the World Anti-imperialist Platform (WAP) was established and is being developed. The main interrelated aims of the WAP are: 1. The coordination and organisation of the anti-imperialist struggle; 2. The ideological struggle against opportunism and revisionism that act to undermine the movement; 3. The consolidation of the consistent revolutionary and internationalist communist forces, without the leading role of which the victorious anti-imperialist struggle of the peoples is unattainable.

In the WAP we consider necessary the broadest possible rallying and mobilisation in the frontal anti-imperialist struggle, of forces and tendencies with different ideological and political starting points and tendencies. However, we are convinced that the optimal way of organising and escalating the anti-imperialist struggle cannot be consciously planned without its organic interconnection with

the struggle for socialist revolution.

Anti-imperialism and socialism/communism, in their social/class and ideological/political content, are two distinct but organically interrelated components of a single revolutionary process, a single movement.

The basic precondition for the strengthening of the anti-imperialist struggle today is the reconstitution and strengthening of the communist movement on a national, regional, and global scale, on the basis of the creative development and application of contemporary revolutionary theory and methodology.

WWIII has brought to the surface a plethora of ideas, scenarios and approaches to the rapid shifts taking place in the balance of power. Currently, the anti-imperialist movement is being approached by forces inspired or influenced to some extent by ideologies and ideological constructs in which concepts and doctrines of “geopolitics” are predominant.

If we seek a truly scientific approach to the issue, we must make a clear distinction between two levels of approach:

1. On the one hand, there is the actual objective historical process in the development of which historical subjects are involved based on the objectively available resources and means of pursuing their actions. The crystallisation of this process leads to the respective changes in the balance of power, the poles of attraction and/or repulsion of power and the corresponding (old and new) decision-making centres.

2. On the other hand, there is a plethora of different levels of reliability or unreliability of ideas, approaches, perceptions, speculations, working hypotheses and so on, through which people attempt to understand, describe, explain, and predict the above phenomena.

### **Geopolitics as ideology and propaganda of the capitalist class**

Geopolitics is a direction of bourgeois ideology, a handmaid to every strategic and tactical pursuit of the “collective capitalist” at national and international level (and therefore of the ruling class’s leading political personnel). Geopolitics is often given a scientific veneer, with corresponding courses, degrees, university positions, “research centres”, etc.

As a widespread direction or trend in bourgeois political thought and propaganda, geopolitics is rooted in the extreme over-exaggeration or even absolutisation of the role of geographical factors in the life of society and in history. According to its ideologies and approaches, the whole flow of the history of human society is directly related to geographical terms and geographic location, in combination with Malthusian and neo-Malthusian ideas of demography, and even with racist concepts of social Darwinism. According to these concepts, not all races and nations are equal. On the contrary, there is a hierarchy between superior races/nations and inferior ones. Moreover, there is always insufficient “vital space” for the “superior and rising nations”, hence the legitimacy of claiming “vital space”, which leads to constant revisions of various physical borders, etc. Therefore, geopolitics as a rule functions as a necessary foundation for the ideology and propaganda of the aggressive foreign policy of imperialism.

While it emerged in its basic ideological directions from bourgeois public written discourse at the end of the 19th century in colonial Britain, France, Sweden, etc. however, as a sphere of ideological framing of the war and political aspirations of the warring imperialist camps, it flourished during the First World War. It was then that the Swedish pan-germanist political scientist Johan Rudolf Kjellén formulated the term “geopolitics”, describing the state as a geographical and biological organism. Since then, geopolitics has also been organically linked to the practical, ‘institutional’ applications of racism (eugenics, the imposition of sterilisation

by court order, concentration and extermination camps for undesirables, control and repression of immigrants, ethnic cleansing, persecution of revolutionaries as forces ‘undermining national purity’, lobotomies, etc.).

During the interwar period it flourished in Italy, Germany, militaristic Japan and elsewhere, where it served as the “foundation” of the official doctrines of fascism, nazism and monarcho-fascism. It provided the ideological basis for the misanthropic and genocidal practices of the regimes of the anti-Comintern fascist axis.

The agents of fascist geopolitics officially organised and disseminated on a wide scale the propaganda of the ideas of revanchism and retaliation for the “unjust character” of the Treaty of Versailles against Germany. What they actually sought was to satisfy the imperialist aspirations for the redistribution of colonies and spheres of influence for the benefit of the German financial oligarchy, which they presented as a supposedly “natural aggression to claim necessary vital space” on behalf of the entire “supreme German nation” and the “Aryan race” ...

After World War II, geopolitics blossomed in the United States and in some other imperialist countries as an ideological tool of anti-sovietism/anti-communism during the cold war, as a means of achieving the neo-colonialist aims of the financial oligarchy of imperialism. A distinctive feature of geopolitics is expressing the claims of the major imperialist states and their trans-state organs, coalitions, etc. for world domination, “world order” and, if possible, “world governance”. In any case, geopolitics has over time been associated with various versions of racism, chauvinism, nationalism but also with versions of cosmopolitanism.

Racism is a mishmash of unscientific and irrational beliefs about the supposed biologically determined physical and spiritual inequality of the human races and about the decisive influence of racial differences on the history and culture of society. Common to all racism is misanthropism, prejudices about superior and inferior races,

the ones who are supposedly destined to be the sole creators of civilisation and domination and those who are incapable of cultural creation and hence are doomed to be exclusively dominated, subjugated, and exploited.

Nationalism, as bourgeois and petty-bourgeois ideology, psychology and politics perceives the nation as a supreme — non-historical and transcendental of class — unity, as a harmonious whole with identical basic interests. The interests of the ruling class are here projected as “nationwide”, while in relation to other nations, the nationalists put forward the idea of their own national supremacy and exclusivity. An extreme form of nationalism is chauvinism, the characteristic feature of which is an insistence on “national exclusivity”, the prevalence of the interests of one nation over the interests of other nations, national arrogance, hostility, and hatred towards other nations.

Cosmopolitanism is the reactionary bourgeois ideology/utopia with geopolitical implications, which is directed against the autonomy of the state and national sovereignty, against national traditions, national culture, and patriotism. This ideology is particularly widespread in the era of imperialism, since it aims towards the unhindered freedom of capital of the multinational monopoly groups on a planetary scale, free rein, and impunity for the financial oligarchy. The agents of this ideology consider anti-imperialism, any national liberation movement, any struggle for national and popular sovereignty “obsolete” (in this respect, the supporters of the revisionist doctrine of the “imperialist pyramid” agree with the reactionary bourgeois utopia of cosmopolitanism, with the only difference being the attempt to present this alignment with the strategy of imperialism as “the only revolutionary one”!).

Proletarian internationalism is opposed to all forms of racism, nationalism, and chauvinism, as well as to bourgeois cosmopolitanism, which advocates the integration of nations through the violent assimilation and enslavement of their

peoples by imperialism in terms of colonialism and neo-colonialism. Marxists see the prospect of the rapprochement and conglomeration of nations through objective social development, through the law governed path towards unification of humanity under communism, in a process that crosses through the liberation, emancipation and self-determination of nations, through the flourishing cultural prosperity of each of these nations as organic elements of the unified humanity’s culture, on a completely voluntary basis.

Based on all the above, geopolitics certainly is not and cannot be considered a science. It is based by definition on a predominantly superficial, subjective and irrationally charged, or even highly obsessive perception of reality, especially when unresolved contradictions emerge due to the accumulation of changes in the balance of power on a regional and global scale.

In conditions of impending and/or ongoing military conflicts, geopolitics becomes particularly popular in the circles of the public opinion and common sense of everyday consciousness.

Despite its popularity in conditions of conflict, however, geopolitics is unable to rise above its immanent methodological inadequacies and its bourgeois reactionary ideological limitations. Geopolitical narratives are rife with unstable references, teetering towards a variety of different ideologies, pseudo-philosophical ravings, and irrational elements.

In its narratives, apart from the exaggeration of the geographic factor, many different factors are invoked at will, which makes it a version of the so-called “factor theory”. This type of “theory” attempts to describe and explain structure and movement, balances, imbalances, and conflicts by invoking certain “coequal” factors: economy, demography, geography, military power, religion, morality, technology, culture, “race”, etc. The inability to organically interconnect and prioritise the factors leads to a chaotic vicious circle through which it is rather impossible to distinguish cause-and-effect relationships, laws, and law-

governed processes. Ultimately, anything can affect everything, and out of this maze of undefined, chaotic interactions, anything can emerge... In this way, it is impossible to produce substantiated and systematic scientific knowledge capable of objectively describing, explaining, predicting and being an effective instrument of human action.

As a rule, its proponents are not concerned about the existence within its narratives of contradictions, disparate elements, even irrational mystifications, typical of the ideological constructions/dogmas of nationalism, chauvinism, etc. I would like to point out that if some advocates of geopolitics show elements of acumen in their remarks, this is in no way due to the scientific validity of this field of ideological activity. On the contrary, any insightful remarks they may make are achieved in deviation from the irrational tradition that historically characterises this field, so it is rather due to their own individual erudition and insight, their own self-education and understanding of social theory, philosophy, political economy, etc.

