

Platform

May 2024 No.12

The World Anti-imperialist Platform

A stylized illustration of a woman with dark hair, wearing a light-colored long-sleeved shirt, holding a large, dark red flag aloft with her right arm. The background is a solid red color. The illustration is rendered in a flat, graphic style with some shading to suggest form and movement.





Contents

| | |
|----------------|--|
| Work | <p>Dead Chauvinism and Living Socialism—How the International Can Be Restored ······2 V.I. Lenin</p> |
| Article | <p>Bourgeois Democracy and Fascism ······7 Harpal Brar Communist Party of Great Britain (Marxist-Leninist)</p> <p>Germany and Europe are gearing up for major wars ······20 Max Kommunistische Organisation (Germany)</p> <p>Philosophy of ideology of the XXI century civilization ······27 Klara Azhybekova Communist Party of Kyrgyzstan</p> <p>The political stance of the Communist Party of Greece... a communist stance? ······33 Chilean Communist Party (Proletarian Action)</p> <p>The destruction of fascism in 1945 as a legacy for the defeat of the present axis of the USA–NATO-EU! ······38 Dimitrios Patelis Revolutionary Unification (Greece)</p> <p>‘Stop the boats!’ The political football of the ‘immigration debate’ in Britain ··47 Joti Brar Communist Party of Great Britain (Marxist-Leninist)</p> <p>The most important feature of the “New Cold War” ······54 Stephen Cho Coordinator of the Korean International Forum</p> |

Dead Chauvinism and Living Socialism —How the International Can Be Restored

V.I. Lenin

December 1914

For decades, German Social-Democracy was a model to the Social-Democrats of Russia, even somewhat more than to the Social-Democrats of the whole world. It is therefore clear that there can be no intelligent, i.e., critical, attitude towards the now prevalent social-patriotism or “socialist” chauvinism, without a most precise definition of one’s attitude towards German Social-Democracy. What was it in the past? What is it today? What will it be in the future?

A reply to the first of these questions may be found in *Der Weg zur Macht*, a pamphlet written by K. Kautsky in 1909 and translated into many European languages. Containing a most complete exposition of the tasks of our times, it was most advantageous to the German Social-Democrats (in the sense of the promise they held out), and moreover came from the pen of the most eminent writer of the Second International. We shall recall the pamphlet in some detail; this will be the more useful now since those forgotten ideals are so often barefacedly cast aside.

Social-Democracy is a “revolutionary party” (as stated in the opening sentence of the pamphlet), not only in the sense that a steam engine is revolutionary, but “also in another sense”. It wants conquest of political power by the proletariat, the dictatorship of the proletariat. Heaping ridicule on “doubters of the revolution”, Kautsky writes: “In any important movement and uprising we must, of course, reckon with the possibility of defeat. Prior to the struggle, only a fool can consider himself quite certain of victory.” However, to refuse to consider the possibility of victory would be “a direct betrayal of our cause”. A revolution in connection with a war, he says, is possible both during and after a war. It is impossible to determine at which particular

moment the sharpening of class antagonisms will lead to revolution, but, the author continues, “I can quite definitely assert that a revolution that war brings in its wake, will break out either during or immediately after the war”; nothing is more vulgar, we read further, than the theory of “the peaceful growing into socialism”. “Nothing is more erroneous,” he continues, “than the opinion that a cognition of economic necessity means a weakening of the will The will, as a desire for struggle,” he says, “is determined, first, by the price of the struggle, secondly, by a sense of power, and thirdly, by actual power.” When an attempt was made, incidentally by *Vorwärts*, to interpret Engels’s famous preface to *The Class Struggles in France* in the meaning of opportunism, Engels became indignant, and called shameful any assumption that he was a “peaceful worshipper of legality at any price”.^[1] “We have every reason to believe,” Kautsky goes on to say, “that we are entering upon a period of struggle for state power.” That struggle may last for decades; that is something we do not know, but “it will in all probability bring about, in the near future, a considerable strengthening of the proletariat, if not its dictatorship, in Western Europe”. The revolutionary elements are growing, Kautsky declares: out of ten million voters in Germany in 1895, there were six million proletarians and three and a half million people interested in private property; in 1907 the latter grew by 0.03 million, and the former by 1.6 million! “The rate of the advance becomes very rapid as soon as a time of revolutionary ferment comes.” Class antagonisms are not blunted but, on the contrary, grow acute; prices rise, and imperialist rivalry and militarism are rampant. “A new era of revolution” is drawing near. The monstrous growth

of taxes would “long ago have led to war as the only alternative to revolution ... had not that very alternative of revolution stood closer after a war than after a period of armed peace...”. “A world war is ominously imminent,” Kautsky continues, “and war means also revolution.” In 1891 Engels had reason to fear a premature revolution in Germany; since then, however, “the situation has greatly changed”. The proletariat “can no longer speak of a premature revolution” (Kautsky’s italics). The petty bourgeoisie is downright unreliable and is ever more hostile to the proletariat, but in a time of crisis it is “capable of coming over to our side in masses”. The main thing is that Social-Democracy “should remain unshakable, consistent, and irreconcilable”. We have undoubtedly entered a revolutionary period.

This is how Kautsky wrote in times long, long past, fully five years ago. This is what German Social-Democracy was, or, more correctly, what it promised to be. This was the kind of Social-Democracy that could and had to be respected.

See what the selfsame Kautsky writes today. Here are the most important statements in his article “Social-Democracy in Wartime” (Die Neue Zeit No. 1, October 2, 1914): “Our Party has far more rarely discussed the question of how to behave in wartime than how to prevent war Never is government so strong, never are parties so weak, as at the outbreak of war Wartime is least of all favourable to peaceful discussion Today the practical question is: victory or defeat for one’s own country.” Can there be an understanding among the parties of the belligerent countries regarding anti-war action? “That kind of thing has never been tested in practice. We have always disputed that possibility” The difference between the French and German socialists is “not one of principle” (as both defend their fatherlands) “Social-Democrats of all countries have an equal right or an equal obligation to take part in the defence of the fatherland: no nation should blame the other for doing so” “Has the International turned bankrupt?” “Has the Party rejected direct defence

of its party principles in wartime?” (Mehring’s questions in the same issue.) “That is an erroneous conception There are no grounds at all for such pessimism The differences are not fundamental Unity of principles remains To disobey wartime laws would simply lead to suppression of our press.” Obedience to these laws “implies rejection of defence of party principles just as little as similar behaviour of our party press under that sword of Damocles—the Anti-Socialist Law.”

We have purposely quoted from the original because it is hard to believe that such things could have been written. It is hard to find in literature (except in that coming from downright renegades) such smug vulgarity, such shameful departure from the truth, such unsavoury subterfuge to cover up the most patent renunciation both of socialism in general and of precise international decisions unanimously adopted (as, for instance, in Stuttgart and particularly in Basic) precisely in view of the possibility of a European war just like the present! It would be disrespectful towards the reader were we to treat Kautsky’s arguments in earnest and try to analyse them: if the European war differs in many respects from a simple “little” anti-Jewish pogrom, the “socialist” arguments in favour of participation in such a war fully resemble the “democratic” arguments in favour of participation in an anti-Jewish pogrom. One does not analyse arguments in favour of a pogrom; one only points them out so as to put their authors to shame in the sight of all class-conscious workers.

But how could it have come to pass, the reader will ask, that the leading authority in the Second International, a writer who once defended the views quoted at the beginning of this article, has sunk to something that is worse than being a renegade? That will not be understood, we answer, only by those who, perhaps unconsciously, consider that nothing out of the ordinary has happened, and that it is not difficult to “forgive and forget”, etc., i.e., by those who regard the matter from the renegade’s point of view. Those, however, who have earnestly and sincerely professed socialist

convictions and have held the views set forth in the beginning of this article will not be surprised to learn that “Vorwärts is dead” (Martov’s expression in the Paris Gobs) and that Kautsky is “dead”. The political bankruptcy of individuals is not a rarity at turning points in history. Despite the tremendous services he has rendered, Kautsky has never been among those who, at great crises, immediately take a militant Marxist stand (recall his vacillations on the issue of Millerandism^[2]).

It is such times that we are passing through. “You shoot first, Messieurs the Bourgeoisie!”^[3] Engels wrote in 1891, advocating, most correctly, the use of bourgeois legality by us, revolutionaries, in the period of so-called peaceful constitutional development. Engels’s idea was crystal clear: we class-conscious workers, he said, will be the next to shoot; it is to our advantage to exchange ballots for bullets (to go over to civil war) at the moment the bourgeoisie itself has broken the legal foundation it has laid down. In 1909 Kautsky voiced the undisputed opinion held by all revolutionary Social-Democrats when he said that revolution in Europe cannot now be premature and that war means revolution.

“Peaceful” decades, however, have not passed without leaving their mark. They have of necessity given rise to opportunism in all countries, and made it prevalent among parliamentarian, trade union, journalistic and other “leaders”. There is no country in Europe where, in one form or another, a long and stubborn struggle has not been conducted against opportunism, the latter being supported in a host of ways by the entire bourgeoisie, which is striving to corrupt and weaken the revolutionary proletariat. Fifteen years ago, at the outset of the Bernstein controversy, the selfsame Kautsky wrote that should opportunism turn from a sentiment into a trend, a split would be imminent. In Russia, the old Iskra,^[4] which created the Social-Democratic Party of the working class, declared, in an article which appeared in its second issue early in 1901, under the title of “On the Threshold of the Twentieth Century”, that the revolutionary class of

the twentieth century, like the revolutionary class of the eighteenth century—the bourgeoisie, had its own Gironde and its own Mountain.^[5]

The European war is a tremendous historical crisis, the beginning of a new epoch. Like any crisis, the war has aggravated deep-seated antagonisms and brought them to the surface, tearing asunder all veils of hypocrisy, rejecting all conventions and deflating all corrupt or rotting authorities. (This, incidentally, is the salutary and progressive effect of all crises, which only the dull-witted adherents of “peaceful evolution” fail to realise.) The Second International, which in its twenty-five or forty-five years of existence (according to whether the reckoning is from 1870 or 1889) was able to perform the highly important and useful work of expanding the influence of socialism and giving the socialist forces preparatory, initial and elementary organisation, has played its historical role and has passed away, overcome, not so much by the von Kiucks as by opportunism. Let the dead bury their dead. Let the empty-headed busy-bodies (if not the intriguing lackeys of the chauvinists and the opportunists) labour at the task of bringing together Vandervelde and Sembat with Kautsky and Haase, as though we had another Ivan Ivanovich, who has called Ivan Nikiforovich a “gander”, and has to be urged by his friends to make it up with his enemy.^[6] An International does not mean sitting at the same table and having hypocritical and pettifogging resolutions written by people who think that genuine internationalism consists in German socialists justifying the German bourgeoisie’s call to shoot down French workers, and in French socialists justifying the French bourgeoisie’ call to shoot down German workers in the name of the “defence of the fatherland”! The International consists in the coming together (first ideologically, then in due time organisationally as well) of people who, in these grave days, are capable of defending socialist internationalism in deed, i.e., of mustering their forces and “being the next to shoot” at the governments and the ruling classes of their own respective “fatherlands”. This is no easy task; it

calls for much preparation and great sacrifices and will be accompanied by reverses. However, for the very reason that it, is no easy task, it must be accomplished only together with those who wish to perform it and are not afraid of a complete break with the chauvinists and with the defenders of social-chauvinism.

Such people as Pannekoek are doing more than anyone else for the sincere, not hypocritical restoration of a socialist, not a chauvinist, International. In an article entitled “The Collapse of the International”, Pannekoek said: “If the leaders get together in an attempt to patch up their differences, that will be of no significance at all.”

Let us frankly state the facts; in any case the war will compel us to do so, if not tomorrow, then the day after. Three currents exist in international socialism: (1) the chauvinists, who are consistently pursuing a policy of opportunism; (2) the consistent opponents of opportunism, who in all countries have already begun to make themselves heard (the opportunists have routed most of them, but “defeated armies learn fast”), and are capable of conducting revolutionary work directed towards civil war; (3) confused and vacillating people, who at present are following in the wake of the opportunists and are causing the proletariat most harm by their hypocritical attempts to justify opportunism, something that they do almost scientifically and using the Marxist (sic!) method. Some of those who are engulfed in the latter current can be saved and restored to socialism, but only through a policy of a most decisive break and split with the former current, with all those who are capable of justifying the war credits vote, “the defence of the fatherland”, “submission to wartime laws”, a willingness to be satisfied with legal means only, and the rejection of civil war. Only those who pursue a policy like this are really building up a socialist International. For our part, we, who have established links with the Russian Collegium of the Central Committee and with the leading elements of the working-class movement in St. Petersburg, have exchanged opinions with them and become

convinced that we are agreed on the main points, are in a position, as editors of the Central Organ, to declare in the name of our Party that only work conducted in this direction is Party work and Social-Democratic work.

The idea of a split in the German Social-Democratic movement may seem alarming to many in its “unusualness”. The objective situation, however, goes to show that either the unusual will come to pass (after all, Adler and Kautsky did declare, at the last session of the International Socialist Bureau^[7] in July 1914, that they did not believe in miracles, and therefore did not believe in a European war!) or we shall witness the painful decomposition of what was once German Social-Democracy. In conclusion, we would like to remind those who are too prone to “trust” the (former) German Social-Democrats that people who have been our opponents on a number of issues have arrived at the idea of such a split. Thus Martov has written in Gobs: “Vorwärts is dead ... A Social-Democracy which publicly renounces the class struggle would do better to recognise the facts as they are, temporarily disband its organisation, and close down its organs.” Thus Plekhanov is quoted by Gobs as having said in a report: “I am very much against splits, but if principles are sacrificed for the integrity of the organisation, then better a split than false unity.” Plekhanov was referring to the German radicals: he sees a mote in the eye of the Germans, but not the beam in his own eye. This is an individual feature in him; over the past ten years we have all grown quite used to Plekhanov’s radicalism in theory and opportunism in practice. However, if even persons with such “oddities” begin to talk of a split among the Germans, it is a sign of the times.

Notes

[1] In its issue of March 30, 1895, Vorwärts published a summary and several extracts from Engels’s preface to Marx’s *The Class Struggles in France, 1848 to 1850*, omitting very important propositions on the revolutionary role of the proletariat, which evoked a vehement protest from Engels. In his letter to Kautsky of April 1, 1895, he wrote: “To my astonishment I see in the Vorwärts today an extract from my

'Introduction', printed without my prior knowledge and trimmed in such a fashion that I appear as a peaceful worshipper of legality at any price" (Marx and Engels, Selected Correspondence, Moscow, 1955, p. 568).

Engels insisted on the "Introduction" being published in full. In 1895 it was published in the journal *Die Neue Zeit*, but with considerable deletions, these at the instance of the German Social-Democratic Party leadership. Seeking to justify their reformist tactics, the leaders of German Social-Democracy subsequently began to interpret their version of the "Introduction" as Engels's renunciation of revolution, armed uprisings and barricade fighting. The original text of the "Introduction" was first published in the Soviet Union in 1955 (see Marx and Engels, Selected Works, Moscow, 1962, Vol. I, pp. 118-38).

[2] Millerandism—an opportunist trend named after the French "socialist" Millerand, who in 1899 joined the reactionary bourgeois government of France and helped the bourgeoisie in conducting its policy.

The admissibility of socialists' participation in bourgeois governments was discussed at the Paris Congress of the Second International in 1900. The Congress adopted Kautsky's conciliatory resolution condemning socialists' participation in bourgeois governments but permitting it in certain "exceptional" cases. The French socialists used this proviso to justify their joining the bourgeois government at the beginning of the First World War.

[3] See F. Engels, *Socialism in Germany*, Section I.

[4] *Iskra* (The Spark)—the first all-Russian illegal Marxist newspaper, founded by Lenin in 1900. It played a decisive part in the establishment of the revolutionary Marxist party of the working class. The first issue appeared in Leipzig in December 1900; it was subsequently published in Munich, in London (from July 1902) and in Geneva (from the spring of 1903). On Lenin's initiative and with his direct participation, the *Iskra* editorial board drew up the Party programme, which was published in *Iskra* No. 21, and prepared the Second Congress of the R.S.D.L.P. which marked the beginning of a revolutionary Marxist party in Russia. Soon after the Congress, the Mensheviks, helped by Plekhanov, gained control of *Iskra*, so that, beginning with issue No. 52, *Iskra* ceased being an organ of revolutionary Marxism.

[5] The Mountain (*Montagne*) and the Gironde—the two political groups of the bourgeoisie during the French bourgeois revolution of 1789. The *Montagnards*, or *Jacobins*, was the name given to the more resolute representatives of the bourgeoisie, the revolutionary class of the time, who stood for the abolition of absolutism and the feudal system. Unlike the *Jacobins*, the *Girondists* vacillated between revolution and counter-revolution, and sought agreement with the monarchy.

Lenin called the opportunist trend in Social-Democracy the "socialist Gironde", and the revolutionary Social-Democrats the "proletarian *Jacobins*", "the Mountain". After the R.S.D.L.P. split into *Bolsheviks* and *Mensheviks*, Lenin frequently stressed that the *Mensheviks* represented the *Girondist* trend in the working-class movement.

[6] *Ivan Ivanovich* and *Ivan Nikiforovich*—characters in Gogol's *Tale of How Ivan Ivanovich Quarrelled with Ivan Nikiforovich*. The quarrel between these two provincial landowners, whose names have become proverbial, started on a most insignificant pretext, and dragged on endlessly.

[7] The *International Socialist Bureau*—the executive body of the Second

International, established by decision of the Paris Congress of 1900. From 1905 Lenin was member of the I.S.B. as representative of the R.S.D.L.P.

Bourgeois Democracy and Fascism

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

Presentation made to the Stalin Society on May 2000

Fascism—the sudden growth?

To those who have accepted as unquestioned the existing social forms and their continuity, and those who have looked to the possibility of peaceful progressive advance within these existing social forms, and those who have dismissed the revolutionary outlook as the fantasy of a minority, the victory of fascism in an advanced industrial country such as Germany came as a brutal shock.

To make a proper assessment, it is essential to see fascism in relation to the whole character of modern social development, of which fascism is an expression, and to get down to the basic movement and driving forces of economy and technique, which have reached a point at which the existing capitalist forms are increasingly incompatible with the further development of production and utilisation of technique.

There is war between them—one must end the other. Either the advance of the productive forces must put an end to capitalism. Or the continued existence of capitalism must bring the advance of production and technique to a grinding halt and plunge billions of people on this planet even further into poverty, misery and war.

These are the only two paths—capitalism or socialism. There is no third alternative. All hopes of a third alternative, which will guarantee the realisation of peaceful and harmonious development without class struggle, through the forms of capitalist ‘democracy’, ‘planned capitalism’, etc. are nothing but pipe dreams. These dreams of peaceful development are merely the

echo of past conceptions, belonging to the era of liberal free-competition capitalism, an era which disappeared a whole hundred years ago, never to return. Free-competition capitalism made for “... the epoch of finance capital and monopolies, which introduce everywhere the striving for domination, not for freedom. Whatever the political system, the result of these tendencies is everywhere reaction and an extreme intensification of antagonisms in the field” (Lenin, *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*, p.113-114).

In our own day, even in the leading imperialist countries which, owing to a period of unprecedented economic expansion and prosperity in the wake of the peculiar conditions (which for reasons of shortage of time and space cannot be gone into here) following the Second World War, are not threatened by serious revolutionary upheavals, and where, thanks to the export of oppression and violence abroad, democratic forms of rule are still maintained, the deepening crisis of imperialism is forcing the ruling monopoly capitalist class increasingly to supplement these democratic forms with new dictatorial and repressive methods—further concentration of executive powers, reduction of parliament to a farcical talking shop, increasing use of emergency powers and police violence, restrictions on freedom of speech, draconian anti-trade union legislation and violent suppression of strikes (e.g., the miners’ strike of 1984-1985) and of demonstrations. This is not fascism yet, but it is an unmistakable trend in the direction of fascist forms of rule in all capitalist countries.

“The development of the production forces of social labour,” observed Marx, “is the historical task and

privilege of capital. It is precisely in this way that it unconsciously creates the material requirements of a higher mode of production” (Capital, Vol III, Kerr Education, p.203).

While recognising this progressive historical role of capitalism, Marx went on to lay bare the inner laws of capitalist development which, he pointed out more than a century ago, would arrive at a stage at which capitalism, far from being able to organise and develop further the productive forces, would merely plunge them into an increasingly vicious cycle of violent crises, stagnation and decay, from which they could only be rescued by the proletariat. This is the essence of Marxism. And its political expression is the dictatorship of the proletariat as the condition precedent for the solution of the problems of our epoch.

Already before the end of the First World War, Lord Leverhulme, the leading trust magnate, wrote: *“With the means that science has already placed at our disposal, we might provide for all the wants of each of us in food, shelter and clothing by one hour’s work per week for each of us from school age to dotage” (Lord Leverhulme, Preface to Professor Spooner’s Wealth for Waste, Routledge, 1918).*

That was eight decades ago. In the period since then productivity has increased several-fold. And yet, humanity is confronted with mass starvation and misery; lack of basic hygiene and access to clean water; death and disease.

Whereas in previous epochs, human beings died as a result of food shortage, in our epoch they die because there is too much food. Capitalism is the first system of production which brings society “face to face with the contradiction that the producers have nothing to consume because the consumers are wanting” (Engels, Anti-Dühring, p.387).

Capitalism long ago became historically outmoded. There could be no better expression of the utter bankruptcy of this system than the fact

that, in the midst of unprecedented wealth and unexampled productive power, it is unable to find the means to exploit a growing proportion of the working class, and is compelled to condemn tens of millions of able-bodied human beings who are willing and able to work as so much disposable scrap. Faced with such a system, cruel as it is absurd, the proletariat “... has no other choice than to starve or to rebel” (Engels, Condition of the working class in England).

The objective conditions for this proletarian rebellion were already ripe from the beginning of the period of imperialism—monopoly capitalism—and especially since the commencement of the general crisis of capitalism in 1914, which directly led to the First World War. However, with the sole honourable exception of the Russian proletariat, led by the Bolshevik Party under the inspiring banner of Marxism-Leninism, the working class of Europe proved unequal to the task. World capitalism used three main weapons to defeat the proletarian revolution in Europe and achieve its own temporary stabilisation:

The first of these weapons was direct civil and counter-revolutionary intervention—the imperialist war of intervention against the young proletarian Russian Republic, the White Terror in Finland, Hungary and Poland.

The second weapon used by the bourgeoisie to defeat the workers’ advance to power was none other than Social Democracy, which had already betrayed the working class by embracing the slogan of ‘Defence of the Fatherland’ at the commencement of the imperialist butchery of the First World War. In the aftermath of that war, the working class, too powerful to be defeated in a frontal battle, was subdued and crushed through the device of Social Democracy, which sadly still had a mass base. The bourgeoisie, while firmly holding on to the levers of power, gave the appearance of surrendering power to the

working class by placing in office social-democratic governments which then went on to do capitalism's dirty work for it, as intended all along. Concessions in the form of wage rises, nationalisation proposals, social security schemes, reduced working hours, etc., were granted to the workers. No sooner had the power of capitalism been securely established than these concessions were wiped out through the capitalist offensive which drove back the workers' living conditions even below pre-war levels.

The third and last weapon in the stabilisation of capitalist power was the ability of European capitalism to draw on the gigantic, and still unshaken, reserves of international imperialism—US imperialism. American loans and credits poured in, just as they were to do following the Second World War, in the form of Marshall Aid, to renovate and reconstruct the shattered fabric of European capitalism.

This stabilisation, built as it was on a shaky foundation, could not last long. Social Democracy, far from leading the fight, as it had promised to do, for socialism (albeit by peaceful, gradual, 'democratic' and parliamentary means), was in reality the instrument for carrying out the capitalist offensive—and by means far from democratic. By its disciplinary and coercive measures against the working class, Social Democracy increasingly alienated the masses and caused widespread disillusionment among the latter. In doing so, it exposed itself as the agent of the bourgeoisie in the working class, and thus rendered itself less effective as a weapon of capitalism. No wonder, then, that during this period, while the influence and the electoral base of Social Democracy declined in the European countries, that of communism increased. Secondly, just as the strength of US capitalism had furnished the base for the reconstruction of capitalism on a global scale, likewise the American Crash brought the whole structure of capitalist stabilisation tumbling down. Even the successes of

the period of stabilisation, with their expansion of production and productive capacity, merely served to intensify all the contradictions of capitalism by bringing in their train an unprecedented crisis of overproduction and glutted markets. What is more, the conditions of monopoly capitalism retarded the 'normal' working-out of the crisis. While the giant monopolies were in a position to maintain big profits, even in the midst of the worst depression, the working class, the petty bourgeoisie and the colonial peoples, who bore the brunt of the crisis, were driven to despair. The poverty of the masses, in the imperialist heartlands and in the colonies, could not but further exacerbate the devastating effects of the Depression, which forced themselves on the consciousness of even certain sectors of the bourgeoisie. Informed capitalist quarters began to recognise that the entire attempt at restoration during the 1920s had been a chase after a mirage.

The spread of this recognition within the capitalist world marked the change in the conscious direction of capitalist policy in the direction of fascism.

The transient period of 'stabilisation' had produced a whole host of myths and illusions (just as the buoyant imperialist stock markets are at present giving rise to equally unfounded assertions, illusions and myths) concerning a new era (new paradigm in the current jargon) of 'perpetual' capitalist prosperity, 'harmonious' capitalist development and 'organised capitalism', all finding their ultimate expression in 'ultra-imperialism', according to which conception capitalist development inexorably proceeds towards the creation of a single world trust, leading to the elimination of inter-imperialist rivalry and the ushering in of an era of rational production and universal prosperity. According to the theory of 'ultra-imperialism' first put forward in the early part of the 20th century, American capitalism was a 'new type' of capitalism which had managed to get shot of the crises and contradictions of the old

capitalism, had “ironed out the trade cycle” and had found the secret of everlasting prosperity for the workers hand-in-hand with ever-rising profits for the capitalists.

Undoubtedly the leaders and statesmen of capitalism, dazzled by the advance in production during the stabilisation period, shared these illusions. No wonder, then, that President Hoover should proclaim, on 27 July 1928, that: “The outlook of the world today is far the greatest era of commercial expansion in history”. He followed this up on 11 August 1928, in his speech accepting the Republican re-nomination for President, with the following words:

“Unemployment in the sense of distress is widely disappearing. We in America today are nearer to the final triumph over poverty than ever before in the history of any land. The poorhouse is vanishing from among us. We have not yet reached the goal, but given a chance to go forward with the policies of the last eight years, and we shall soon with the help of God be within sight of the day when poverty will be banished from this nation” (New York Nation, 15 June 1932).

As one would expect, the principal channel for transmitting these illusions to the masses of Europe and America was none other than Social Democracy. Labour delegations, whose expenses were paid by the capitalist governments, were sent from Britain, Germany and many other European countries to the US with the sole object of bringing back the new gospel from the Holy Land of Capitalism. This Social Democratic gentry, on their return, dutifully pronounced the triumph of capitalism over Marxism. With its stranglehold over the organisations of the working class, especially trade unions, the Social Democratic ‘machine’, backed by the powerful and all-pervasive instruments of bourgeois propaganda, sang in adoration of American capitalism, Fordism, rationalisation, the capitalist era, and so on and

so forth—with the sole aim of demoralising the working class, destroying the latter’s faith in a socialist future, and sowing illusions among them of a bright future under the conditions of capitalism.

The subsequent economic collapse, and with it the collapse of all the theories and illusions of the stabilisation period, produced great disillusionment among the petty bourgeoisie and the proletariat who had allowed themselves to be led up the garden path by Social Democracy. It was this disillusion which, inter alia, created the conditions for the advance of fascism among the petty bourgeoisie and in certain strata of the working class.