As a rule, professionals of this kind (university professors, journalists and “analysts”, rambling politicians and other representatives of the ideological apparatus of the ruling class) cannot rise above the scientifically veneered propagandistic schematisation and systematisation of a narrative framework, according to the current ideological agendas for the justification of predetermined decisions taken by the political staff of the oligarchy of capital, the national or supranational bodies and institutions they serve (governments, transnational bodies such as NATO, EU, etc.).

At the level of the bourgeois geopolitical scriptwriting, peoples cannot be acting subjects, but expendable “resources” used to carry out the “national & supranational goals of the elites”. Therefore, they de facto fail to notice the class content in the interests of the real acting subjects behind every war, while the only subjects they acknowledge and promote are state formations/nations and coalitions of states. In practice, for geopolitics, the acting subjects can be, above all,

the ruling classes, and their instruments at the national and supranational/transnational level (coalitions of states, etc.). Thus, the class essence, the contradictory and law-governed character of the system, comes to the surface in an inverted form, which not only conceals its essence, but presents the respective accomplishments and predeterminations of the strategy of imperialism as a one-way street...

### **An account of the historical context for the emergence of narratives on “multipolarity”**

A systematic engagement with the history and main trends of geopolitics is not within the scope of this paper. For the sake of ideological debate here, I will make specific reference to that version/sub-variant of geopolitics which is nowadays projected as “multipolarity”. The debate concerns certain trends within and around the anti-imperialist movement of our time, which for various reasons resort to the aforementioned version of geopolitics.

Initially, the term “polarity” was introduced into the discourse of geopolitics, political science and international relations in the 1970s, within the context of needing to describe and explain the terms of the then dominant bipolar system of the Cold War.

Multipolarity emerged as a term and a trend in geopolitics after the end of the Cold War. It implies the existence (or the pursuit of the emergence and simultaneous predominance) of multiple poles/centres of power in the world, composed of the strongest powers/states, which are not bound to any specific alignment after the collapse of the bipolar world. According to some “multipolar” narratives, none of these “poles of power” (military, cultural, political, economic, etc.) should outnumber the others, nor seek to extend its influence over the others. As of 1989, with the end of the Cold War, the bipolar world (US and USSR) ceased to exist. Since then, many “well-meaning” journalists have been indulging in opinion pieces on the “future just world”, which somehow “ought” to be “multipolar, fair and equitable”, “subscribing to international

law, morality and equality”, fostering mutually beneficial cooperation and “fair competition in the world market”, leaving room for each independent country to have its own domestic and foreign policy, etc., and so on.

At that time the confrontation was characterised by the antagonism between two rival socio-political and economic systems, two camps: capitalism and the countries of early socialism. Particularly after the crushing defeat of fascism-nazism — with the decisive role of the USSR and the anti-fascist popular liberation movements led by the communists — other types of relations of power were created on a global scale which favoured the development of anti-colonial, anti-imperialist, and national liberation movements on all continents where until then, the main imperialist countries had maintained their conquests and colonies. At that time, even to the most ignorant on matters of social science, it was clear that there was an irreconcilable conflict between two poles (camps, coalitions), between “two worlds” led by two superpowers: the first led by the USA and the second led by the USSR.

Among them there was also an ambivalent and contested space, a multitude of countries that were then and often still are called “third world countries”. One after another, these countries were gaining their independence in various ways and at various levels. The breadth and depth of the socio-economic and political independence they achieved emerged as a function of the class character of the socio-political and ideological fronts that led these anti-colonial anti-imperialist movements, of the balance of power at the national, regional, and international levels, and of the effectiveness of internationalist assistance from the camp of the early socialist countries. This explains the range of diverse socio-economic changes and reforms historically observed in them in the decades after WWII.

These changes cannot be understood scientifically without the theoretical and methodological investigation into the position and role reserved

by the existence of the camp of the early socialist revolutions and the countries that emerged from them. They must be examined as a historically necessary escalation of the basic contradiction of the global capitalist system, as a fundamental condition and manifestation of the general crisis of this system, i.e., the fact that the superior system/socio-economic formation of private property (capitalism) is beginning to lose the justification of its historical existence due to the progressive development of humanity in the direction of socialism, communist unified humanity. It is precisely the manifestation of revolutionary situations that blossom into victorious early socialist revolutions within the countries that constitute the weak links of the world capitalist system that creates conditions for an upsurge of historical optimism and new types of liberation movements in the countries that have been subjected to overexploitation by the parasitic imperialist countries.

The contradiction between the poles of the imperialist core and the periphery of the colonies and conquests of that core is also a manifestation of the basic, fundamental contradiction of the global capitalist system: the contradiction between capital and labour.

With the research established by Lenin in his work “Imperialism, the highest stage of capitalism”, it becomes clear that in the monopoly stage, the escalation of capital accumulation on a global scale creates multiply mediated<sup>1)</sup> mechanisms for extracting surplus wealth on a planetary scale in the form of monopoly super-profits.

It was precisely as a result of the creation and strengthening of the camp of early socialism that — at the level of the balance of power, but also at the level of the realisation of this fact — another level of capacity for struggles for the liberation/emancipation of the colonies emerges, as a result of which the range of options for the predatory parasitism in terms of genocide, of the imperialist countries against the colonies and their possessions, semi-colonies, dependent, semi-independent and



formally independent countries is shrinking.

In this way, during the monopoly stage of capitalism (imperialism), after World War II, rapid changes in the global balance of power emerge, which are directly related to the qualitatively different manifestations of the essential fundamental contradiction of the capitalist system:

1. The dipole of the contradiction between capital and wage labour, between dead labour of the past (embedded in the material means of production) and living labour of the present (which productively activates these material means).

This fundamental contradiction continues to manifest itself, but no longer in a clear form, in the context of each individual country. It is precisely the new type, the escalation to a higher level of the law of capital accumulation discovered by Marx, that leads — as Lenin demonstrated in the field of the science of political economy — to the monopoly stage, in which two additional organically interrelated contradictory dipoles are revealed, manifested on a radically different scale, as qualitatively and essentially differentiated:

2. capitalism — early socialism and
3. imperialist center — colonial/neo-colonial periphery.

It is precisely the triumph of the Great October Socialist Revolution and the subsequent great early socialist revolutions in Korea, China, Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, Cuba, etc. that has a catalytic effect on the emergence of this third dipole, as expressed by the extremely popular but inaccurate term “third world”.

Each of these organically interconnected opposing dipoles, and all of them combined, constitute fields of distinctive struggles between the forces of progress and regression: wage labour and capital, early socialism, and decaying imperialism (monopoly capitalism), anti-imperialist/anti-colonialist movements and imperialism/neo-colonialism.

In this way, in the 20th century, a new level of internationalisation of the economic, social, and ideological-political life of the world’s population

on a global scale was launched. The world system, the global division of labour and the respective positions and roles of countries and regions of the world are articulated in their further development through the escalation of these contradictory bipolarities, which are not static, but are subject to the historical necessity of the law of the global unified revolutionary process of the transition of humanity to socialism, which is the becoming, the process of the formation of communism, of unified humanity.

The process of this revolutionary transition cannot be understood in a non-historical, linearly mechanistic way. It is a process characterised by an extraordinary and increasing complexity and diversity that is not only due to the multiply mediated relations between the fundamental contradiction of the capitalist system and its necessary derivative manifestations under imperialism. They are also linked to the extraordinary diversity of residual pre-capitalist forms and structures. These remnants — insofar as they are not completely transformed by capitalism — function as historically necessary and extremely convenient for the monopoly overexploitation of imperialism, forms of manifestation and historically specific reproduction of inequality. In this capacity they are organically intertwined with the law of the “weak link” and thus with the extremely contradictory process of the rise and fall of revolutionary movements in the historical confrontation between the forces of revolutionary progress and counter-revolutionary reaction/regression.

Contrary to the reactionary and irrational self-delusions of the ideologues of the financial oligarchy (who were quick to celebrate ghoulishly, joining the cries of the bourgeoisie along with the lamentations of some shipwrecks of the “left” of defeat and renunciation of even the idea of revolution) the temporary defeat of some early socialist revolutions (in the USSR and in the European socialist countries) did not in any way signify the death knell of the “end of history”, the

definitive and irrevocable domination of capitalist barbarism, the cancellation of the inevitable historical course of humanity towards communism.

Indeed, the world labour and revolutionary movement has suffered an unprecedented strategic defeat. The tragic consequences of this counter-revolution were even expressed in demographic losses amounting to genocide. The people of the movement tragically experienced the counter-revolution, its consequences, and its impact, often in the form of existential anguish.