Meanwhile, confronted with the basic contradiction of capitalism, namely, that between the social productive forces on the one hand and the relations of production on the other, and being forced to recognise the reality of the advance of technique outstripping the existing forms of social organisation, the leaders of capitalism were faced with a stark choice: either get rid of the existing forms of social organisation (i.e., private ownership of the means of production) since they are incompatible with the whole advance of technique; or, in the interests of the maintenance of the system, long outmoded historically, suppress technique, restrict productive capacity downwards to the level of consumption of the impoverished masses, suppress class struggle, intensify class oppression, and resort to war as the only way out of the quagmire. This amounts, in other words, to destruction of productive forces and revolt against the machine, against science, against parliamentary democracy, and trade war followed by a real war as the final ‘solution’. We know which choice the bourgeoisie made—and was bound to make—in its selfish class interests. It opted for the second of these alternatives. The end of the period of stabilisation made way for the new phase, the most complete and consistent expression of which is

fascism. “Such is the bed of Procrustes... to which modern capitalism in its extreme stage of decay seeks to fit the tortured body of humanity” (R Palme Dutt, *Fascism and Social Revolution*, Martin Lawrence Ltd, London, 1934, pp. 47-48).

What is fascism?

Far from being an independent theory and system born in opposition to capitalism, far from being an independent ideology of the petty bourgeoisie hostile to the proletariat and monopoly capital alike, fascism is, on the contrary, the most consummate expression, in certain conditions of extreme decay, of the chief tendencies and policies of capitalism in its imperialist stage. Fascism is the response in practice of the imperialist bourgeoisie faced with the threat of proletarian revolution. It is a counter-revolutionary mass movement which, while enjoying the full support of the bourgeoisie, deploys a mixture of social demagogy and terrorist methods in order to crush the revolution and strengthen the dictatorship of finance capital. In order to define fascism and place it in its concrete reality, one must expose its class basis, the system of class relations which give birth to it and within which it operates, and the class role assigned by finance capital to it and which it duly performs. Any attempt to separate fascism from its progenitor—the bourgeois dictatorship—can only result in absurd assertions, of the type uttered by the Daily Herald, the official organ of the Labour Party and the TUC, on the very day that the Nazis seized and shut down the trade unions in Germany:

“The ‘National-Socialists’, it is essential to remember, call themselves ‘Socialist’ as well as ‘National’. Their ‘Socialism’ is not the Socialism of the Labour Party, or that of any recognised Socialist Party in other countries. But in many ways it is a creed that is anathema to the big landlords, the big industrialists and the big financiers.

“And the Nazi leaders are bound to go forward with the ‘Socialist’ side of their programme.”

The lines quoted above, while not saying anything about the ‘socialism’ of the Nazis, are very revealing about the ‘socialism’ of the Labour Party and the TUC, as well as of the entire thrust of this leadership’s imperialist line, according to which fascism is merely a wing of socialism—of a rather unorthodox variety, but nevertheless an “anathema to the big landlords, the big industrialists and the big financiers,” who, strange though it may sound, lavishly funded it before finally placing it in power in the period leading to the assumption of government office by the fascists, as well as during the period of fascist dictatorship. In no country has fascism ever conquered power. It was nurtured and enabled to grow, saved from extinction in its early stages at the hands of the working-class movement, and finally put into power, thanks to the direct support of the bourgeoisie. It was able to rely on the assistance of the greater part of the state machinery—the army officer corps, the police and the judiciary who, while meting out the utmost of severity to the proletarian opposition, treated the fascists with benign leniency.

Through its social demagogy fascism was able to build a somewhat broader mass base by appealing preponderantly to the petty bourgeoisie (also crushed by monopoly capital), as well as the lumpen proletariat and the demoralised sections of the working class, helped along by the robber barons of finance and industry, as well as the big landed magnates, all of whom supported it financially and directed it politically. Once in power, however, fascism carried out the ruthless behests of monopoly capital, and mercilessly turned the state machinery against those of its supporters who had been gullible enough to expect anti-capitalist measures from it.

Once in power, casting aside its anti-capitalist rhetoric, fascism revealed itself in its true colours as

“a terrorist dictatorship of big capital” (Programme of the Comintern, 1928).

“Fascism arises where a powerful working-class movement reaches a stage of growth which inevitably raises revolutionary issues, but is held in from decisive action by reformist leadership ...Fascism is the child of reformism” (R Palme Dutt, Labour Monthly, July 1925).

Italy—then a backward country

The transfer from the policy and methods of liberalism and concessions to that of fascism is no sudden volte face. They are the two halves of a single policy. So long as the forces of the bourgeoisie are inadequate and unprepared, it resorts to concessions and reliance on the reformist leadership to weaken and break the revolutionary offensive, while making furious undercover preparations for a direct armed suppression of the proletarian movement at a suitable time. While fooling the masses with sham concessions, breaking their unity through the good offices of Social Democracy, the ‘liberal’ and ‘democratic’ governments secretly equipped and armed fascism. With the completion of this stage, and with the proletarian forces sufficiently weakened, the violent counter revolution was let loose. The violent offensive of fascism (in Italy as elsewhere) was executed under the benevolent protection of the bourgeois liberal and Social Democratic governments (Giolitti and his successors in Italy).

The Italian experience furnishes a classic demonstration of the transition of bourgeois democracy to fascism, from which three principal conclusions stand out in sharp relief:

1. The sweep of the revolutionary movement in Italy was broken, not by the bourgeoisie, nor by fascism, but by its own internal weakness and lack of revolutionary leadership—by reformism.

2. Fascism appeared on the scene to play the hero (under police and military protection) to harass and

slaughter an already-retreating army, AFTER the proletarian advance had already been broken from within and widespread disillusion set in, thanks to the Turatis and D’Aragnas of Italian reformism.

3. The transition to open fascist dictatorship, far from being a sudden and abrupt break and a reversal of bourgeois policy, was, on the contrary, a continuation of bourgeois policy into novel forms in the new conditions.

Fascism was begotten, nurtured and prepared within the conditions of bourgeois democracy; and when the conditions were ripe, it was placed in power to exercise the naked terrorist dictatorship of big capital over the working class and the intermediate strata.

Germany—the treachery of Social Democracy

In November 1918, the German working class overthrew the old state and its victory was total:

“In November, 1918, the Revolution was the work of the proletariat alone. The proletariat won so powerful a position that the bourgeois elements at first did not dare to attempt any resistance” (Kautsky, Introduction to the third edition of The Proletarian Revolution, 1931).

How was this victory of the proletariat turned, in the course of the following 15 years, into its exact opposite? Social Democracy is the answer.

Although German Social Democracy had originated on the basis of the revolutionary programme of Marxism and had a long and glorious tradition, in the imperialist era opportunism, parliamentary cretinism and corruption, and the economist politics of trade-unionism, had made increasing inroads into the Party. The outbreak of the First World War in 1914 completed this process, with the Social Democratic Party openly and unashamedly siding with Kaiser Wilhelm, German militarism and the bourgeoisie. Adopting the slogan of ‘defence of the fatherland’ in an imperialist predatory war, German Social

Democracy, like its counterparts in other European countries (the sole honourable exception being the Bolsheviks in Russia), betrayed the working class and trampled underfoot the banner of proletarian internationalism. The November 1918 revolution was organised by scattered revolutionary elements who had gathered, in the very difficult conditions of war censorship and Party censorship, in the illegal Spartacus League (founded in 1916) and the Independent Socialist Party (founded in 1917).

The Social Democratic Party played no part in the victorious 1918 revolution. On the contrary, it was opposed to the revolution from the start. In his libel lawsuit in Berlin in 1922, Scheidemann declared:

“The imputation that Social Democracy wanted or prepared the November revolution is a ridiculous, stupid lie of our opponents” (quoted in R Palme Dutt, op.cit. p.109).

At the time of the outbreak of the revolution, Social Democratic leaders occupied ministerial positions in the Coalition Government of Prince Max. In the critical period, their executive called upon the population not to support the revolution. But the moment the revolution had triumphed on 9 November, Social Democratic leaders rushed to Liebknecht and the Independents begging to be included in the leadership of the victorious revolution and form a joint government. Ignoring Liebknecht’s advice, the Independents fell for the bait in the name of ‘unity’ and formed a coalition with the Social Democrats, i.e., with the enemies of the revolution, the open agents of the bourgeoisie. Thus, where all other means had proved useless, bourgeois influence was restored at the heart of the new regime through the treacherous Social Democracy.

Far from destroying the old state machine—the army, police, judiciary and the reactionary bureaucracy—the Social Democratic government protected the old regime at every step. Instead of arming the proletariat for the defence of the

revolution, it not only ordered the disarming of the workers but also armed and equipped special counter-revolutionary corps under the command of the ultra-reactionary monarchist officers. And it is these White Guard troops who thus went on to drown the proletarian revolution in blood. Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg were brutally murdered, their murderers going unpunished and openly gloating in their crime under the Social Democratic government. Steadily and systematically, with the application of limitless terror, the resistance of the workers was broken from the end of 1918 through to 1919. With the defeat of the 1918 revolution by Social Democracy, the basis was laid for the subsequent rise of fascism.

Far from acting out of blindness, folly and stupidity, as their apologists would have us believe, the Social Democratic leadership were driven solely by a burning desire to “save Germany from Bolshevism”, that is, to save capitalism. To achieve this aim, Social Democracy was prepared to commit any crime, perpetrate any outrage, against the proletariat.

While the illegal armed counter-revolutionary formations were protected and tolerated by Social Democracy and by the Entente, the attempt of the workers at self-defence through the formation of the Red Front was brutally suppressed by Social Democratic Interior Minister in 1929. Thus was built the Weimar Republic, which existed from 1918 to 1932, on the basis of a coalition between the bourgeoisie and Social Democracy. The latter was in power throughout this period. During the greater part of these years it was part of the Federal Government (from 1918 to 1925, under the presidency of Ebert, and from 1928 to 1930 in the Müller cabinet). The principal police President posts were held by Social Democrats. In view of this, it is not an exaggeration to say that fascism grew to power under the protection of Social Democracy.

While on paper the Weimar Republic was “the finest democracy in the world”, in truth it was a figleaf for the maintenance of the reactionary institutions of the old regime. It appealed to the old-time monarchists and generals to defend it against the communists, and it indulged in the indiscriminate violent suppression of the workers, with frequent recourse to martial law and emergency powers against the proletariat. This is what the eminent American bourgeois journalist, Mowrer, who harboured no revolutionary sentiments, had to say of this ‘democratic republic’:

“A virgin Republic that appeals to old-time monarchists and generals to defend it against Communists! Inevitably it falls into the enemy’s hands ...

“What can be said for a republic that allows its laws to be interpreted by monarchist judges, its government to be administered by old-time functionaries brought up in fidelity to the old regime; that watches passively while reactionary school teachers and professors teach its children to despise the present freedom in favour of a glorified feudal past; that permits and encourages the revival of militarism which was chiefly responsible for the country’s previous humiliation?

“What can be said for democrats who subsidise ex-princes who attack the regime; who make the exiled ex-Emperor the richest man in deference to supposed property rights ... This remarkable Republic paid generous pensions to thousands of ex-officers and civil servants who made no bones of their desire to overthrow it.” (E A Mowrer, ‘Germany puts the clock back’, quoted in R Palme Dutt, op.cit. pp.114-115).

These were precisely the conditions within which, fascism utilised the widespread discontent, economic hardship and universal anger against the humiliating treaty of Versailles with its crippling tribute. It was only able to do so, however, because German Social Democracy, which had leadership

of the majority of the working class, far from giving leadership on these issues, had completely identified itself with capitalism and the regime of Versailles and with wholesale repression of the proletarian masses. To crown it all, the bourgeois ‘democratic’ regime helped fascism to build up its armed formations by protecting it from above and giving it assistance through the state machine—the police, the judiciary, the army and the big capitalists—right up to the moment of finally placing it in power.

German fascism stood no chance of attracting the masses and building for itself a mass base without pretending to stand for ‘socialism’. So Nazi propaganda was characterised by an eclectic mix of contradictory and unscrupulous demagogy, with its frenzied anti-Semitism, wild anti-capitalist rhetoric, and chauvinist denunciations of the treaty of Versailles. In his *Mein Kampf*, in a sentence deleted since the 12th edition in 1932, Hitler wrote:

“The German has not the slightest notion how a people must be misled, if adherence of the masses is to be sought”. Hitler’s model was the British war-time propaganda, which was the object of his admiration as the finest example of the art of demagogic lying.

The dramatic expansion of German fascism from 1930 to 1932 is explained by the fact that the world economic crisis not only undermined the whole basis of stabilisation and of the Weimar Republic, but it also undermined the position of Social Democracy, which was very closely associated with them. The economic crisis and the Brüning hunger-regime finally exposed the utter bankruptcy of all the promises and fairy tales of Social Democracy about peaceful democratic progress and ever-rising prosperity under the conditions of capitalism. With the progress of the spread of disillusionment with Social Democracy, the class-conscious workers passed to communism, the politically backward elements crossed to the camp

of fascism. Between 1930 and 1932, while Social Democracy lost 1,338,000 votes, the Communist Party gained 1,384,000. With the undermining of Social Democracy, with this weakened and discredited Social Democracy no longer able to check the growing advance of communism, and the consequent polarisation of society into two clearly-defined hostile camps, German capitalism required new methods and new tools. Faced with an unprecedented economic crisis, the bourgeoisie was in desperate need and in a hurry to wipe out the social gains of the 1918 Revolution in the field of wages, hours and social legislation, which had hitherto furnished the main basis for the influence of Social Democracy among the proletariat. Instead of the concessions of the first few years of the revolution, capitalism now had to put the workers into the straitjacket of Draconian measures of economic hardship. To achieve this aim, in view of the existence of a powerful Communist Party, with a strong and rising influence in the working class, and the declining influence of Social Democracy, German capitalism needed new—and naked—forms of dictatorship. Unceremoniously Social Democracy was pushed aside from the Federal Government, and replaced in the summer of 1930 by the Brüning dictatorship, which ruled without parliament by emergency decree, but with Social Democratic support. It was from this period—from the time of the Brüning dictatorship—that the overwhelming majority of German capitalists and landlords completely transferred their allegiance to National Socialism, hitherto only partly supported, as the instrument of their terrorist dictatorship. Had Social Democracy been prepared to ally with communism for a joint resistance to the hunger offensive of the Brüning dictatorship, it is perfectly reasonable to suppose that the capitalist offensive need not have succeeded. But, in the name of the policy of the ‘lesser evil’, Social Democracy supported the Brüning dictatorship’s

hunger decrees and attacks on the workers. In so doing it strengthened capitalism, weakened the workers’ front, disorganised the proletarian ranks, and played right into the hands of fascism. This disorganisation of proletarian forces in the critical period of 1930-1932 meant that the initiative, and the gains from widespread hunger and want, which ought to have strengthened the proletarian camp, passed instead to fascism.

Before the Nazis came to power the Communist Party and the Red Trade Union opposition issued calls to the Social Democratic Party and the General Trade Union Confederation for joint action of all labour organisations against the then impending wage offensive (April 1932 appeal) and for the organisation of a general strike for the repeal of emergency decrees and the disbanding of Storm Troops (20 July 1932 appeal). Both these appeals were rejected, the second on the spurious ground that the call for a general strike was provocative and that the ballot box was the only instrument for opposing fascism. A third appeal for a united front was issued by the Communist Party on 30 January 1933 after the installation of Hitler as Chancellor. There was such a groundswell of support for this call that, although it did not respond officially, the leadership of the Social Democratic Party was compelled to explain its refusal in its own publications. While specifically rejecting any joint action against Hitler on the spurious ground that, as he had assumed power legally he should not be opposed, it proposed a ‘non-aggression pact’ with the Communist Party, i.e., abstention from mutual verbal criticism. The fourth call for a united front, made on 1 March 1933, after the burning of the Reichstag and the unleashing of unbridled Nazi terror, was also left unanswered by the Social Democratic leadership, as the latter was busy at the time trying to come to an understanding with the Hitlerites for the toleration of Social Democracy under fascism. Ignorant quarters have

levelled the criticism that the Communist Party's emphasis on the 'united front from below', and its failure to appeal directly to the leadership of German Social Democracy and the trade unions earlier than 1932, contributed to the failure of the working class to frustrate the fascist advance to power. This criticism is totally groundless, failing as it does to take into account the actual conditions then prevailing in Germany. When the Social Democrat, Severing, in his capacity as Minister of the Interior, was shooting down the workers' May Day demonstrations in 1929, it would have been pointless to have appealed to the leadership of Social Democracy for a united front against the attack on the workers. However, with the expulsion of the Braun-Severing government by Von Papen, an opportunity for such an appeal presented itself, and the Communist Party sent its proposal to the Executives of the Social Democratic Party and the General Trade Union Federation for a united front. The firm rejection of the Communist proposal by these two bodies ensured the victory of fascism.

Thus the united working-class front, which alone stood any chance of defeating the Hitlerites, was made impossible by the stubborn refusal of Social Democracy to co-operate with the communists—a refusal which paved the way for the victory of fascism. This attitude of Social Democracy's flowed directly from its line of class collaboration with the bourgeoisie and reliance on the bourgeois state—a line which it pursued even in the conditions of dictatorship, in the name of the 'lesser evil' under Hindenburg, Brüning and Von Papen, declaring that they were a 'lesser evil' than the outright victory of fascism. Far from being a lesser evil, these forms of dictatorship were merely preparing the ground for the complete victory of fascism and destroying, step by step, the resistance of the working class. Their work completed, they handed over state power to the Hitlerites. Hindenburg was installed as President with the support of Social

Democracy. Within a year he had installed Hitler as Chancellor. And even after the victory of the Hitlerites Social Democracy refused to oppose it for the reason that, having come to power 'legally', it was a 'lesser evil' than an 'illegal' Nazi terror.

Failing in their efforts to secure the co-operation of Social Democracy for a united working-class front against the encroachments of capital and the dictatorial regimes, the Communist Party succeeded in bringing about at least a partial united front from below, resulting in increased working-class resistance, which culminated in the Berlin transport strike of November 1932. The strike was led by the Red Trade Union opposition after the trade-union officials had rejected a massive vote of the workers for a strike. Parallel with this, the November 1932 elections reflected the rising working-class resistance: while the Nazi vote fell by 2 million and the Social Democratic vote fell by 700,000, that of the Communist Party rose by 700,000 to nearly 6 million. Von Papen was forced to resign on 17 November, and his resignation was followed by long negotiations between Hindenburg and Hitler. In view of rising working-class militancy, it was considered inopportune to instal Hitler in the Chancellery. Accordingly, Von Schleicher was made the Chancellor. He, by granting a few concessions to the working class, for which he received the plaudits of the Social Democratic and official trade-union leadership, duly succeeded in lulling the resistance of the working class who were under the malignant influence of Social Democracy. Once the necessary conditions were prepared, Hitler was installed as Chancellor, on 30 January 1933. The ebbing of the fascist tide, as reflected in the November 1932 election, far from marking its annihilation, as was being trumpeted from every roof-top by Social Democracy, merely convinced the bourgeoisie to hasten fascism's rise to power before the latter's stock should have irretrievably sunk and that of communism have risen to dominance.

“After the losses of the National Socialists in the Reichstag elections of November, German ‘Big Business’ decided that the immediate danger was that the National Socialist Party might disintegrate too rapidly” (C B Hoover Germany Enters the Third Reich, 1933, p.64—quoted in R Palme Dutt op. cit. p.125).

So Big Business decided to instal fascism in power with the sole aim of enabling the latter to use the state for rebuilding its strength and shattering all opposition.

The sapping of the German working-class will to resist had been effected not by fascism but by Social Democracy, whose leadership was treating the prospect of a Nazi government in a favourable light. Thus, in April 1932, Severing went on record as saying: “The Social Democratic Party no less than the Catholic Party, is strongly inclined to see Herr Hitler’s Nazis share the government responsibility” (quoted in R Palme Dutt, p.127).

On coming to power, Hitler armed the Storm Troops and incorporated them into the state’s ‘auxiliary police’ with special responsibility for the policing of the elections due to be held on 5 March. He suppressed the whole of the Social Democratic and Communist press, arrested leading militants, banned all working-class gatherings and propaganda, unleashed a reign of terror, and held elections in these conditions. These elections, held under “the shackles of vile terrorism”, as the Daily Herald of 4 March 1933 correctly stated, and accompanied by gross irregularities (in some districts the polling figures exceeded the electorate), could hardly reflect the wishes of the German people. Ignoring all this, Social Democracy eagerly resorted to the plea that now Hitler had a “democratic mandate” it was not justifiable to oppose him save as a “loyal parliamentary opposition”. Taking parliamentary cretinism to its logical absurdity of supporting a fascist terrorist regime because it had a majority in Parliament,

albeit a rigged majority secured at the point of a bayonet in elections held under terror, Stampfen, the former editor of Vorwärts, wrote:

“The victory of the government parties makes it possible to govern strictly in accordance with the Constitution.

“They have only to act as a legal government, and it will follow naturally that we shall be a legal opposition; if they choose to use their majority for measures that remain within the framework of the Constitution, we shall confine ourselves to the role of their fair critics.”

For his part, Kautsky, at one time the leader of the Second International and considered the best theoretician of Marxism after Engels’ death, but long since degenerated and gone totally rotten, wrote:

“The dictatorship has the mass of the population behind it.”

Kautsky had travelled a long way since he wrote his famous Road to Power in 1906. Beginning with opportunism on the questions of the tasks of the proletarian revolution in regard to the bourgeois state, through his support for the imperialist First World War and his opposition to the proletarian revolution in Russia, he had rolled down to the bottom and into the gutter, writing pieces embellishing the Hitlerite regime as founded on mass support.

W N Ewer, diplomatic correspondent of the Daily Herald, wrote that Hitler’s triumph was “... a victory for democracy,” for he had “come to power by the most strictly constitutional means ... Of course there was a certain amount of intimidation. There always is ... The figures indeed are proof that the election was practically free” (‘Why Hitler Triumphed’, Plebs, April 1933, quoted in R Palme Dutt, op. cit. p.128).

An exactly similar view was expressed by Maxton, the Chairman of the Independent Labour Party:

In this way Social Democracy attempted to cover

its subservience to fascism by the barely-disguised device of first ignoring the conditions of terror under which the election of 5 March was held, and then use this mockery of an election as providing a legitimate mandate for the fascist regime.

Social Democracy's disgraceful, degrading and despicable line was to continue after the election in a vain attempt to curry favour with fascism. The speech of the Social Democratic leader, Wels, at the opening of the Reichstag on 23 March, was an important expression of this line. He, as the leader of the party, openly resigned from the Executive Committee of the Second International, accusing the latter of spreading "atrocious stories" against the fascists. The leadership of the trade unions declared its readiness to co-operate with the Nazis, hailed in their press as the fascist "revolution", as a triumphant "continuation of the 1918 revolution". It stressed that the common enemy was communism, and that their 'socialism' was a "German affair" (Sozial Demokratischer Pressedient, 9 March, 1933, quoted by R Palme Dutt, op. cit. p.129). Reaching the depths of degradation and treachery to the working class, on this basis, the central executive committee of the trade unions gave an official call to the workers to participate in Hitler's May Day.

"The trade union leaders have sealed their reconciliation with the new rulers of Germany," wrote the Daily Herald of 24 April 1933.

The attempt by the reformists of Social Democracy to play the role of a recognised tolerated adjunct to fascism failed, in part owing to the fact that a huge number of workers in the big factories rejected their leaders' calls and stayed away from the Nazi May Day parades. Once it was crystal clear that the Social-democratic leadership's grip on the workers was inadequate to serve fascist ends, straight away on 2 May, the Nazis seized the unions, amalgamated them into their own labour front, marched their leaders into prison, and in their place appointed Nazi functionaries.

"The Leiparts and the Grassmanns", declared Dr Ley, the leader of the Nazi Labour front, "may profess their devotion to Hitler; but they are better in prison" (quoted in R Palme Dutt, op. cit. p.129).

For its part, the Social Democratic Party traversed the same path of humiliation, degradation and capitulation, followed by dissolution. On 17 May all its members in the Reichstag voted for the fascist government's resolution and joined in unanimous acclamation of Hitler. Much good did this grovelling do for them! All the property of the Social Democratic Party was confiscated, and on 22 June the organisation itself was declared 'dissolved'.

With this, Social Democracy was compelled by the bourgeoisie to continue its disruptive work in the conditions of illegality—conditions in which it could be of greater use to the ruling class in the event of a revolutionary upheaval than if it were to closely and openly identify with fascism.

The sole honour of consistent opposition to the bourgeoisie, and to fascism in particular, belongs to the Communist Party. The balance of class forces during the period under discussion did not crown its efforts with success, but the fact that its line was correct, and that it pursued this line in the working-class movement without fear or favour—of this there cannot be the slightest doubt.

In view of the above, we may list the following as the decisive causes of the temporary victory of fascism:

1. The strangling by Social Democracy and the trade unions of the 1918 revolution in the name of 'democracy' and the restoration of the power of capitalists, landlords and old reactionary institutions;
2. The support by Social Democracy and the trade unions of the successive emergency and dictatorship regimes leading up to the assumption of power by the Nazis;
3. The rejection by Social Democracy and the trade unions of a united working-class front;

4. The refusal by Social Democracy and the trade-union leadership to resist Hitler on his accession to power or on the commencement of the Nazi terror.

As R Palme Dutt correctly pointed out: “The experience of Germany from 1918 to 1933 is the classic demonstration before the international working class of how a working-class revolution can be destroyed and squandered and brought to the deepest abyss of working-class subjection. It is the classic demonstration before the international working class of where the path of bourgeois ‘democracy’ leads, step by step to its inexorable conclusion” (op. cit. pp. 131-132).

In Austria too “The victory of the proletarian revolution ... was fully in the grasp of the workers in 1918-1919, and was only prevented by Social Democracy. This is common ground, and is admitted by the Social Democratic leaders themselves. Otto Bauer describes the situation at the end of the war in his book ‘The Austrian revolution of 1918’:

“ There was deep ferment in the barracks of the people’s army. The people’s army felt that it was the bearer of the revolution, the vanguard of the proletariat ... The soldiers with arms in hand hoped for a victory of the proletariat ... ‘Dictatorship of the proletariat!’ ‘All Power to the Soviets!’ was all that could be heard in the streets.’

“He continues:

“ No bourgeois government could have coped with such a task. It would have been disarmed by the distrust and contempt of the masses. It would have been overthrown in a week by a street uprising and disarmed by its own soldiers.

“ Only the Social Democrats could have safely handled such an unprecedentedly difficult situation, because they enjoyed the confidence of the working masses Only the Social Democrats could have stopped peacefully the stormy demonstrations by negotiation and persuasion. Only the Social Democrats could have guided

the people’s army and curbed the revolutionary adventures of the working masses ... The profound shake-up of the bourgeois social order was expressed in that a bourgeois government, a government without participation in it of the Social Democrats, had simply become unthinkable.’

“The role of Austrian Social Democracy was thus in fact exactly parallel to that of the German. The power of the workers’ revolution was deliberately destroyed by Social Democracy in the name of bourgeois ‘democracy’” (R Palme Dutt, op. cit. p.137).

The development of fascism in Italy, Germany and Austria reveals all too clearly that the role of Social Democracy is crucial in the accession of fascism to power. Without understanding of this inter-relationship between Social Democracy and fascism, it is impossible to understand capitalist politics since the end of the First World War, which marked the open desertion of Social Democracy, representing significant sections of the working-class movement, especially of the trade-union and parliamentary leadership, in all the imperialist countries to the side of the bourgeoisie.

The further evolution of Social-democratic parties since then has played a big part in defeating working-class revolutions in the years immediately following the first world war, in the growth of fascism in the subsequent years, and in the fight against communism since the Second World War.

(The following part will be continued in the next issue.)

Germany and Europe are gearing up for major wars

Max | Kommunistische Organisation (Germany)

The façade of a liberal-democratic, prosperous country

There is a widespread international perception of Germany as an economically highly developed, cosmopolitan and democratic state that, unlike the USA, is committed to diplomacy and balance. Germany spends a lot of work and money to create such an image internationally with the help of an extensive network of NGOs, party foundations and foreign government services. The aim is to recruit well-trained foreign specialists and lay the political and diplomatic groundwork for global business for the German export industry.