This defeat was of strategic importance and was tragically experienced by the people of the revolutionary movement. However, in terms of the logic of history, on a world/historical scale, it was only a tactical defeat. There is no strategic total victory in history without individual tactical defeats of the ultimate victors. Defeats through which the camp of the forthcoming victorious revolutions regroups at all levels (theoretical, practical, organisational, etc.) to finally defeat the forces of counter-revolution definitively and irrevocably.

The tragedy of this defeat in no way negates the historical necessity of the global revolutionary process, the historical legitimacy of the revolutionary transition to a unified humanity. In the period since these counterrevolutions, the historical law governed process has continued to escalate through the contradictions mentioned above and other more complex and mediated ones. Underground fundamental processes (not visible on the surface by the common mind, untrained in dialectical science, and its variant that remains locked into metaphysical schemas stereotyped by dogmatism and revisionism) continued the work of the destructive and creative forces of historical becoming.

The Soviet Union and the European countries of early socialism were once again transformed into a field ripe for predatory exploitation, being violently dragged back into the capitalist system. Imperialism, by means of unbridled revanchism, tried and to a considerable extent succeeded in subordinating them to its own system of global

division of labour, positions, and roles. For this purpose, all legitimate and illegitimate means, all deceitful and inhuman ways of imposition, manipulation and subjugation have been employed.

This process was characterised by the recolonisation of these countries and peoples by the imperialist camp led by the USA and its supranational organs. This process of recolonisation found fertile ground in a historically unprecedented process of primary accumulation of capital. The hitherto historically known process of Primitive Accumulation of Capital took place in its classic form as a process of historical transition from feudalism to capitalism, as a process of the abolition of feudalism and the feudal guild relations of society by the emerging capitalist relations of production. This process was spearheaded by the then revolutionary rising bourgeoisie together with its allies, the nascent working class and the poor peasantry of smallholders and landless peasants who suffered the evils of the declining serfdom. Successive early bourgeois revolutions were swept away by feudal counterrevolutions and restorative processes, until finally the capitalist system (long since dominant in the field of economy) was established at the level of the bourgeois superstructure. This took place with the late bourgeois and bourgeois-democratic revolutions, in a process which in the major European countries lasted for more than five centuries.

On the contrary, the unprecedented historical form of Primitive Accumulation of Capital beginning anew was led by the newly emergent parasitic bourgeoisie of Russia and the other countries of the post-Soviet space. This partially incomplete accumulation took place under conditions of global domination of late imperialism.

Crucial for understanding the historical context of the emerging narratives of multipolarity are the tectonic shifts in power marked by the development process of the early socialist countries that are continuing socialist construction, with the prominent role of the historically unprecedented rapid development of the People's Republic of

China.

### **Geopolitical doctrines on “multipolarity”**

New impetus has been given to various forms of geopolitical/geostrategic public discourses among the ideological constituents of the ruling class of various countries after the victory of the bourgeois counter-revolution, the dissolution of the Soviet Union and the imposition of reactionary processes of dismantling the coherent framework of the planned socialist economy during the capitalist restoration in the countries that emerged from the dissolution of the USSR and overall in the countries of early socialism in Europe.

Particular reference should be made to the adoption and application of geopolitical views of “multipolarity” in Russia after the bourgeois counter-revolution in the USSR. The historical specificity of the ideologies put forward by the newly emerging bourgeoisie in Russia is organically linked to the historical specificity of its emergence and formation: from the structures of the “shadowy” underground economy that parasitized on the weaknesses of the central planning of the USSR in the sphere of circulation, to the appropriation of ever deeper positions and roles in the economy and society, in proportion to the escalation of the bourgeois counter-revolution and capitalist restoration. They literally enriched themselves by treading on corpses, by the predatory privatisation of the wealth and infrastructure created and defended by generations of Soviet citizens with their sweat and blood.

That explains their ambivalent character. For decades they have been grovelling, begging the imperialist powers for a share and a role in the world economy. They have been getting kicked around and having doors slammed in their face on all sides. World imperialism did not relish the defeat and dissolution of early socialism in the USSR and Europe to have in its place even petty capitalists with aspirations and ambitions. It was and is aiming to pre-emptively eliminate all competition, through further fragmentation, the

total colonisation of the post-Soviet formations, by turning them into vulnerable and subservient sources of raw materials, energy and cheap labour power. For this goal, a slimy submissive comprador bourgeoisie (of the Latin American banana republic-type like that of the late Yeltsin) is more than enough. Whatever independence and autonomy this bourgeoisie has had stems from the constant battering and humiliation at the international level, from the fact that Russia has not yet been dissolved, and — above all — from the mighty arsenal inherited from the USSR.

The present Russia is by no means the USSR and should not be equated to it. However, even the present counter-revolutionary Russia with the anti-Soviet/anti-communist excesses of its leadership, has to cloak its actions with references to the glorious anti-fascist victory of the USSR, “anti-Nazism”, etc., because it owes any power it may hold, to the achievements and legacies of the October Revolution and building of socialism.

The Soviet and later Russian spy, political scientist, diplomat, and politician Yevgeny Primakov<sup>2)</sup> (1929-2015) was the mastermind behind the Russian Federation’s pursuit of foreign policy and diplomacy based on the doctrine of a Russian variant of “multipolarity”, the operational/military version of which is known today as the “Gerasimov doctrine” (after the Russian Chief of the General Staff, General Valery Gerasimov).

- Pursuit of a “multipolar world” governed by a group of independent powerful states, capable of counterbalancing the unipolar power of the USA.
- Seeking to regain control of the post-Soviet space, playing in it the role of a pole of re-coalescence and integration of countries it influences and inspires.
- Highlighting and strengthening in geopolitical terms Russia’s “Eurasian role” in Central Asia and beyond.
- In this context, it is necessary to establish close alliance relations with Asian countries (especially China, India, Iran, etc.), capable of bringing forth the weakening of Euro-Atlantic economic and monetary dominance in the global economy and the international division of labour, as well as strengthening tendencies of

coalescence within the EU.

- It is of vital importance to prevent further expansion and strengthening of NATO in its periphery, by activating military-technical or even military operational measures of power projection and deterrence.

There are two versions or aspects of narratives about “multipolarity”:

1. The first is confirmatory, pointing out the situation in which there is no singular dominant pole, or two of them with undisputed power, but a situation of uncertainty in which a few existing or even potentially rising poles — centres of power — emerge as coexisting, competing, or cooperating.

2. Of an ethical and/or practical political nature: “multipolarity”, as a desirable idealised state of affairs or even as “strategy”.

The 1st version (confirmatory in character) contains, in my opinion, the rational core of this argumentation: it ascertains, captures some moments of an ongoing process, even if it does so in a static, fragmented, and disjointed way, without scientifically examining where, why, and how this process came about and without being able to make a scientific prediction of where this situation is going to lead.

First of all, we must point out that no complex developmental process exists in the form of a steady state, as any kind of static “multipolarity”. This is particularly true of society as the most complex system which constitutes an organic whole.

Any organic whole — no matter how multifactorial the context of the preceding or even contemporary reality within and from which it emerges — may well include various trends and dynamic directions of further development, however, in the course of the developmental process itself, these diverse tendencies converge until they are polarised as components of a fundamental antithetical dipole which gives rise to its development, a moving and driving contradiction, which constitutes the law-governed basis of its self-development. This is the fundamental contradiction of the system from

which all further derivative contradictions arise.

Therefore, in the process of the scientific research and the dialectical reconstitution in the cognition of the structure and history of society as a developing (organic) whole, any partial existence of a forming diversity of poles and contradictions can only constitute a historical moment of the early stages of a new whole being formed, with its own essential contradiction.

Therefore, both versions of the “multipolarity” narratives mentioned above are highly unscientific, limited, static and restrictive. Both the approach which regards “multipolarity” in a confirmatory way as a given and unchangeable state of affairs, and the one which perceives it as an ideal and insurmountable future prospect, as an imperative to which the development process must be directed towards, as a ... “strategic goal of the anti-imperialist movement”.

Therefore, if there is a rational core to the multitude of views on multipolarity, it is at best reduced to the static confirmation, pointing out the existence of various poles, at some stage of their development process.

And in the case where multipolarity is perceived as a moral/political and ethical principle, as some kind of ideal, or — even worse — as some kind of strategy the pursuit of which is asserted as a basic strategic purpose of an anti-imperialist movement, it is certain that if such an extremely short-sighted, vague and disorienting goal of this kind is adopted, it will ultimately have disastrous consequences for the movement. In any case, the multipolarity narratives, however “realistic” they may seem to some, are highly unhistorical, undialectical, and therefore, unscientific, and ungrounded.

Of course, in terms of the discourse articulated by institutions of foreign policy and diplomacy, certain versions of a desirable “multipolarity” may have a certain resonance and functionality. In the case of those who evangelise a world in which there will no longer be unipolarity, supremacy and domination on a planetary scale of, say, a coalition of coercion headed by the United States as the “sole

superpower having claims”, the functionality of this narrative has some meaning, some significance in tactical terms. This significance could be expressed in slogans along the lines of: “Down with the imperialist aggression of the US-led axis!”