The fact that this perception has very little to do with reality has been demonstrated to the peoples of the world, not least by Germany's aggressive leading role in supporting the genocide in Palestine. The German government wants to defend Israel as a third party in the main proceedings at the International Court of Justice. Last year, German arms deliveries to Israel increased tenfold to over 320 million US Dollars. A military operation by Germany and the EU in the Red Sea was decided in order to combat the outstanding solidarity actions of Ansar Allah for Palestine and thus enable military supplies to Israel. Within Germany, we are experiencing massive racist media incitement and a politically repressive atmosphere in which any criticism of Israel is criminalized under the pretext of "anti-Semitism". Migrants, Arabs and Muslims in particular, are being racially slandered and socially excluded. Criminal law is being expanded to prosecute any solidarity with Palestine. A "specific German responsibility" for the existence and "defense" of Israel is repeatedly invoked in public. The mass extermination of Jews under

German fascism during the Second World War has perfidiously been transformed by Germany into a weapon to legitimize its imperialist policies and the genocide of the Palestinians.

We were able to experience a taste of the new German warmongering back in February 2022, with the launch of Russia's military operation. The media and politicians went into full swing with racist incitement against Russians, alternative perspectives were banned from the public sphere and positions against NATO were legally prosecuted under the pretext of "approval of the Russia's war of aggression". Similar to Palestine, the continuity of Germany's chauvinist and imperialist policy is evident, as Germany has twice invaded Russia in the history of the 20th century and waged a war of extermination against Russians, which cost 27 (!) million Russian lives in the Second World War. Today, German tanks and arms systems are once again aimed at Russia and the German government boasts that it is the second largest financial supporter of Ukraine after the USA.

The Social Democratic German Defense Minister Boris Pistorius recently warned the German public that there would be a war against Russia within a few years. Marie-Agnes Strack-Zimmermann (FDP), the leading candidate of the right-wing liberal governing party for the EU parliamentary elections in May, is pushing for the formation of an EU army and is heavily campaigning for rearmament. Two years ago, Germany passed an extra budget for military spending of over 100 billion US dollars and is also increasing its annual war spending to almost 60 billion US dollars. However, this is no longer enough for the ruling elite. They are boosting each other in public with ever higher demands for

the arms budget. One top politician and “defense expert” recently called for over 320 billion US dollars in additional military spending. The goal? The development of an internationally competitive war industry.

This policy is accompanied by attacks on the living conditions of the working class in Germany. Inflation rates of almost 7% (2022) and 6% (2023) have severely devalued workers’ wages. Costs for food, heating, petrol, rent and other items have risen massively. Recently adopted attacks on the welfare system and social security for refugees serve to exert further pressure to lower wages. Almost a fifth of all employees in Germany already work in the so-called low-wage sector. Unfortunately, there is hardly any resistance to these attacks. The working class is being deeply integrated into Germany’s imperialist policies by a trade union led by wealthy labor aristocrats. More on this later in the text.

In the following, we will first take a closer look at the role of German imperialism in NATO’s war against Russia and, in particular, its relationship with the US. These questions have caused controversial discussions in Germany and around the world, especially after the Nord Stream gas pipelines were blown up, not least within the communist movement.

A brief history of German imperialism in the world

In order to understand Germany’s current role in the world, it is essential to recall at least a few decisive milestones in the development of German imperialism.

In relation to its European competitors, namely the homeland of capitalism England and also France, capitalist industry took hold in Germany late, but all the more dynamically. The up-and-coming German bourgeoisie joined forces early on with a class of reactionary feudal landowners

who were closely linked to militaristic Prussia. A bourgeois revolution (1848) that was only partially carried out and the late overcoming of feudal fragmentation (1871) slowed down the ambitions of the German capitalists. Their advantage, however, was that they could build on an already high level of technology and science. At the end of the 19th century, German capitalists rose to become world leaders in sectors such as the chemical and electrical industries. In contrast to its European competitors, Germany did not have anywhere near as large a colonial dominion. Monopoly capital lacked access to raw materials and a sufficiently large market. Its “birth defect” of being a capitalist superpower that came too late and too short erupted with Germany’s aggression in the First World War—an imperialist war to redivide the world. Germany urged to dominate Europe in order to be able to assert itself from here, especially against the USA. The defeat in the First World War was a severe setback for the German capitalists’ drive to expand. Together with the growing threat to capital posed by the victory of the October Socialist Revolution, this laid the decisive basis for a renewed attempt to achieve world power. For the US, Germany’s hostility towards its European rivals, England and France, was a welcome development. German finance capital fostered fascism and, with the Second World War, committed monstrous crimes to conquer Europe (and far beyond, such as the German fascists’ African campaign to conquer North Africa) and destroy the Soviet Union.

After the end of the Second World War in Europe, German imperialism was on the ground. With the help of the United States, which had established itself at the head of the imperialist world order through the war, West Germany was able to rebuild itself as a barrier against the socialist world system. The first NATO Secretary General Lord Ismay summed up the US strategy for Europe in a clear formula: Keep Russia out, keep the USA

in, keep Germany down. Under the conditions of the post-war order, a constellation between the major European powers and the USA emerged, the basic lines of which are still valid today. The USA guarantees the framework of the imperialist order in terms of military and financial policy. The major European powers grudgingly accept the dominant role of the USA, which is expressed in NATO in particular, for lack of any alternative. The result was a relationship that had to be characterized by both partnership and rivalry. German monopoly capital, which had profited from the predatory war and the millions of prisoners of war used for forced labor, was able to pursue its economic and political resurgence under the protection of US imperialism after the Second World War. With the economic and political integration of Europe, from the European Coal and Steel Community to the EU, Germany was able to realize a long-cherished strategy. Particularly after the counter-revolution—the defeat of socialism in Europe—German monopoly capital was able to use European free trade to place itself at the forefront of Europe from West to East. To this day, Eastern European countries serve as a cheap labor base for German industrial production, the EU member states as a market—they are flooded by the German export-oriented industry and are competing to the death. German car manufacturing in particular plays a key role in structuring production and supply chains to suit its interests. An important component of this economic strategy of German monopoly capital was access to cheap energy resources, primarily Russian gas.

The USA was not opposed to European integration. On the contrary, it even strongly promoted it after the Second World War. However, the decisive factor for US imperialism to this day has been that this development has remained integrated into the order it guarantees in terms of security policy. EU expansions went hand in

hand with NATO expansions. After 1990, the US strengthened its military influence in Eastern European countries in particular, which in any case viewed an overly powerful Germany with a certain degree of skepticism in light of historical experience. An independent EU army was however always a no-go for the USA and has so far failed, despite numerous attempts by Germany.

War against Russia—Germany a vassal of the USA?

Since February 2022 at the latest, we have been experiencing a seemingly completely contradictory situation in Germany. On the one hand, Germany is taking a united and particularly strong stance against Russia alongside the US and the other NATO states. The German Foreign Minister Annalena Baerbock had already said on February 25, 2022 that the sanctions were imposed with the intention of “ruining Russia”. Alongside her, other political and economic leaders are also pursuing an aggressive war rhetoric against Russia. On the other hand, the sanctions policy and the economic decoupling from Russia had created problems for the German economy, primarily with regard to its supply of cheap energy. In addition, the Nord Stream pipelines were blown up in the fall of 2022, an attack on Germany’s central energy infrastructure that was tolerated without any major uproar or public outcry. How can this be explained?

In fact, these developments have led to very controversial discussions, even within left-wing and communist circles, which continue to this day. Should progressive forces demand the independence of German imperialism from the USA? Is there still a strong independent bourgeoisie in Germany that needs to be fought against? Wouldn’t representatives of the bourgeois class even be potential allies for such a national strategy of independence from the US? Last but not least, these questions also give rise to controversial

discussions about the new party “Bündnis Sahra Wagenknecht”, which was founded in January and is campaigning for such a national strategy for German capital. Some non-exhaustive theses on the issue are presented below. Many questions remain unanswered and require further in-depth study and intensive discussion, also in an international context. These are problems and questions that have a direct impact on the class struggle. They are questions of strategy and tactics. Who is the enemy, who is a potential force of alliance? What are the main lines of political struggle? A more comprehensive understanding of the functioning and relations of power of the current imperialist order must be developed by progressive forces worldwide. We want to continue working on this and try to contribute with the means at our disposal.

Germany was already involved in an aggressive policy against Russia long before 2022. German foreign policy was heavily involved in the Maidan coup in 2014 and helped turn Ukraine into an anti-Russian entity. Over the course of the 00s, it became increasingly clear to the West that Russia could not be subordinated and integrated in the desired way. Putin’s speech at the Munich Security Conference in 2007 certainly stands out, in which he said in response to the constant expansion of NATO to the east: “I think that the unipolar model is not only unsuitable for today’s world, but impossible”. In contrast to the USA, Germany nevertheless remained more ambivalent in its relations with Russia, which, incidentally, have always been defined by the simultaneity and alternation of cooperation and confrontation, also with regard to economic and political relations since the end of the 19th century. In contrast to the US, Germany has been more cautious in some areas—such as the issue of Georgia and Ukraine joining NATO—precisely because of its economic ties with Russia.

After the counter-revolution around 1990, the so-

called “unipolar moment”, US strategists made no secret of their claim to be the sole superpower that would not tolerate any competition. With its policy in Yugoslavia and Eastern Europe, the USA constantly tried to limit German influence and, in particular, to secure its power in Europe militarily. In line with Lord Ismay’s above mentioned line, Germany’s deepening economic ties with Russia had to be broken. Both Trump and Biden had certainly not been sparing in their criticism of the gas pipelines, even imposing sanctions on Germany and all companies involved in the construction of Nord Stream II. Angela Merkel and, after her, Olaf Scholz nevertheless stuck to the construction of the pipeline, clearly expressing Germany’s goal of great power politics.

From the US perspective, it is a very desirable outcome that the German competitor is weakened by the war and now instead of Russian gas is forced to buy US LNG. On the one hand, Germany is currently not in a position to sufficiently counter the actions of the USA and at the same time is tied to the USA with strong common interests in maintaining the imperialist order. At the same time, the German bourgeoisie cannot accept Russia’s growing influence in Eastern Europe—“its backyard”—and is therefore breaking ties with Russia out of its own direct interests.

Crucial to the background of NATO’s war against Russia is the crisis of hegemony of US-led imperialism. The economic crisis of 2007 and the economic rise of China, which is reflected in the Belt and Road Initiative, are probably the most striking manifestations of this crisis. The interest in preserving the imperialist order as it was established under the leadership of the USA unites the major European powers to a certain extent. They are not (yet) in a position to maintain their dominant role by their own means. Last but not least, they lack military capacity. But is it at all realistic that Germany, Great Britain or France

will be able to develop these capabilities to act independently? To what extent are the ruling circles of monopoly capital acting completely rationally in this respect? Hasn't historical experience, particularly that of the Second World War, shown what adventurous dreams of great power the capitalists indulge in? We need to understand these contexts better.

In any case, it looks as if German imperialism is trying to use the war against Russia to position itself stronger and potentially more independently. The Bundeswehr (German military) is assuming key responsibilities on NATO's eastern flank, which it is also using to build up its own capacities. Not only is its own military potential being massively expanded, extensive subsidies are cushioning the sharp rise in energy costs for monopoly capital. German capitalists are also finding a variety of ways to circumvent the sanctions against Russia that affect their business in one way or another. However, this is countered by the closure of factories and relocation of major German corporations. In some cases, they are also being lured to the USA with promises of hefty subsidies. The extent to which German imperialism is actually currently seeking to strengthen its independence and its own monopoly capital, and the extent to which this is actually successful and a realistic prospect, still needs to be better investigated. Politicians in the German government never tire of proclaiming their transatlantic friendship on the one hand and their shameless ideas of an aggressive German great power policy on the other. Lars Klingbeil, Chairman of the SPD, put it this way in the summer of 2022:

“Germany must aspire to be a leading power. After almost 80 years of restraint, Germany now has a new role in the international coordinate system.”^[1]

Anyone who can do the math knows that Klingbeil is hoping to resume the leadership role that German fascism brutally tried to enforce. What

is clear is that no progressive development can be expected from a strengthening of the independence of German imperialism—however realistic it may be. The brief historical overview should above all illustrate the reactionary tradition of German monopoly capital. For over 150 years, the local corporations and banks have developed and refined their global accumulation regime. They form the continuity of Germany, beyond the changes in political forms of rule and major disruptions. German monopoly capital represents a chauvinistic and adventurous class aimed at imperialist expansion and subjugation, which only accepts its dependence to the US for as long as it absolutely has to.

We want to continue to work on these questions. We want to understand how united “the West” really is in waging a third world war against China? Where are the contradictions that could be deepened? How does German imperialism operate worldwide, and how can we build an internationalist resistance against it? Does the West still need the sort of fascist rule that was practiced in the 20th century, or have the techniques of rule been refined and the unity of the West reached the point where other forms of rule are needed to preserve imperialism?

Strengthening the anti-imperialist struggle and international solidarity

Every day it becomes increasingly clear that NATO's war against Russia is neither about Ukraine nor “just” about Russia. The supremacy of Western imperialism under the leadership of the US is itself in deep crisis. Last but not least, an important effect of the magnificent struggle of the Palestinian people against the Israeli occupation force is that the lines of the international class struggle are becoming more evident. The mask of liberal democracy has been removed—the reality of imperialist subjugation and aggression is confronting the

peoples of this world with all clarity. In the crisis, the reactionary nature of imperialism becomes obvious. In fact, this tendency of crisis within the imperialist countries and also in Germany is linked to the strengthening of reactionary and chauvinist elements of domination. The current German government itself is dismantling democratic rights, flanked by a well-controlled media apparatus with chauvinist agitation. At the same time, attempts are being made to channel any discontent of the people into even more reactionary sections of bourgeois rule. Openly fascist forces are being strengthened, left-wing opposition forces are being integrated into the ruling bourgeois-liberal establishment.

In principle, this situation offers an enhanced opportunity to expand and tighten the ranks of the revolutionary workers' movement and raise the level of class consciousness, precisely because the policies of imperialism must show themselves more visibly. However, further powerful barriers stand in the way of this goal within the German working class. The German Trade Union Confederation (DGB), the umbrella organization of German trade unions, which unites around six million members, stands firmly on the side of German imperialism, both when it comes to the war against Russia and Germany's support for the genocide in Palestine. The trade union leadership and the Social Democrats (including the Left Party) are integrating large sections of the working class into the German war drive and are embracing the interests of German monopoly capital to keep the German economy as competitive as possible—ostensibly to safeguard their own employment. The bribery of broad sections of the working class acts as the material basis for the opportunism of the labor aristocracy. Any movement for international solidarity, militant trade union politics and opposition to imperialist policies is stifled in a practiced manner within the trade unions and broad sections of the public.