In any case, however, the insistence on “multipolarity” as a strategic horizon indicates a tendency and attitude in which the weaker pole or poles, the “cheated” ones in the present balance of power, claim a better position for themselves in the future order of society or even beg for this position, in cooperation with other weaker and “cheated” peers. So, if the discourse of multipolarity is articulated in this context, it is a rather short-sighted and shallow move to ideologically frame tactical objectives, which in no way could constitute a strategic perspective of an anti-imperialist movement with a revolutionary impetus and objective.

This clearly pertains to the multipolarity beliefs and rhetoric of the official political and propaganda discourse of the newly formed, current ruling class in Russia.

Here I am not even referring to those shades of “multipolarity” ideologies that are organically and overtly linked not only to versions of mysticism, obscurantism, regression, and reaction, but also to versions of fascist practices and ideologies. Indicatives are the cases of the pursuit of the constitution of geopolitically significant centres/poles based on reactionary tendencies that are more akin with conspiracy theories, such as “anti-globalism”, “conservative values”, ecclesiastical and theological structures of orthodoxy, pan-Slavism<sup>3</sup>, pan-Turkism, every nationalist “great idea”, etc. The pursuit of e.g., the establishment of a pole of this “multipolarity” based on “national Russian exclusivity”, the “Russian idea”, a metaphysical “special mission of the Russian people”, the “Russian idea”, the “Russian world” — and that in a highly multinational state like the present Russian Federation — denotes a nationalist and chauvinist position. Russian nationalism, in a spirit of conservatism and reaction that feeds national

division, cannot be posited as the counterpoint to the russophobic hysteria of imperialism.

Versions of the “multipolarity” discourse can also be observed in declarations of a constitutional character, in official texts of international organisations, such as BRICS, the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation (SCO), the Eurasian Economic Union (EEU) and other alternative coalitions in the present historical context.

A similar rhetoric is often expressed with regard to the foreign policy of the PR of China, in full conformity with the foreign economic policy model adopted by this early-socialist country at the international level. In all these cases we must take into account the specificity of the international policy and diplomatic language of various countries, which should not be directly confused with the concise scientific and ideological equipment of the anti-imperialist revolutionary movement.

### **Ethical and moral aspects of “multipolarity”**

Does “multipolarity” have anything to do with justice?

Justice is a concept that touches on aspects of ethics, politics, and law. The concepts of good and evil are placed at a higher level of generalisation and abstraction, allowing the formulation of moral judgments about certain moral phenomena as a whole. In contrast to the concepts of good and evil, which morally characterise certain phenomena (attitudes, behaviours, acts, actions, steps, initiatives, omissions, inaction, and so on), justice characterises more specifically the interrelation of certain phenomena, or even the overall assessment of the state of society at any given time, in terms of the interrelation and distribution of good and evil in the relations between people. In this light, through the concepts of justice and injustice, people assess the totality of the social conditions of their existence and form their perception of the need and desirability of maintaining or changing these conditions.

Under the prism of justice, the ways of

distribution among people of goods in scarcity (e.g. of optimal access in terms of quantity and quality to material goods and services for the satisfaction first of all of biological needs, of optimal access to creative activities that lead to the development of the individual and to the acquisition of culture) are examined. It concerns therefore the way people relate to each other, mediated by access or not to desirable and contested goods. It also concerns the global dimension of the economy and inter-state relations, the relations of exploitation, domination, and subordination on a planetary scale.

From this point of view, if this access is unequal, i.e., as long as the existence of exploitation of man by man is historical necessity, injustice prevails and the prospect of the elimination of this exploitation projects itself as the prospect of justice. However, the objective conditions of this prospect, which arise, are formed and mature historically, are realised in corresponding conceptions of justice. The latter are divided, they differ and clash, to the extent that the material interests of individuals, groups (classes), countries, groups of countries and society, of humanity as a whole, are divided, differ and clash, while the respective dominant conception of justice, is consolidated and internalised at the level of everyday practice within the dominant relations, but in general, it is also imposed by the institutions of the dominant material interests as a pseudo-generic justice, which supposedly expresses the whole of society (through law, institutions, etc., but also by invoking “national interests”, international and/or “universal”, “democratic”, “anti-authoritarian” principles, values, institutions, etc.).

These perceptions change historically and regionally. For example, in antiquity, slavery was seen as the natural state of slaves (according to Aristotle, “speaking tools”), while feudalism and serfdom were considered in their decline by the rising bourgeoisie to be an unjust and undignified anachronism that deserved to be overthrown.

Until recently, the neo-colonialist super-exploitation of peoples by imperialism was

considered an “insurmountable normality”. However, with the escalation of WWII, the anti-imperialist/anti-neo-colonialist sentiments of hundreds of millions of people on the planet are beginning to snowball as a claim for justice and dignity in international economic relations.

From a certain point of view, justice can be projected and function as the moral dimension of the respective conditions and limits of the consent of the underprivileged, of those subjected to exploitation, oppression, or (when these tolerable limits are exceeded, which is perceived as social injustice, corruption, and so on) of the claim to change their conditions of existence. In the latter case, we have clear symptoms of the manifestation, on a mass scale and at the level of everyday consciousness, of the moral decay and bankruptcy of historically obsolete economic and social relations and institutions, but also of the balance of power that is radically changing.

However, provided that revolutionary Marxist-Leninists do not wish to indulge in abstract moralism and arbitrary deontological constructions from a safe distance, they do not confine themselves to philosophical reformulations of the experiences that cause the above symptoms in the subjects of everyday consciousness, nor to schemes outside of the historical place and time, as if they were timelessly unchanging “principles and values”. Abstract ideas, understood as an unhistorical self-righteousness, and feelings of justice cannot replace the theoretical (philosophical and interdisciplinary) investigation of the actual possibilities and the law-governed necessity of a way out of the social deadlocks experienced by people as conditions of injustice at the local, national, and global level. They cannot be a substitute for the struggle to achieve the tactical and strategic goals of the real revolutionary movement.

The bourgeois conception of justice is linked to formal equality (egalitarianism) and natural law theories. In the bourgeois “neoliberal” ideologies of “unadulterated meritocracy” and in the practices of post-modernist identity and rights politics, the

complete degeneration of the demands of the rising bourgeoisie for equality, justice and freedom is manifested today. The neoliberal revision of bourgeois values that is predominant today is manifested with such extreme social minimalism that it not only renounces the prospect of social revolution, anti-imperialism and any radical demands of the working class and the people, but also renounces any positive definition of the fight against injustice, inequality and oppression, from every positive platform, means and ways of making demands, from every concrete interconnection of revolutionary tactics and strategy. It is limited to negatively critiquing the conditions that led to the consolidation of the now undisputed inequality and oppression, or to the conditions of their reformation in order to ensure consensus with the strategic choices of the financial oligarchy. Modern opportunism and revisionism operate in a similar way.

#### **Some practical conclusions on ideological intervention and propaganda in the anti-imperialist movement**

In the case where “multipolarity” is put forward as an ideal, an expectation of a more just world or, in any case, of a framework for more just international relations, then it is linked to deontological thought and to a certain moral ideal, to some notions of justice based on a certain sense of right.

In this respect, people and groups of people who begin to understand injustice on a primitive level, even in terms borrowed from “multipolar” narratives, are welcome into the movement.

However, there is no reason to maintain and reproduce this static, limited, and restrictive level of awareness as it is, nor is there any reason for it to be promoted as the central concern and purpose of the movement.

Any perception of the people that even partially, even in a static way, reflects the sense of injustice from the dominant regime of imperialism, which is now endangering humanity, can be a certain basis, a starting point for their rallying in our frontal

anti-imperialist struggle. But this is not enough. The catalytic intervention of communists armed with scientific revolutionary theory is required to achieve further radicalisation of the perceptions and dispositions of these people.

In any case, this sense of justice is organically linked to the position and condition of some who are or feel wronged or even “cheated” in the international division of labour, positions, and roles, in the global hierarchy of countries and regions. In this sense, even as a framework of protest expressing this sense of right, the rhetoric of “multipolarity” is extremely shallow and pessimistic if it is ever to become a frame of reference capable of inspiring an anti-imperialist movement with a certain perspective. In its narratives, this rhetoric takes as given by default the conditions and limits of the state of a certain type of transitional international relations on the planet. It moves by definition in the realm of hetero-definition, a negative identification with the old world, with the declining and waning imperialist unipolarity under the leadership and hegemony of the United States.

The rhetoric of “multipolarity” disorientates from the realisation of the nature of war and the imperative necessity of militant anti-imperialism, trapping consciences in the ideologies of the bourgeois pseudo-science of geopolitics, in the tail of the capitalist class of certain countries. Therefore, it does not and could not constitute a positive project of perspective that could as a strategically oriented purpose stimulate a mass anti-imperialist movement in a revolutionary direction.