Today in Germany, the solidarity movement with Palestine is one of the most driving forces with great progressive impact. The migrant youth from within the German working class seems to be in sharpest conflict with Germany's chauvinist and neo-colonial policies on the side of Israel. Last but not least, progressive potential for an internationalist and militant German workers' movement can be found here. It is the task of communists to take up and to foster this potential.

Unfortunately, however, there is also a strong radical left-wing influence in communist circles, which renders a supposedly consistent stance against the ruling government completely tame. The idea that the war in Ukraine is a supposedly inter-imperialist war is widespread. In short, the idea is that on an international scale there would be a competition between two imperialist poles, one organized around the US and the other around China. The workers' movement should take neither side, but fight for socialism. Such a position was also advocated in the Communist Organization after February 2022 by some who later split from our organization. We have recognized how dangerous this supposedly highly revolutionary position is in the reality of the class struggle. In practice, such verbal radical leftists mainly turn against everything and everyone who is in sharp conflict with imperialism in order to "warn" the workers' movement that Russia, China, Mali, South Africa etc. have capitalist economies and governments that must themselves be fought against. Colonial and neo-colonial subjugation are either marginalized or completely ignored. In fact, such forces play into the hands of the propaganda and political line of NATO imperialism and advocate the continuation of the imperialist order.

In contrast, together with other forces, we are trying to strengthen and better understand the connection between national liberation, anti-imperialist struggles and the struggle for socialism.

The loss of confidence of the peoples of the world towards the European and North American superpowers is good and must be intensified by communist forces. The political and economic crisis of imperialism must be deepened through class struggles and national liberation struggles. We stand for the defeat of NATO and German imperialism, whether in Ukraine or Palestine, West Africa or China. The struggle for sovereignty and independence from the system of imperialist oppression and exploitation must, in our view, be supported and understood as part of the struggle for socialism.

In this sense, the enormous and dynamic developments within the imperialist order present us with concrete and major tasks. The communist and anti-imperialist forces must tighten their ranks worldwide to a much greater extent. We need a common international connection, discussion and unified action in the worldwide class struggle. With this in mind, we—albeit as a small and young organization—seek international exchange, the deepening of political relations and sharp debate in order to better and more comprehensively understand the burning issues of our time. With this in mind:

Up, international solidarity!

Notes

[1] Speech by Lars Klingbeil on the “Zeitenwende” at the Tiergarten Conference 2022, held on June 21, 2022 in Berlin.

Philosophy of ideology of the XXI century civilization

Klara Azhybekova | Communist Party of Kyrgyzstan

Modern civilization, being in the conditions of all-encompassing crisis of capitalism, is in a state of self-liquidation within its imperialist phase, in search of a new ideology!

All post-Soviet republics, after the destruction of the Soviet Union, have long argued that there is no need for any ideology, no isms, i.e. feudalism, capitalism, socialism.

No materialism or idealism, and we're only talking about a legal and democratic society! Soviet people did not realize for a long time that behind these words there was a process of destruction of socialism and transition to criminal feudal capitalism!

During these 33 years of post-socialism, people realized what a swamp they had been driven into! According to the IMF recommendations, the absolute majority of the republics, having implemented their recommendations on reforming the economic, social, spiritual sphere found themselves with destroyed enterprises, without work, without wages, many simply without a roof over their heads, without access to medicine!

REALIZATION OF THE CRIME COMMITTED AGAINST THE PEOPLES AND STATES has come, but a little late! During these years, the peoples of the post-Soviet space have suffered enough! They went looking for work in Europe, USA, United Arab Emirates, Canada, Australia! But at the same time, pay attention to the MILLIONS of people who went to Russia from almost every republic to the center of their great Motherland! And she accepted, gave and gives work, citizenship! Citizens of the republics that became part of the Eurasian Economic Union enjoy benefits, especially those republics where Russian is the state language! But the West does not sleep! They do not tolerate the friendship and brotherhood between the peoples of

the Soviet Union.

They try to quarrel them, organize conflicts and massacres between them! So the war inside Russia itself in Chechnya, conflicts in Nagorno-Karabakh between Azerbaijan and Armenia, Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan, inside Tajikistan itself, Moldova and Transnistria, inside Kazakhstan itself, Georgia and Abkhazia, the long processing of Ukraine with the help of surviving Banderites, discrimination of the Russian-speaking population of the South-East of Ukraine, which led to the Special Military Operation of Russia on demilitarization and denazification of Ukraine!

The entire liberal ideology has collapsed not only in the post-Soviet republics, but all over the world! Moreover, the monopolistic world that emerged after the destruction of the Soviet Union, the dictatorship of the USA state over the rest of the world, the merciless exploitation of the Western powers over the rest of the world does no longer satisfy the proletariat, the workers of the world!

THE PSEUDO-DEMOCRACY AND PSEUDO-RIGHTS OF THE CRIMINAL BOURGEOISIE OF THE WORLD IS REJECTED BY THE WORKING CLASS, BY SOCIETY!

A contradiction arises between the bourgeois demand for equality and the proletarian demand for equality!!! F.Engels in the Anti-Dühring writes that it must "be realized not only in the sphere of the state, but to be real, it must be carried out in the public, economic sphere!" (F.Engels. Anti-Dühring. K.Marx and F.Engels. Opus, vol. 20, p107-109).

Attempts to de-ideologize the post-Soviet space with the full force of the dictatorship of the neo-bourgeoisie that came to power, created by the West and the traitors of the Motherland at short notice, showed the deception and lies about some de-ideologization of society! In reality, there was an

active process of erasing from the consciousness, the spiritual world of people of COMMUNIST IDEOLOGY, of COMMUNIST VALUES!

Instead, the ideology and values of the criminal bourgeoisie were imposed.

New Constitutions were adopted, new laws were passed, which gradually eliminated the social guarantees and social gains of socialism!

The post-Soviet neo-bourgeoisie at the same time tried to prove together with the IMF, that supposedly there are progressive reforms in all spheres, that we are joining the Western democratic and legal system!

But in reality, all the wealth of the post-Soviet republics was exported abroad, financial capital to Europe and the United States, assets of factories and plants! The merciless exploitation of the working masses grew steadily. As Marxists pointed out in their time, that the enrichment of modern capitalists is no less than that of slave owners and feudal lords:

“takes place through the appropriation of other people’s unpaid labor and that all these forms of exploitation differ from one another only in the way in which this unpaid labor is.” (F. Engels. Karl Marx. K. Marx, F. Engels. Opus, vol.19, p.115). Therefore, the attempts of neo-bourgeoisie to prove that they are building a just, equal, democratic, legal society is nothing but lies and hypocrisy!

In all civilizations always dominates the ideology of the class, which at the moment carries out the dictatorship of power! With all certainty we can say that at present the dominant ideology both in the post-Soviet states and in the world in general, except for socialist countries, is dominated by BOURGEOIS IDEOLOGY! Many post-Soviet republics are shamefully silent about it!

After all, they promised to go forward to a democratic state based on the rule of law! And returned to decrepit anti-human, fascist capitalism? It has already outlived its time and must go! Mankind no longer wants to live in a WORLD of EXPLOITATION, COLONIZATION, spiritual and

moral regression, greed, fascism, in a world of dissonance of the super-rich and the super-poor, lies and deceit, hypocrisy.

and provocation, dishonor, self-interest, evil, fear for tomorrow! All this is the world of capital! Mankind is on the verge of an ecological catastrophe, with no instinct for survival and self-preservation! Running towards its own self-destruction! What can save us?! There is only one alternative, and that is the transition to socialism by the whole world! The core of this process will be Russia with all its brotherly republics of the USSR!

The moment has come to speak openly, without shyness about the future IDEOLOGY of the whole civilization, about the future type of states in the world! The name of this ideology is SOCIALIST!

Perhaps it’s a little uncomfortable for many people to talk about socialist ideology, which has been vilified and desecrated for more than thirty years together with the bourgeoisie of the imperialist powers! Now it seems that everyone has seen their true false essence!

If we look at the universal laws of development and the evolution of IDEOLOGY at different stages of development of society, we will see that it changed with the transition from one type of formation to another!! In the primitive communal formation, apparently, we can speak only of the psychology of social consciousness of primitive society, for then there were no opportunities for people to systematize their “world outlook”, for such an opportunity appears only when some part of it begins to engage in intellectual labor!

Such an opportunity arises with the emergence of class society! From that moment the arisen ideology also begins to divide into the ideology of the ruling class and the ideology of the subordinate class! Hence we can differentiate ideologies into the ideology of slave owners and slaves, feudal lords and serfs, bourgeoisie and proletariat, in socialism the ideology of working class and labor peasantry and labor intellectuals!

Under socialism, although classes still exist,

but in their relations there are no antagonistic contradictions, no one exploits anyone, property belongs to all the people! Therefore, they have a single “world outlook”, a single ideology!

The theory of communist ideology emerges in the XIX century, the creators were K. Marx and F. Engels. Its realization in practice occurs in the XX century by the leaders of the world proletariat V. I. Lenin and I. V. Stalin! By them a great socialist civilization—the Soviet Union—is created, in which the ideology of the working class and all the working masses prevails. After the victory of the Soviet Union in the Great Patriotic War against Hitler’s fascism in 1941-1945, the WORLD SOCIALIST SYSTEM emerges in the history of mankind in 1917.

Against the BOURGEOIS ideology appears the COMMUNIST, in its FIRST PHASE—SOCIALIST IDEOLOGY! Between them there is an irreconcilable struggle, but being on the same planet Earth, in the same human society. Capitalism, its dominant bourgeois ideology, which has existed for more than 5 centuries could not live together with the newly emerged communist ideology, which could sweep them off the face of the Earth very quickly! So it put all its efforts into defeat it. Capitalism in the military sphere, when confronted face to face with the Soviet warrior, with the Soviet it suffered a crushing defeat!!!! At that time, all intellectual potential, all financial potential was invested to find victory over socialism and communist ideology! And they found it! Which way? The method of deceit, the method of bribing the top! M. Gorbachev, A. Yakovlev, B. Yeltsin, E. Shevarnadze, Bakatin, young magpies Chubais, Kozyrev, Gaidar, Burbulis, Kravchuk, Shushkevich and others of local origin! Now they are making up that socialism had outlived its usefulness by that time! Nonsense! More than 500 years of capitalism has not outlived itself, but 73 years of socialism has outlived itself? The socialist era has only just begun its activity for the working masses of the world! It gave real rights for the man of labor: the right

to housing, to education at all levels, to medicine, FREE OF CHARGE, GUARANTEED BY THE STATE, the right to work with decent wages at low prices for basic necessities, which were counted in pennies! For example: bread - 16 kopecks (pennies), butter - 68k, milk - 24 kopecks, meat - 85 kopecks, rent for a 3-x room without electricity - 3 rubles, etc. What capitalist society has such prices? Pupils’ notebooks - 5 kopecks, city fare - 5 kopecks! And now? Airfare! Frunze-Moscow - 60 rubles, Frunze-Tashkent - 14 rubles, Frunze-Osh - 8 rubles! Calico - 80 kopecks, crepe de chine - 6 rubles, natural plush - 8 rubles! (1 ruble is 1 eurocent) Electricity - 4 kopecks for one kilowatt, the list can go on endlessly! Let at least one post-Soviet republic say that now under their sovereignty there are all these benefits! In my opinion, Belarus is the only country that has preserved the conquests of socialism! Practically all the republics fulfilled the orders of the CIA, International Monetary Fund on the recommendations of which all high-tech Soviet enterprises were destroyed, with the exception of two republics! We believe that time will come and the most odious ones will be brought to justice for treason against the Motherland, even posthumously!

Since many states are looking for a new ideology to rally their people around it, I would like to dwell on the content of this concept! Although it is noticeable that attempts are being made to unite people around some or several religions or religious ideology!

Undoubtedly, consolidation of people around some religion is the most convenient for the ruling class! All the more liberal, bourgeois ideology has finally discredited itself and is practically unviable!

As for religious ideology, it gives to some extent adaptation of people to the present very difficult conditions of life on our Planet Earth, because the realization of each person of his defenseless place in this world increases his fear for his children, relatives, close ones, for himself and he accepts these religious values as support and compensation

for all the costs of this earthly life!

What is IDEOLOGY? How to determine whether it is a scientific ideology or an unscientific, anti-scientific ideology?

To understand this concept, it is necessary to find out the content of the concept “world outlook”, because these concepts are identical. By “world outlook” we understand a set of principles, views, beliefs, which determine the direction of activity and attitude to reality of an individual person, or a social group, class or society as a whole! We conclude that if the principles concern one person—it is called “world outlook”, if social groups, parties, society as a whole - it is already an ideology? What are these principles, views, beliefs? The core of these principles, views and beliefs are philosophical principles, then political, legal, ethical, aesthetic, scientific and religious principles, views and beliefs! And all these principles can exist both at the level of psychology, ordinary consciousness, and at the level of ideology, theoretical, systematized consciousness!

It is very important to single out the circle of “world outlook”, ideological problems, to which we can refer to

- 1) the solution of the basic question of philosophy,
- 2) the concept of development,
- 3) problems of the meaning of life and values,
- 4) problems of the social ideal.

From the point of view of the first problem, the individual, class, and society may hold materialistic or religious-idealistic views! As an example, we can say that the Soviet society prioritized materialistic principles, views and beliefs. Marxist, materialistic ideology was dominant, while religious idealistic views also existed, but they were like relics of the past!

The second world-view problem determined on what positions does an individual, class or society stand on, the positions of DIALECTICS OR METAPHYSICS? Those who stand on the positions of dialectics believe that everything changes, passes from one quality to a new quality based on the laws

of dialectics: the unity and struggle of opposites, which reveals development as self-development without any external push, not needing any supernatural beginning. Further, the law of transition of quantitative changes into qualitative changes and vice versa applies! For example, new information technologies give absolutely new possibilities of communication between people, states, countries! A new quality—the Internet gives a momentary transfer of information to distant distances!