...

To the extent that geotectonic power shifts and war continue, this fluidity will be reflected in the existence of various attraction/repulsion movements of poles and centres. Hence, the “multipolarity” views will also be reproduced in various forms. This will continue to happen until — through the conflicts and the revolutionary potential that they gestate — the new transitional crystallisation of the global basic contradiction, together with its derivative essential manifestations,

emerges more clearly in a new stage, in a new contradictory dipole, with the forces of the pole of socialism and its anti-imperialist allies strengthened in breadth and depth (extensively and intensively), in the event that it emerges victorious from the conflict.

This conflict of the WWII, which has resulted from radical qualitative and essential changes in the content, forms and acting subjects involved in the resolution of the crux of the contradictions of the time and the conjuncture, in turn, catalytically counteracts all these variables, accelerating, widening and deepening the transformations and projections of the subjects involved.

The rapid resurgence of a new unprecedented wave of anti-imperialism, now capable of dynamically and drastically nullifying to a large extent the potential for super-exploitation of the majority of the world's population by the imperialist powers (through the siphoning off of enormous surplus value, through various and multiply mediated mechanisms of neo-colonial super-exploitation through the extraction of monopoly super-profits), it is also significantly upgraded through new alliances, coalitions and integrations of an alternative type. The rapid expansion of BRICS at their recent 15th summit in South Africa alone is indicative of the quantitative changes that are now becoming qualitative and essential. We are no longer talking about a numerical aggregation of countries, populations, sizes, economic and military powers, but about a qualitative and substantial leap in the formation of a new pole-centre, i.e., a new subject-in-the-making with a decisive role in the global development process.

These trends are extremely encouraging. However, the revolutionary movement has no room for groundless over-optimism and complacency while life-or-death conflicts are escalating.

The history of early socialism and 20th century anti-imperialism has shown that the viability of the revolutionary camp depends directly on the interrelation of revolutionary and counter-revolutionary forces in the global revolutionary

process.

In this correlation, the role of the camp of the socialist countries, the extent and depth of the consolidation of the socialist transformations within them, and the degree of their constitution as a collective historical subject are catalytic and decisive.

The degree of their constitution as a collective historical subject is in turn a function of the level of economic integration and internationalisation of socialist relations of production, the degree of collective subordination of their societies to scientific planning, and therefore of their monolithic unity in the face of the remaining lethal forces of shrinking imperialism.

The historical experience of the 20th century has shown that the camp of early socialism was clearly inferior to the imperialist camp, both in terms of its forces and in the degree of integration of socialist economies and societies compared to imperialism. Unfortunately, the "multipolarity" within the socialist camp (with disruptive tendencies that even reached the point of warlike inter-alliance conflicts, and even with elements of nationalist geopolitics) played an undermining and disintegrating role, contributing to the discrediting of socialism and the well-known phenomena of counter-revolutions at the end of the 20th century.

Only with a qualitative and substantial upgrade (a radical broadening and deepening) of the socialist camp as a leading pole will the upgrade of the anti-imperialist camp be achieved, the pulling power of which will strengthen the world/historical tendency of the "non-capitalist mode of development" with a clear socialist orientation for the countries that break the shackles of imperialist neo-colonial dependence.

In this way, through the victorious advance, military or peaceful, of the revolutionary pole (socialist and anti-imperialist), the process of the early socialist revolutions will be completed and revolutionary processes will be launched in the developed capitalist countries as well, in the centres of imperialism, since the financial oligarchy, having



lost its sources of parasitism, will no longer be able to use the resources of monopoly superprofits to manipulate the working class in its countries of origin (through bribery, deception, divisions and brute force).

Then socialism will begin to develop (sublating the capitalist and pre-capitalist remnants, free from external sabotage and interference) on its own (scientific-technical, productive, and cultural) basis and will move rapidly towards communism, towards the maturity of society, towards a unified humanity.

Then the time will come for the mature and late socialist revolutions, with the victory of which the ground for any trace of “multipolar” phases and conceptions will have disappeared, since capitalism and all exploitative relations will have been eliminated from the historical arena.

No ideological construct of “multipolarity” is even capable of putting the complexity of this dialectic of strategic and tactical goals on a rational scientific basis.

These tasks call for a conscious struggle for the qualitative and essential theoretical, practical, and organisational upgrading of the world anti-imperialist and communist revolutionary movement, which confirms the strategic importance of achieving the aims of the World Anti-Imperialist Platform.

## Notes

1) Multiple mediation, in dialectical logic and methodology of scientific research, refers to the type of connections, relations and interactions that characterise the contradictory complexity of a system that constitutes an organic whole. These are non-linear, complex, multi-level, contradictory, obscured, not directly visible on the surface, connections the investigation of which requires systematic scientific research. e.g. For some, the mere fact of the existence of formally independent states in Africa, is evidence of the absence of imperialist dependence, overexploitation, etc. while ignoring the profound and multiply mediated mechanisms of surplus value extraction in the form of monopoly superprofits, unequal exchange, overpricing and underpricing, loan agreements, currency manipulation, government takeovers, extortion, regime change, arms programmes, foreign bases, military interventions, etc. that are typical of neo-colonialism.

2) Primakov is ideologically and politically positioned in right-wing social democracy. He sought for Russia a version of capitalism with

state-monopoly regulation of the Keynesian type. His popularity soared when, as prime minister of the Russian federation and while on his way to an official visit to the United States in 1999, upon learning of US and NATO bombings of Yugoslavia, he instructed the pilot of his aircraft to make a 180° turn over the Atlantic and return to Moscow. It was a cowardly symbolic act of dignity towards the US leadership. A leadership that in its unbridled arrogance had staged the complete national humiliation, the international vilification of counter-revolutionary Russia also on a symbolic level: with the media coverage of the official presence of the Russian Prime Minister alongside the coverage of the bombing of the fraternal for the Russian people Yugoslavia! Of course, it would have been of much greater value — and not only symbolic but mainly practical — if Mr. Primakov had allowed the then President of Belarus, Lukashenko, to deliver some S-300 anti-aircraft anti-ballistic missile batteries to the heroic Yugoslavia, which would have practically prevented an attack on it by the Western powers. However, Russia's leadership at the time was far from adopting a dignified defence policy even at that level.

3) An internet search of the word “multipolarity”, as a rule, leads to the notorious irrational “philosopher” Aleksandr Dugin. Evidently, we are dealing with aggressive marketing over-promoting this version of eclectic beliefs of a fascist hue, at the heart of which is consistently anti-Sovietism/anti-communism, the resurrection of reactionary doctrines of 18th-19th century slavophiles, a primitive version of Russian nationalism, mysticism of orthodoxy and the projection of Russia as the bearer of a metaphysical mission of “Eurasianism”. The connections of these circles with the terrorist Nazi organisation “Golden Dawn” in Greece and with a multitude of far-right, nationalist, and fascist groups from Turkey and many other countries are anything but accidental. As long as some people base their “anti-imperialism” and their disposition for “independence” on bourgeois geopolitical narratives of “multipolarity” on the resurrection of the obscurantist “Eurasian” mysticism of the 19th century, seeking “philosophical depth” in the irrational fascist ravings such as Dugin's, they are practically paving the way to fascism!

# Disappearing context: West created and backed Ukrainian fascists for 85 years

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

25 June 2022

*The Azov battalion did not appear out of nowhere; fascism has been the imperialist tool of choice in Ukraine since the 1930s.*

For those trying to understand the situation in Ukraine, one particularly important piece of context worthy of closer examination is the role of Nazis in the west's policy in the country for 85 years.

While imperialist politicians and media are keen to downplay the existence and role of fascists in the country, routinely whitewashing them or disappearing them from view, it has become abundantly clear to all who care to see that they are a significant and increasingly dominant force. But how could that have happened in a formerly socialist republic?

On 5 March this year, the Manchester Evening News published an interview with a 98-year-old Ukrainian living in Britain titled: 'He fought Stalin ... now this Ukrainian hero doesn't know if his nephew has been killed in combat' (the online version was later taken down). Included in the article was a heartrending account of old timer Iwan Kluka's fears for his nephew's safety and the interviewer's gushing description of him as "the most remarkable man I've ever met".

Not included was the information that the nice old uncle must have been an active Nazi collaborator — one of the thousands who fought alongside their leader Stepan Bandera as part of the German Wehrmacht. In fact, the Ukrainian (more specifically, the Galician) section of the SS was famous for being even more brutal than the rest of that notoriously psychopathic organisation.

Ukraine felt the full force of Germany's

Operation Barbarossa invasion of the USSR in 1941, and experienced the ruthless brutality of the Nazi scorched-earth occupation that followed. Thousands of towns and villages were completely razed, their entire populations massacred with the aim of 'making space' for German settler expansion ('lebensraum') and wiping out the Slavic 'untermensch' (subhumans).

In the seismic conflagration that followed, of the 27 million Soviet people who died defending their socialist motherland, between 8 and 10 million died in Ukraine alone.

## **Counter-revolutionary remnants embrace fascism with enthusiasm**

Many of Ukraine's Nazis were remnants of the forces that had fought against the Red Army during the civil war and war of intervention that followed the 1917 October Revolution. Fanatical anti-Bolshevism had always been their guiding ideology, as had antisemitism, and pogroms against both revolutionaries and jews were their stock-in-trade from the beginning.

Both civil war leader Symon Petliura and his ideological successor Stepan Bandera (leader of the Nazi-allied Organisation of Ukrainian Nationalists), were rabid antisemites whose regimes massacred tens of thousands of jewish Ukrainians. Both have been deified in modern Ukraine as 'fathers of the nation' and are presented in the west as democrats of the first order.

According to the World Socialist Website, Petliura's brief anticommunist regime in Kiev in 1919 was responsible for the murder of 30,000 jews. Twenty-two years later, Bandera's SS thugs likewise led pogroms in Nazi-occupied Ukraine, rounding

up and massacring as many Jews as they could find.

Documentary evidence relating to the Wehrmacht's advance into Ukraine in 1941 reveals that about 140 pogroms were perpetrated by Bandera-ites in western Ukraine in just the first few days of Operation Barbarossa. Between 13,000 and 35,000 Jews were murdered in the last days of June 1941, while OUN-B propaganda director Stepan Lenkavski called for the physical extermination of Ukrainian Jewry.

Meanwhile, such was their reputation for viciousness that the Nazis "used their Ukrainian collaborators to commit murders and acts of brutality that were too disturbing even for the SS units. For example, SS task force 4a in Ukraine confined itself to 'the shooting of adults while commanding its Ukrainian helpers to shoot [the] children'."

But our western liberal media and politicians, so sensitive to the tiniest hint of linguistic 'anti-semitism' from any opponent of the status quo, are totally uninterested in the actual performance of the most bloody acts of antisemitism carried out in its service.

To paraphrase Karl Marx's famous description of the English established Church: The imperialists will more readily pardon an attack on 99 of their 100 high moral precepts than on 1/100th of their global looting. Genocide itself is *culpa levis* (a minor sin) as compared with a criticism of imperialist financial interests ...

### **Fascism the favoured tool of imperialism in eastern Europe**

The ultranationalists who happily adopted outright fascist ideology during the rise of the German Third Reich (and have never dropped it since) continued to be the favoured tool of western imperialism in trying to subvert and overthrow Soviet power in Ukraine.

Not only were they used by British imperialists between the wars, and by the German imperialists during WW2, but the Ukrainian Nazis were once again adopted by the USA and Britain at

the end of the second world war (even as it was still being fought, in fact) and sponsored to continue a guerrilla war against the socialist government and people of Ukraine (and in Poland) for some years after the war in Europe had officially been declared over.

After the epic defeat of German forces at Stalingrad, with Hitler's armies on the retreat, Bandera-ite forces regrouped as the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA) in 1943, armed with German weapons and inspired by the Nazi ideology of creating a 'pure' Ukrainian state.

"In 1943 and 1944, the UPA organised massacres that claimed the lives of 90,000 Poles and thousands of Jews. It also brutally terrorised, tortured and executed Ukrainian peasants and workers who wanted to join the Soviet Union. The UPA went on to kill some 20,000 Ukrainians before the insurrection was completely crushed in 1953." (WSWS)

British and American secret services were already supplying these 'opponents' before the end of WW2, and fuelling the ongoing civil war became the CIA's first large-scale project to destabilise the Soviet Union.

As the Manchester Evening News interview unwittingly highlighted, thousands of members of the defeated UPA were brought to the USA, west Germany, Canada and Britain at the end of the war, against the wishes of the Soviet Union, which wanted to try them for their crimes. Initially, they came as 'prisoners of war', but they were later simply absorbed as 'displaced European workers'.

Although living in the west, these Ukrainian fascists were encouraged to keep alive their 'traditions' and to bring up the next generation in hopes of a revival of their cause's fortunes. Thus Iwan Kluka and his compatriots founded the still-thriving 'Ukrainian club' in Glossop — part of a well-funded network of such clubs across Britain.

Absorbed into the west, the Ukrainians' Nazi affiliations were whitewashed and many were integrated (often via the CIA and MI6) into academia and the media in order to rewrite their

history as ‘democratic freedom fighters’. They also helped to locate conduits for smuggling anti-Soviet propaganda into Ukraine.

### **A ready-made pro-imperialist force**

It was therefore no difficult matter for the imperialists to reintroduce and support the creation and resurrection of far-right groups in Ukraine after the collapse of the Soviet Union. They also provided substantial funding to facilitate the process of rehabilitating Ukrainian Nazi war criminals after 1991 — in official history, in academia, in school curriculums, in popular culture and in the media generally.

A special commission set up in 2000 and another in 2005 whitewashed the history of Ukraine’s Nazis, preparing the ground for a law that gave parity to the war records of veterans of the antifascist Red Army and stormtroopers of the fascist OUN/UPA. This law was passed by the west-backed coup government of Viktor Yushchenko after the so-called ‘Orange revolution’ (i.e., imperialist-backed coup) brought him to power at the end of 2004. It was also at this time that the leaders of the fascist party Svoboda first entered the Ukrainian government.

Since then, fascists and fascist sympathisers have been integrated into every part of the Ukrainian state, from the parliament and government to the media, cultural institutions and the army. Thousands of militants have trained in the ranks of the notorious Azov battalion (allegedly independent of the state but increasingly dominating it) before moving on into the ranks of the Ukrainian national army.

In this way, while Azov itself is not that big (although at its peak it was far bigger than any normal battalion of several hundred men, and even than a regiment of several thousand), its influence on the state and on the military is enormous.

Swedish historian Per Anders Rudling described Ukraine’s atmosphere in 2013: “The hegemonic nationalist narrative is reflected also in academia, where the line between ‘legitimate’

scholarship and ultranationalist propaganda is often blurred. Mainstream book stores often carry holocaust denial and antisemitic literature, some of which finds its way into the academic mainstream.”

While the fascists have been able to create a significant base of support amongst the impoverished Ukrainian speakers in the west — in their traditional stronghold of Lviv in particular but also in Kiev — they have had much less success in the east, home to most of Ukraine’s ethnically Russian population and to the industrial heartlands of the Soviet era, whose people played such a major role as Red Army fighters and partisans in the WW2 fight against fascism.

Those identifying today as ethnically Russian are depicted by the Bandera-ites as ‘eastern mongols’ and ‘Orcs’ (i.e., subhuman), as opposed to Ukrainians in the west, who they claim are ‘pure Europeans’. This fascistic racial profiling is openly stated on their media and increasingly becoming state policy (insofar as there is such a thing as a Ukrainian state any more), but seems to provoke no particular outrage in the allegedly antiracist ‘liberal’ west.

Meanwhile, among other historical events, the leaders of Svoboda publicly celebrate the founding of the Galician division of the SS (describing it as “the pride of our nation”) and the Nazi invasion of Ukraine (Operation Barbarossa).

One younger party ideologist Yuri Mykhalchyshyn from Lviv founded a right-wing think tank back in 2005 that he initially named after Nazi propaganda chief Josef Goebbels. In his writings, he has openly referred to the “heroic” legacy of fascists including Stepan Bandera and has described the holocaust as a “bright episode in European civilisation”. (Nationalism and fascism in Ukraine: A historical overview by Konrad Kreft and Clara Weiss, WSWS, 10 June 2014)

### **The EuroMaidan and its aftermath**

The coup of 2014 was, as in 2004, organised primarily by the CIA and was carried out in order

to replace (again!) the government of Viktor Yanukovich, who (again!) had been elected on a platform of retaining friendly economic and political relations with both east and west. His government had refused at the last minute to sign humiliating and punitive trade deals and loan agreements with the European Union and the IMF.

For this declaration of independence, Yanukovich was forced from office and into exile at the point of a gun, Ukraine's parliament was sacked and violent fascist-led protestors occupied Kiev's streets. Their west-trained snipers shot policemen and passers-by and their riotous thugs were given PR treatment (and cookies!) by western media and politicians, who described them as 'pro-democracy protestors'.

The result of this intervention was the installation of a government of kleptocratic stooges to facilitate the west's total takeover of Ukraine's economy, territory and resources.

It is in this context that we must understand the moves for independence, autonomy and liberation that were instigated by Ukrainians in the east of the country in response to the imposition of a US-controlled fascist-dominated regime that was determined to reverse the victory in WW2 and to scapegoat Russophone Ukrainians by turning them into second-class citizens in the interests of keeping the population divided and weak while Uncle Sam and co looted what remained of their wealth.