And on the basis of the law of negation of negation! This law of development shows that development is not linear, but spiral! There are triads, when on the third spiral there will necessarily be a repetition of the first spiral! For example, public ownership of the means of production in the primitive communal system, will necessarily repeat in socialism, passing through the 2nd spiral—private property. And the dialectical negation proves that the progress of society and in other spheres too can be only when the factor of continuity is necessarily present! Progress presupposes taking all the best that was in the past quality. If every new spiral starts from scratch, there will be no development! Post-Soviet states are sitting destroyed, because they wanted to build a new rotten capitalism from scratch! Remember how fiercely they destroyed everything Soviet! Or let's look at what Ukraine has become! It's as if everyone's cerebral cortex has been removed!

This concept of development can be solved from the point of view of metaphysics! Everything must be as God created it! Everything depends only on him! Let's remember the dogmas of religion! Then we must live in rotten capitalism forever! Or we will change society as we want it to be! What to sit and hope when and who will bring us justice, equality, true freedom and democracy like manna from heaven? Or should we expect it only there in the afterlife? (Not existing from the point of view of materialism).

Undoubtedly, there are certain regular stages of

development of society and regularities of their transition from one quality to another quality! In addition to the religious understanding of the development of society, there is also an idealistic understanding from the point of view of both objective and sub-objective idealism! Objective idealism believes that the world is alienated from some external absolute idea, and subjective idealism that the world is a creation of myself!

For example, the author of the former is Hegel, the second is Hume, Mach, Avenarius, phenomenologists, who speak of a kind of pure, purified from nature consciousness!

The third “world outlook”, ideological problem is the problem of the Meaning of Life! This question is answered and lived according to its understanding by the individual, classes and parties, and society.

If the meaning of life is understood as the vocation, the purpose of any individual, class, party, society—to develop all-round development of all their capabilities and abilities, to make their personal or group, social contribution to history, to the progress of society, its culture, then, it turns out, it is possible to derive several visions, directions of this meaning of life!

The first direction is purely individualistic, selfish, narrow self-interest prevails in everything! This type, of course, characterizes all civilizations where private property prevails! Look at the present civilization! Except socialist states we see how society suffers from pathological individualism: corruption, thievery, bourgeoisie, at the same time a high level of religiosity of the population! The rich bourgeoisie in parliaments pass laws that serve their whims! For example, that after 10 years any crimes are annulled for expiration of the statute of limitations! Very convenient! Use a military coup d'état from a NATO military base, shoot the opposition and the government, use Islamic terrorists to organize inter-ethnic conflict and get into power! Get into the safety deposit boxes, transfer a considerable amount of state money from the banks, appoint yourself President and

you're done! Don't think that this is a fairy tale! I wonder how the CIA aunt and her associates did it. Probably, the past bourgeoisie behaved so well that the people agreed even with such lawlessness! But the most interesting thing is that the same criminal pro-Western bourgeoisie again wanted to make a coup with the help of Islamic extremists and again sit in the presidential chair, using the already tested version! Fortunately, the pro-people forces came and did not give them a new opportunity to rob the people and the workers. But they tried many times to organize a new coup with the help of war with neighbors! This is an example of the narrow self-interest of the pro-American criminal bourgeoisie.

At any price, even the death of a huge number of people, but to sit in the chair! After all, these coup bandits could not be prosecuted because of the statute of limitations!

Nothing! The Soviet Union had no statute of limitations for treason and state military coups!

The second point of view on the meaning of life is a religious point of view, very developed in post-Soviet times! Everything is done only in the name of the Most High, in the name of serving God! For what? To get to paradise in the next world! After all, there is a possibility to go to hell if you serve God wrongly! But he teaches: do not kill, do not steal, be honest and decent, help your neighbors! How is it that in such a super religious society with mosques, churches, synagogues? There are so many thieves, crooks, corrupt, murderers and pedophiles, casinos, drug dealers and addicts. Perhaps it is the other way around? It's because of this generalized lawlessness.

That society has such a high rate of religious conversion?

Science says: “Every religion is nothing but a fantastic reflection in the heads of those who are not religious, of the external forces that rule over them in their daily lives, a reflection in which earthly forces take the form of otherworldly forces.” (F. Engels. *Anti-Dühring*. K. Marx and F. Engels. Opus, vol.20, pp.328- 330)

It is social forces and causes that prevail: exploitation, oppression, discrimination, poverty wages, legal insecurity, racism, genocide, phobias on national, racial, ideological grounds, unemployment, crazy prices for medicine, education, colonization and ordinary fascism, which prevails in modern capitalism in its state of crisis and agony. Religion will be overcome as all the above reasons are overcome! This is possible only under socialism!

The third point of view on the meaning of life is the altruistic point of view! The individual, class, party, society puts the PUBLIC INTERESTS in the foreground! The interests of the people, society, the state!

That's what the Bolsheviks were, socialist states, people of socialist society! And what was the reason for that? PUBLIC OWNERSHIP OF THE MEANS OF PRODUCTION! Plants, factories, hospitals, rivers, lakes, mountains—these are people's property! Now even pastures have become private, rivers have been taken over too! Soviet people had a collectivist psychology and altruistic thinking and approach! We were brought up from childhood from kindergarten and school with a sense of the Motherland, love for it and responsibility! There were structures for this: October, Pioneers, Komsomol members, then Communists! They took oaths, educated leaders, hikes, pioneer camps, Komsomol construction sites, military training in schools and universities! There were no oligarchs, rich and poor, no palaces or huts! After the Great Patriotic War it was difficult for everyone, how much we had to rebuild! Soviet patriotism, Soviet internationalism, brotherhood and friendship, Soviet mentality, Soviet altruism helped to save the Fatherland, to restore it in a short period of time! Of course, does faith in the Almighty help people in the most difficult moments, especially in times of war, in times of illness? In his time K Marx, when he was still 17 years old in his article "Reflections of a young man when choosing a profession" appears to have written that:

"History recognizes those men as great who, working for a common goal, themselves become nobler, experience exalts as the happiest the one, who has brought happiness to the greatest number of people; religion itself teaches us that the ideal to which all aspire has sacrificed itself for the sake of mankind" (K. Marx and F. Engels, Op. cit, vol.40, p.7.)

The next point of view on the meaning of life is when both public and private interests will coincide! This is the ideal of the future developed socialist and further communist society! People of communist civilization!

The fourth "world outlook", ideological problem is the problem of the SOCIAL IDEAL! The modern world gives a huge palette of ideals for mankind in what kind of world he would like to live in! Almost all Islamic extremists want to revive the Islamic caliphate! For the criminal bourgeoisie of the whole world the best ideal of society is modern fascist capitalism in the stage of imperialism! They do not need anything else!

For communists, socialists, the social ideal is a socialist society, which will smoothly pass into communism! The problems of ideology of all mankind are super relevant today! It is clear to everyone that the ideology of capitalism, liberalism drives mankind to self-elimination! Destruction of ecology of rivers, lakes, seas, rivers, oceans, predatory destruction of nature leads to the elimination of protective forces of the Earth itself from external negative influences from other planets, all of them should be considered at the state level and the whole world to confront this problem! Science must take the lead in solving all our problems! Only scientific approach is the only real way to solve the coming catastrophe on Earth! As K. Marx wrote: "In science there is no high road, and only he can reach its shining peaks, who is not afraid of fatigue, climbs on its stony paths". (K. Marx and F. Engels. Soch, vol., 23, p. 25).

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

Chilean Communist Party (Proletarian Action)

Index

Part 1: Critical approach to the positions of the CPG

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

Part 2: Criticism of the ideological foundations of the CPG

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

Part 3: Imperialism vs. imperialism?

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

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

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

A brief parenthesis

Dear readers, we had announced that this time we would focus on the Russian productive structure. However, in the last few days there has been an event of great importance which we cannot ignore and which requires a few words on our part, so we will continue the thread of this work in the next issue... although the event to which we refer is part of the central theme we are dealing with.

We refer here to Iran's retaliatory attack against the Zionist regime of Israel, called True Promise, in response to the latter's (i.e. Israel's) attack against the Iranian diplomatic facility in Damascus, Syria.

We express our strong support for the True Promise retaliatory attack. We would like to point out that Iran has taken a balanced (some would say overly moderate) stance in the face of the immeasurable crimes of the Zionist State of Israel and the US (and with the participation of the UK, Germany, France and other countries) against the Semitic Palestinian people, the constant provocations against its own country and the ongoing attacks against Syria.

Yemen, Hezbollah and resistance forces in Iraq joined the Iranian response.

The United States, for its part, asked Iran not to attack US forces in the region, to which Iran responded that it would not do so unless they intervened, demonstrating its firm determination

not to allow anyone to dictate what to do.

Iran's current reaction seems to us inevitable, forced and desired by Israel and the US and certainly welcomed by the vast majority of the peoples of the region. The international bourgeois press will defame Iran. It will label it as an aggressor. We have known this media manipulation in the past and we also see it in the present, for example in the way information is delivered about the Russian Special Military Operation in Ukraine and in the Palestinian conflict. Victims are turned into aggressors, aggressors into victims.

Iran did not intend to attack Israel on a large scale, but wanted to leave a message: Israel must know that its actions would no longer go unpunished. It would surely have suited Israel if Iran had attacked its country in such a way that the US would have been forced to intervene in its defense against Iran.

The proof that Iran never intended to launch a full-scale military attack against Israel is the fact that if US and Israeli intelligence had actually had information about such an attack by Iran, the US would have moved warships from the western to the eastern Mediterranean and many more aircraft would have moved to bases near Iran, such as Cyprus, although not to countries in the region, because Qatar, Oman, Saudi Arabia and even Turkey have denied the US NATO bases for a confrontation with Iran. The latter is indicative of a trend in the Middle East region: that countries in the region look with increasing respect to Iran and with decreasing respect to the United States.

Iran's political posture and military actions are historically diametrically opposed to those of Israel. While Israel is preferentially engaged in attacking the civilian population of Gaza, Iran concentrated exclusively on military targets in Israel.

The great dream of the Israeli bourgeoisie and its representatives in parliament and government, practically since the foundation of the Zionist state, has been the destruction of its "enemies", that is, of

all those states that oppose its expansionist policy, its geographic role as a NATO "military base" in the region, the occupation of Palestine, the genocide and racial discrimination of the Palestinian Semitic people, etc. Israel is the only country in the world that has not defined its borders. For Israel, Saudi Arabia is part of the "hostile" world, but it has not been able to confront it in the desired way because Saudi Arabia has been and is a privileged ally of the United States in the region. Therefore, Israel was forced to seek agreements with Saudi Arabia, such as the "Abraham Accords". But wherever the protective hand of the US has not been there, it has pursued an almost unbelievable policy of aggression. In Iraq, for example, Israel's policy was to overthrow Saddam Hussein, who opposed Israel. In Syria, Israel supported all the jihadists, including the Islamic State itself, in order to support the overthrow of the government of President Bashar al-Assad, without success, whose wounded were treated in Israeli hospitals. In Lebanon, Israel has waged three wars to wipe out the country and Hezbollah in particular, also without success. With this policy of aggression, rooted in its origins, Israel has created an unstable situation in the region and for itself. The only more or less secure border Israel has left is the border with Egypt. It is difficult to predict for how long....

The facts show that the two-state solution is unfeasible and that the only solution is the one proposed by Iran itself: a single state in which Palestinians, Jews and Christians coexist on an equal footing. In our opinion, the State of Israel, essentially the product of British imperialism, has no moral right to exist, at least since the beginning of its territorial expansion and the start of the forced displacement and genocide of the Palestinian Semitic people.

In the midst of this growing instability that Israel has brought to the region and which has finally turned against itself, a state has emerged that can

confront it: precisely Iran. The Communist Party of Greece criticizes in this way our support for Iran for its resolutely anti-imperialist role:

“On the contrary, it is considered that ‘Russia and China are not aggressive imperialist powers’ and together with others, such as North Korea and Iran, are presented as ‘anti-imperialist’, which, together with the so-called progressive governments of Latin America, resist imperialism.

Moreover, we see that any class-based approach is abandoned as various regional unions, ‘such as ALBA and CELAC’, which basically involve capitalist states but the WAP believes that will ‘bring together the oppressed nations of Latin America’, are praised.”^[1]

For the CPG, the resolute anti-imperialist stances of Iran and other countries such as Russia and socialist China and socialist DPRK would be nothing but a farce. In other words, the Iranian retaliatory attack True Promise would not be worth celebrating because it supposedly would not constitute an anti-imperialist gesture. The CPG issued a tepid statement in which, as expected, it did not celebrate True Promise, but merely warned against military escalation:

“Iran’s expected attack on Israel, in retaliation for the criminal attack by the Israeli state on the Iranian embassy in Damascus, Syria, with the death of Iranian officials, constitutes a dangerous escalation of the war in the Middle East that could take on frightening proportions in the event of an attack by Israel and its allies against Iran.

The KKE had warned from the very first moment that the Israeli occupation and genocide against the Palestinian people, with the support of the US, NATO and the EU, the Israeli attacks in Syria and Lebanon, as well as the imperialist antagonisms in the Red Sea, with the presence of Euro-Atlantic military forces and the participation of Greece, form the conditions for the generalisation of war and open the ‘gates of hell’. The peoples of the

region, including the Greek people, are in the vortex of great dangers.”^[2]

It is noteworthy, however, that the CPG did not blame Iran or use words of reproach against it.

Iran is the only country in the region that poses a real threat to Israel, which is de facto a US military base in the middle of the Middle East. Israel alone could not stand up to Iran. The support of US and British imperialism (and other countries such as Germany and France) are essential for its survival. Iran’s first real response to Israel’s permanent and vile provocations meant the flight of more than 300,000 Zionist settlers from the country. This shows that they have no confidence in the ability of their army or their government to protect them from a possible Iranian wrath. If more than 300,000 settlers left Israel as a result of a single attack, it is left to the imagination to estimate how many there would be if Iran were to mount a serious response.

Proof that Israel cannot act with impunity and that it is vulnerable is not the only positive consequence of this important event. An even more important consequence is that the Sunni-Shia divide is narrowing. Hamas’ statement supporting the Iranian reaction is significant. On Sunday, April 14 of this year Hamas declared:

“We, in the Islamic Resistance Movement (Hamas), consider the military operation of the Islamic Republic of Iran against the Zionist occupation regime as a natural right and a deserved response to the crime of attacking the Iranian consulate in Damascus and assassinating several leaders of the Revolutionary Guards there.”