Since the Russian armed forces had a big base in Crimea, Ukraine's various fascist militia were unable to prevent the Crimean people from carrying out a peaceful referendum on their future. Unsurprisingly, they voted overwhelmingly to return to Russia, which they had been part of until Khrushchev transferred the territory to Ukraine in 1954. No one at the time took much notice of this move, since in the fraternally multinational USSR it made no meaningful difference to anybody's life.

Across the Russophone eastern Donbass region, there was mass protests against the coup regime and its implementation of a law removing Russian as an official language of Ukraine. Azov and other fascist militia arrived in force to quell the unrest. In

Odessa, the people's protests were met with a brutal massacre of workers, burned alive in the trade union building while fascists chanted outside and prevented them from leaving.

The eastern port city of Mariupol, home to the massive Azovstal steel works, became the private fiefdom of the Azov thugs, who brutalised the local population and, mafia-style, drew funds from the local economy in any way they could. (The fall of the Azov by Jacob Dreizin, The Duran YouTube channel, 18 May 2022)

In response to these events, the people of the Donetsk and Lugansk areas of the Donbass also held referenda, where they voted for autonomy within Ukraine — in particular for a guarantee of their right to use the Russian language. When the massacres in Odessa and Mariupol forced the people there to capitulate to the coup, their towns were then occupied by fascists, who not only terrorised the local people but also created bases from which to attack the newly-formed autonomous regions, which in turn had no choice but to take up arms if they wanted to avoid the same fate.

The antifascist war that began in Donbass in 2014 carried on for eight years, but was almost entirely disappeared from the western media. There were no fundraisers or ribbons for the refugees, widows and orphans. There were certainly no demands to 'Arm, arm, arm Donbass', as recent liberal 'antiwar' activists were heard to chant in support of more arms to Ukraine!

While the war was fought enthusiastically by Ukraine's private 'volunteer' fascist paramilitaries, thousands of ordinary conscripted Ukrainians deserted, left the country or switched sides and joined the resistance, taking their arms and equipment with them.

Swiss military expert Jacques Baud has pointed out in this regard that: "According to a British Home Office report, in the March/April 2014 recall of reservists, 70 percent did not show up for the first session, 80 percent for the second, 90 percent for the third, and 95 percent for the fourth. In

October/November 2017, 70 percent of conscripts did not show up for the autumn recall campaign. This is not counting suicides and desertions (often over to the autonomists), which reached up to 30 percent of the workforce in the ATO area.

“Young Ukrainians refused to go and fight in the Donbass and preferred emigration, which also explains, at least partially, the demographic deficit of the country.” (The military situation in the Ukraine, The Postil magazine, 1 April 2022, our emphasis)

By 2020, ‘independent’ paramilitaries (i.e., private armies answering to various west-backed oligarchs and ultimately to imperialist commanders) made up 40 percent of Ukrainian armed forces, numbering 102,000 men who had been armed, trained financed by the USA, Britain, Canada and France. They included in their ranks large numbers of foreign fighters, thugs and mercenaries from at least 19 different countries.

While the integration of fascists into the Ukrainian state machine and armed forces has been facilitated and accelerated since the 2014 coup, fascist paramilitaries like Azov have been used to train not only Ukrainian Nazis but also fascist thugs from all over Europe and north America.

In fact, the Ukrainian state has been revealed as having no meaningful existence outside the various CIA-controlled institutions, and no control over the country. Very aptly did John Pilger describe post-Maidan Ukraine as a “CIA theme park” in 2014. (In Ukraine, the US is dragging us towards war with Russia, The Guardian, 13 May 2014)

Like post-invasion Libya, the territory had become a place where the USA in particular felt it could do as it pleased with no oversight, whether that be setting up unsupervised biowarfare labs, looting Ukraine’s agriculture and industry, or creating a world base for the arming and training of white supremacist cannon fodder. (Misanthropic Division, FOIA Research, 6 January 2019)

As with Isis and Libya in the middle east, the repercussions are likely to be deadly, and to be felt across Europe and America for decades to come.

### **Airbrushing Nazis today**

So fascists have been backed, armed, trained and given propaganda cover in Ukraine by the imperialist powers since well before WW2. First as a tool against the USSR and more recently as a tool against capitalist Russia, whose size, resources and military capability made its aim of economic independence a huge threat to the imperialist west, and to US hegemony in particular. (Joti Brar, The Drive to War Against Russia and China, 2017)

This policy has never materially changed. The imperialists still want to weaken and if possible balkanise and destroy Russia. They still want to loot Ukraine and use it as a tool in their war against Russia. And they continue to make full use of their Nazi proxies in Ukraine for all these purposes.

The Nazis we see in Ukraine today didn’t pop up spontaneously in 2014 or even in 2004. They have been a continuous force above and underground in the country, many in exile in the west during the cold war period, and they have owed their existence throughout to foreign backers, who have helped them to stir up racial hatred and to convince a sizeable section of the population in the west of the country that Russia and the Russian people are their enemy and that all their problems would be solved if a west-aligned and ‘pure’ Ukraine could be created, cleansed of their polluting presence.

Launching the special military operation on 24 February this year, President Vladimir Putin gave three objectives for Russia’s operation: “demilitarise” Ukraine (i.e., remove its ability to act as a Nato proxy), “denazify” it, and secure its permanent neutrality.

While we can’t know the details of Russia’s military details, rational commentators have been able to draw conclusions from events as they have unfolded.

Demilitarisation has been approached by the destruction of Ukrainian aviation, air defence systems and reconnaissance assets. By the neutralisation of command and intelligence structures, fuel depots and supply lines. And by

gradually creating a cauldron around the bulk of the Ukrainian army massed in the Southeast of the country.

Denazification is being carried out first and foremost by the destruction and neutralisation of volunteer battalions operating in the cities of Odessa, Kharkov and Mariupol in particular, and by the simple expedient of checking captured soldiers for the Nazi tattoos which fascists seem unable to do without. What further steps will be necessary to remove the fascist threat from Ukraine remains to be seen.

### **Western narrative falling apart**

In response to all this, the west, having failed in its economic war to break Russia's resolve, is relying mainly on PR manipulations to shore up domestic support for its apparently bottomless spending plans.

The Ukraine army's media brigade, its biggest and most well-organised section, is wholly under the control of the CIA, which expertly directs its production and packaging of media-friendly disinformation. The imperialists are making full use of their dominance and control of cyberspace in order to paint a wishful portrait of a popular resistance movement led by an incorruptible hero (Volodymyr Zelensky, don't laugh).

Netflix has even underlined this narrative by airing for western audiences the TV programme in which he played the part of an incorruptible man of humble origin shot into the presidency via his social media following.

Western media carefully hide from our view the fact that it is the Russians who are trying to avoid civilian casualties and the Ukrainians who are using civilian areas and civilian populations as shields, holding people hostage and refusing to let them leave in order to deter Russia from attacking their positions. The Ukrainian military and militias have no qualms about using hospitals, schools, kindergartens etc as bases.

Even the fascists hunkering in the tunnels under the Azov steelworks in Mariupol port were

presented as innocent civilians in the western media — and indeed, they had taken some women and children hostage in order to fuel this narrative.

Meanwhile, the same Azov battalion that was formerly labelled as fascist all over the west, and was previously subject to social media censorship, with posts that glorified it being removed, has become the hero of the hour. On 24 February, Facebook changed its policy and allowed posts favourable to the militia. A week or so later, the same platform authorised calls for the murder of Russian soldiers and leaders in eastern European countries.

It can be hard for the average worker to understand why it should be that our media is telling so many bare-faced lies about Russia and the war in Ukraine. But when we understand that the bastions of our so-called 'free press' are not free at all, but serve big capital, serve imperialist monopoly, whose interests are diametrically opposed to those of workers everywhere, we can begin to understand why they should be deceiving us on such a grand scale.

And as Russia continues to liberate towns from under the fascist jackboot, to capture Azov-affiliated and other war criminals, and to collect evidence for their trials, we can expect to see this latest tissue of lies collapse into ignominy.

As the lies are relentlessly exposed, we can expect the anger of workers in Britain and elsewhere to rise — especially when it is understood how the cost of living crisis that is bringing poverty and hunger to workers everywhere has been wilfully stoked by the reckless imperialist drive to war; by the quest for profit and domination.

# The Character of the War

**Stephen Cho** | Coordinator of the Korean International Forum

Essence and characteristics are different but closely related. Each being or movement has innumerable characteristics, but their essential characteristic is the most important aspect that distinguishes them from one another. In short, essential characteristic corresponds to the ‘What’ of 5W1H (what, who, where, when, why and how). To understand this ‘What’, we need to answer the question of the ‘Why’. ‘What’ and ‘Why’ are the two main components of a goal. Without knowing ‘What’ and ‘Why’, we can never know ‘How’.

War is a struggle. The battle between those waging a just war and those waging an unjust war is one of the starkest class struggles. The highest level of class struggle is a revolutionary war, and the category of revolutionary war includes an anti-imperialist war.

What should we make of the Ukraine war that broke out in eastern Europe in 2022? This is a question about the character of the war in Ukraine. More specifically, a question about its essential character. In other words: what is the war in Ukraine, and why did it happen?

The simple and clear answer is that it is an anti-imperialist and antifascist war, a liberation war, and a preventive war. This describes the war from the anti-imperialist camp’s viewpoint, and directly, from the standpoint of Russia. For Russia’s opponents, the war has the opposite character.

The war in Ukraine is an anti-imperialist and antifascist war. Waged by Russia, it is an anti-imperialist war against imperialist NATO and also an antifascist war against the Ukrainian fascist forces, puppets of imperialist NATO. Russia called the war in Ukraine a ‘special military operation’ at the beginning of the war in February 2022 and revealed three goals: denazification, demilitarization, and protection of its population.

The elimination of the Azov battalion in Mariupol

in May 2022 was an example of the denazification, the seizure of an underground arsenal in Bakhmut in May 2023 was an example of the demilitarization, and the merger of Lugansk, Donetsk, Zaporizhia, and Kherson was an example of protection of the population.

Further, President Putin first referred to the conflict as a “war” in December last year and did so again at the Victory Day ceremony on 9 May this year. While the war in Ukraine appears to be a war between the Russian and Ukrainian armies, but it is in reality a war between Russia and NATO. The actual operational direction of the Ukraine’s military forces lies with NATO, and its soldiers are trained and its weapons are mainly provided by NATO. Other NATO forces are also directly and indirectly involved in the war in Ukraine in various forms and ways, whether as commanders or soldiers. Without NATO’s involvement, the war in Ukraine would have been over long ago. In fact, it would never have started.

The war in Ukraine is a liberation war. It did not begin in 2022 but in 2014. Its roots go as far back as 1991, with the counter-revolution in the Soviet Union and eastern European socialist bloc. Indeed, the imperialist’s plan to use Ukraine against Russia goes back to the 1950s and even earlier.

NATO’s eastward expansion policy since 1991 is one of the root causes of the war in Ukraine, and the Maidan coup in 2014 and the subsequent eight years of fascist genocide against the Russian people is one of the direct causes of the war in Ukraine. Therefore, from Russia’s point of view, the war in Ukraine is a liberation war to free the Russians and the Ukrainian people from fascist and beastly repression.

The war in Ukraine is a preventive war. The imperialist powers have continuously pursued isolation, division, and collapse strategies against



Russia. From the infamous ‘grand chessboard’ strategy of Zbigniew Brzezinski to NATO’s eastward expansion policy and a succession of engineered ‘color revolutions’ to depose independent-minded or Russia-friendly governments in former socialist countries.

In February 2022, NATO was secretly propelling its forces towards a full-scale invasion of the besieged Donbass. Its attack forces were based in Mariupol and spearheaded by the neo-nazi Azov battalion. NATO, which had already invaded and dismantled Yugoslavia in the 1990s, was working on such a plan, so naturally, Russia had no choice but to prepare.

There is a view that defines the war in Ukraine as an interimperialist war. The argument put forward is that Russia is an imperialist country, fighting in Ukraine for colonies and spheres of influence. According to this view, Russia is no different in essence to the imperialist leaders of NATO, namely the United States and western Europe.

This view rests on an unscientific characterization of Russia’s social character, which in turn is based on a wrong understanding of imperialism. The most egregious case of this erroneous reasoning can be found in the theory of the ‘Imperialist Pyramid’ put forward by the Communist Party of Greece (KKE).

Russia is not an imperialist but a capitalist country with lots of socialist heritage. At the beginning of the retreat from socialism to capitalism, under the regime of Boris Yeltsin, Russia even degenerated into a colony of US and European imperialism. Since then, the country has mainly exported resources not capital. Russia is not a country that lives primarily by exporting capital, importing raw materials and plundering colonies for superprofits, quite the reverse.

The relationship between Russia’s politics and economy is also completely different from that of an imperialist country. In Russia, political circles take the initiative above the economic circles. Many companies, especially in the energy sector, are nationalized in Russia, and they implement the

policy of voluntary deviation in which nationalized companies provide cheap supplies to the people and bear their own losses. This is also related to Russia’s socialist heritage.

This is one of the reasons why Russia has not deviated from the line of anti-imperialism even though it is not a communist and internationalist country. Especially in recent years, Russia has joined the unitary anti-imperialist front, along with North Korea and China, and never derailed or wavered from it.

In 2023, the probability of the spread of war in eastern Europe and the outbreak of war in East Asia is rising. In East Asia, Taiwan and South Korea are the most likely places for wars to break out. When the wars materialize, we should call them the Taiwanese War and the South Korean War. An agreement between the President of North Korea Kim Il Sung and the Premier of China Zhou Enlai in 1961 states that when war in either Taiwan or South Korea breaks out, the other will immediately follow. The prerequisite for this agreement is that it has to be an anti-imperialist war. In the current context, it is clear that such a war will have anti-imperialist character. So it can be affirmed that they will happen almost immediately.

The wars in Taiwan and South Korea are anti-imperialist wars, national-liberation wars and national reunification wars. Concretely, a war in South Korea is an anti-imperialist and antifascist war, when we consider the common point with a war in Taiwan, it is an anti-imperialist war.

The wars in Taiwan and South Korea are anti-imperialist wars. They are anti-imperialist wars in which China and North Korea are ostensibly fighting the Taiwanese and South Korean authorities respectively, but in reality they are fighting US imperialism, the true ruling power in Taiwan and South Korea.

The imperialist camp includes Japanese militarism and European imperialism which follow US imperialism. Unlike Taiwan, South Korea is a fascist society. It really has fascist evil laws such as the National Security Act and repressive institutions

such as the National Intelligence Service. The regime of Yoon Suk-yeol is escalating fascistization by repressing political parties and conducting anti-communist campaigns in South Korea. It describes North Korea as the “main enemy”, insisting on its right to make a “preemptive nuclear strike” and holding huge nuclear war exercises one after another.

Recently, it joined in forming the US-Japan-South Korea trilateral military alliance to create an Asian version of the NATO. Clearly, the war in South Korea has a relatively more antifascist character compared to the war in Taiwan, so it should be considered both an anti-imperialist and an antifascist war.

The wars in Taiwan and South Korea are national liberation wars. Taiwan has been one with the Chinese mainland since the middle ages, and currently, only 1-2 percent of Taiwanese are ethnically Taiwan aboriginal. The vast majority of Taiwan's people are Chinese. Meanwhile, Korea has been a single nation for over 5,000 years.

The war in Taiwan is a national-liberation war to free the Chinese people living in Taiwan from the domination of foreign imperialist powers. The war in Korea is a typical national-liberation war aimed at establishing the sovereignty of the Korean nation on a nationwide scale, not only in the north but also in the south, driving out the US army that entered South Korea as an occupying force in September 1945, and finally achieving the national liberation that was left incomplete in August 1945.

The wars in Taiwan and South Korea are national reunification wars. Taiwan and South Korea are the targets of the reunification, which is at the very heart of the both China's and North Korea's core interests. Taiwan was separated from the Chinese mainland when Chiang Kai-shek fled to Taiwan, and South Korea was divided from the north by the US occupying forces. The people in Taiwan and South Korea have as a result had to suffer the pain of division for more than 70 years.

There is no more important task or need for the Chinese and Koreans than resolving this issue of

their countries' division. There are many ethnic nations in the world that have been divided by foreign powers, and Korea is a representative example. That is why the war in Korea will be a representative national reunification war.

North Korea describes the war in South Korea as the “South Korean Liberation War”. This reflects North Korea's recognition that it had already been liberated on 15 August 1945 and its determination to complete the victory that was only partially achieved on 27 July 1953. This concept also implies a national-liberation war and a national reunification war. Thus, the concept of the South Korean Liberation War centres on the goal of the war rather than the target of the war — that is, national liberation and national reunification rather than anti-imperialism and antifascism.

Anti-imperialist, antifascist, liberation, preventive, national-liberation and national reunification wars are all just wars. The character of the war is defined depending on one's position. In this respect, for Marxists and anti-imperialists, the just character of these wars is historically, morally and scientifically proven and undeniable.

As we know, WW1 was an interimperialist war, WW2 was an antifascist war. Following the war in Ukraine, if wars break out in Taiwan and South Korea, WW3 will be in full swing. The common point of the wars in Ukraine, Taiwan, South Korea is that they are anti-imperialist wars. Absolutely, WW3, the anti-imperialist war, is a just war as like WW2, the antifascist war.

A just war may not necessarily be won, but political and moral superiority is undoubtedly one of the main factors that assist in it towards victory. If you have the way and means to achieve the goal of justice — namely, a strong army and exceptional operations — the chances of victory are close to perfection. And if the goal of justice is achieved, humanity has the opportunity to take a great leap forward.