Yet another important consequence of the True Promise is that Iran has not only demonstrated with this reaction that it can reach any part of Israeli territory, but also any part of the region where U.S. troops are located. It is not for nothing that the United States asked Iran not to attack its soldiers in the region.

But perhaps the most relevant fact has been

the reactions of China and Russia. China, in its characteristic diplomatic posture, has given its approval and support to Iran while maintaining a diplomatic silence, just as it did with Russia and the special military operation in Ukraine. Reading between the lines of recent publications, China's support and positioning on Iran's side is clear. In the Global Times one can read the following:

“The fundamental cause of the current conflict between Israel and Iran is the Palestine-Israel conflict. Yet the US turned a blind eye to the root causes of the Middle East crisis. Worse, since the Palestine-Israel conflict began, the US has not made enough effort to stop Israel's actions, instead it has provided a large amount of military aid and political support to Israel, turning itself into an absolute accomplice and conspirator in the humanitarian disaster in Gaza.”^[3]

One wonders what argument the CPG would use to qualify such words as imperialist. But in reality we know their reasoning, because according to them, “Russia, China and Iran do not express their support [...] because they stand with the peoples' just cause but because they want to hinder the US plans in the region, to impede it, to afflict it.”^[4] Better, it seems, to “not impede” the US....

When China recently defended the Palestinian people's right to armed struggle before the International Court of Justice in The Hague, it did not do so, of course, “because it supports what is ‘just for the peoples’ but because it wants to hinder US plans in the region, to make it difficult for them”. With these words, the Chinese representative in The Hague, Ma Xinmin, “wanted to impede” the US:

“In pursuit of their right to self-determination, the use of force by the Palestinian people to resist foreign oppression and complete the establishment of an independent state is an inalienable right well grounded in international law. [...]

The GA resolution 3070 of 1973, I quote: ‘Reaffirms

the legitimacy of the peoples' struggle for liberation from colonial and foreign domination and alien subjugation by all available means, including armed struggle.’ End of quote. This recognition is also reflected in international conventions, for example, the Arab Convention for Suppressing of Terrorism of 1998 affirms I quote: ‘The right of peoples for combat foreign occupation, aggression by what ever means including arm struggle in order to liberate territories and to secure the right of self definition and independence.’ End of quote. Armed struggle in this context is distinguished form ext of terrorism. It is grounded in the international law. This distinction is acknowledged by several international conventions. For example: Article 3 of the OAU Convention on the Prevention and Combating of Terrorism, of 1999. I quote: ‘The struggle waged by peoples in accordance with the principles of international law for their liberation or self-determination, including armed struggle against colonialism, occupation, aggression and domination by foreign forces shall not be considered as terrorist acts.’”^[5]

Remarkable words that even go beyond China's traditionally moderate and diplomatic approach to international politics. Russia's support for Iran's True Promise was, as usual, rather more direct:

“What was done by the Islamic Republic of Iran in response to this criminal act and in the shadow of the inaction of the (UN) Security Council was the best way to punish the aggressor and a manifestation of the tact and rationality of the Iranian authorities.”

The overt or covert support of Russia and China for Iran and the growing cooperation between these three countries point to a promising future from the point of view of the defeat of imperialism. In the late 1990s Brzezinski had pointed out that potentially the most dangerous scenario for the US and its goal of perpetrating as long as possible its hegemony over the world would be a coalition

between China, Russia and perhaps Iran:

“Potentially, the most dangerous scenario would be a grand coalition of China, Russia, and perhaps Iran, an ‘antihegemonic’ coalition united not by ideology but by complementary grievances. It would be reminiscent in scale and scope of the challenge once posed by the Sino-Soviet bloc, though this time China would likely be the leader and Russia the follower. Averting this contingency, however remote it may be, will require a display of U.S. geostrategic skill on the western, eastern, and southern perimeters of Eurasia simultaneously.”^[6]

We are seeing in the present that such a constellation has been constituted....

Notes

[1] 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/>

[2] Communist Party of Greece (CPG), “Ανακοίνωση του Γραφείου Τύπου για την κλιμάκωση του πολέμου στη Μέση Ανατολή” (in English: “Press Office statement on the escalation of the war in the Middle East”), in: <https://www.902.gr/eidisi/politiki/361613/na-dynamosei-i-laiki-apaitisi-gia-apemploki-tis-horas-mas-apo-toys>

[3] Global Times: “West wields big stick of sanctions against Iran again, revealing blatant double standards”, Apr 17, 2024 09:17 PM, in: <https://www.globaltimes.cn/page/202404/1310780.shtml>

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

[5] TeleSUR, “China defiende lucha armada palestina contra ocupación israelí” (in English: “China defends Palestinian armed struggle against Israeli occupation”), February 22, 2024, in: <https://www.telesurtv.net/news/china-cij-derecho-uso-fuerza-palestina-ocupacion-israel--20240222-0014.html>

[6] Brzezinski, Zbigniew, “The Grand Chessboard, American Primacy and Its—Geostrategic Imperatives”, Perseus Books Group, April 1997, p. 55

The destruction of fascism in 1945 as a legacy for the defeat of the present axis of the USA–NATO-EU!

Dimitrios Patelis | Revolutionary Unification (Greece)

Contents

- On the character, forces and legacy of WWII
- Imperialist propaganda and distortion of history.
- Imperialism and fascism in WWII & WWIII
- On the character of the frontal struggle during WWIII. On the Specificity of the Russian ruling class.
- Conclusion

The Second World War (WWII) was the most terrible military conflict known to mankind. It erupted as a result of the interplay between the contradictions rising from the end of World War I, as a means of consolidating and reshaping the balance of forces at the international level, distributing and redistributing the world's wealth and power, and resolving the contradictions between the imperialist powers of the time, on a field permeated by the waves in the wake of the first early victorious socialist revolution. After the defeat of the counter-revolutionary forces of internal reaction and external multinational intervention, the imperialist powers never hid and never gave up their plans to crush the USSR.

On the character, forces and legacy of WWII

The aggression of the fascist and militarist regimes established in a number of countries (Germany, Italy, Spain, Japan, etc.) led to WWII. The fascist (anti-Soviet, anti-communist) “Anti-Comintern” aggressive axis was formed under nazi Germany, fascist Italy, militarist monarcho-fascist Japan and their allies. This axis, strengthened with the complicity and support of the “democratic” imperialist countries, became, with the war it

unleashed, a mortal enemy not only of the USSR but of all progressive humanity and, above all, of the international revolutionary workers' movement.

The economic and political support for the rise of fascism by the monopoly capital of the time (Ford, Standard Oil, Dupont, etc.) is now well known, as is the continuation of economic transactions with Germany during the war. For example, the “investment” of the bank in which Prescott Sheldon Bush (father of US President George H.W. Bush and grandfather of President George Walker Bush) was an executive, in the rise of nazism and the extraction of monopoly super-profits from the slave labour of Nazi prisoners through Brown Brothers & Harriman and Thyssen's UBC Bank is quite revealing.^[1]

Thus, the imperialist powers showed astonishing understanding and tolerance of the nazi remilitarisation of Germany and their supposed “neutrality” during the Spanish Civil War, which turned Spain into a testing ground for nazi and Italian fascist weapons systems and tactics. They sympathetically “gifted” Austria to Hitler (along with the Vienna railway junction) and, through the Munich Agreement, horribly betrayed Czechoslovakia, first by surrendering the Sudetenland (1938), paving the way for the conquest of the entire country, and preventing its government from accepting Soviet aid (in collaboration with the Polish government, which did not allow the passage of Soviet troops to its aid). Together with the nazis, they generously supplied Finland with troops and war materiel during the conflict with the USSR.

The British and the French engaged in a parody

of diplomatic manoeuvres, trying to secure Soviet support in the event of war without making the slightest commitment on their part, while maintaining secret contacts with the Hitlerites. Faced with the imminent danger of being isolated in a war with Germany and its allies, without having completed the rearmament of the Red Army (planned at the end of the Third Five-Year Plan), the USSR, with the Non-Aggression Pact (23/8/1939), achieved a temporary postponement of the war, which broke out in the centre of the capitalist world. The British and the French also sacrificed their anti-Soviet ally Poland in order to finally create a German-Soviet border so that the long-awaited attack on the USSR could be launched, while they theatrically declared war on Germany (3/9/1939) without firing a single shot for nine months...

On 22 June 1941, Germany, backed by the economic and military potential of the entire European continent united under its occupation and/or influence, attacked the USSR. Historically, this was the 1st European Union! The young Soviet Union became the main target of the axis, taking on the heavy task of the anti-fascist struggle, which radically changed the character of the war: it became a life and death struggle of the first socialist country against the most aggressive strike force of the world of capital. Its peoples, with their enormous sacrifices, were the decisive factor in the defeat of fascism in Europe and the world. The evacuation of the European USSR of productive units and population and the transfer of all infrastructure beyond the Urals, with the attacking nazis at the gates, was a tremendous achievement.

According to the Victory in Europe day Announcement of the U.S. Department of Defense "The conflict began in 1939, when Germany and the Soviet Union invaded Poland [...] The war had been raging for almost five years when U.S. and Allied forces landed on the beaches of Normandy,

France, on June 6, 1944. The invasion signaled the beginning of the end for Adolf Hitler and Nazi Germany. In less than a year, Germany would surrender and Hitler would be dead. The areas of Western Europe liberated by Allied forces would become thriving democracies, while those liberated in the East would be occupied for decades by Soviet forces. U.S. forces participated in the celebrations in France, a nation that had borne much of the brunt of the fighting."^[2] The audacity of the leaders of the current Euro-Atlantic axis knows no bounds. They officially and shamelessly spread the most monstrous lies in order to rewrite history according to their anti-communist propaganda needs, to promote the miserable lie about the "shared responsibility" of Nazism and socialism ("Stalinism") for the war, to erase from people's memories the historical truth about the character of the war and the decisive contribution of the USSR to the anti-fascist victory.

In the end, who bore the brunt of the crushing of the then anti-communist, fascist "anti-Comintern" axis? 61 countries took part in WWII, in operations conducted on the territory of 40 countries. The USSR caused 77% of Germany's total losses in the war. The death toll was high: over 55 million (some estimates put it at over 80 million), including 27 million Soviet civilians and military personnel. The victims of the Chinese people numbered at about 35 million. The exact number of victims of the atrocities of Japanese imperialism in Korea, the Pacific and Indochina is not known. The number of victims is an indication of the contribution of each country to the war. For example, 7% of the then population of Greece sacrificed themselves by writing glorious pages in the history of the struggle for national liberation that was spearheaded by the communists. The UK had 450,900 dead (military and civilian), the USA had 419,400 dead throughout the war (less than the number of deaths in road accidents in the same period).^[3]

Revolutionary thought must highlight the historical dynamics of the interaction between the extensive and intensive development of capitalism and early socialism in relation to the rising and fall of the polarisation of the two global socio-economic systems in the light of the interrelation between global revolution and counter-revolution. It may be that the planned mobilisation for war, and the hasty acceleration of events, exacerbated the fundamental contradiction of socialist construction, imposing forms of formal versus essential socialisation, extensive development versus intensive, etc., which manifested in the post-war period, as well as in the form of bureaucratisation. The historical imperative, however, was inexorable. Could the USSR have survived and prevailed without the unprecedented pace of industrialisation it had achieved, without the unimaginable feat of transferring all industrial production east of the Urals, under conditions of total war, without the mass self-denial of its peoples, who believed in the victory of socialism and threw themselves into a life-and-death struggle with the technologically and economically superior (in the early years of the war) war machine of the Reich?

The post-war reconstruction from the ruins of a literally flattened country and its transformation into the world's second industrial and military superpower, with the simultaneous beginning of the "Cold War", is monumental. It was in this context that the formation of the socialist camp and the rise of the peoples' struggle against colonial and neo-colonial dependency took place, largely on the basis of the geostrategic balance of forces and the presence of the Red Army.

With the anti-fascist victory, the global early socialist system and the anti-colonial and national liberation movements, which were strengthened and oriented by it in different ways, were born.

The USA emerges from WWII almost unscathed and greatly strengthened, but the extensive

development of global capitalism is substantially limited. The pure and unchallenged global domination of the pole of capitalist powers over the dependent world is dynamically disrupted by the alternative historical perspective, which is no longer an abstract possibility, but is actively realised. We now have three worlds: the "first", the "second" and the "third". The course of the latter becomes a great historical contest. Complex systems of interactions are emerging within and between them.

This is not a mechanical, quantitative, extensive geographical contraction of an otherwise unchanging capitalism. It is a change that has qualitative and substantial effects on both poles of this new expression of the antithesis between capital and labour, on the two interacting and antagonistic camps, but also on the contested space in between. It is a change in the field of extensive development that inevitably leads to an intensive restructuring of the mechanism of exploitation on a national and international scale ("Cold War", transition from colonialism to neo-colonial forms of economic exploitation, state-monopoly regulation, "welfare state", etc.).

This was followed by a multitude of local (overt and covert) heated conflicts, which led to the militarisation of the economy and the application of geopolitical tactics for the rapid acquisition and defence of the maximum "living space", as well as a "buffer zone" for socialism, and so on. The resources available to the USSR for the armaments that ensured the "balance of terror" are unimaginable.^[4]

Imperialist propaganda and distortion of history

Today, it is the undisputed victors of the Cold War and the current representatives of the US-led axis, the nazis of our time, who are methodically escalating the Third World War (WWIII), who are doing everything they can to rewrite history, to

erase from the memory of the people the decisive contribution of the USSR, of the communists and the left-progressive people, who gave everything to liberate humanity from fascist brutality. The audacity with which a barrage of disinformation has been unleashed, aimed at distorting the historical truth, desecrating the victory and vilifying the very forces that contributed decisively to the outcome of this war, is astonishing. The scribblers, “historians”, journalists, politicians, etc., amateur revisionists of history, whether they are on the payroll, or “volunteers”, using Goebbels’ methods of brainwashing, with infinitely more effective means of mass manipulation than those of the nazis, are striving to prepare the ground for the full implementation of the objectives of the present strike force of world capital, objectives similar to those pursued by Hitler... This tidal wave of lies, wrapped in the glamour of the Hollywood myth, seeks to spread the image of the American “rushing to liberate Europe and save humanity”... The ghosts of the past are intertwined with the nightmares of the present and the future...

As if it were not the imperialist “allies” who bred and nurtured the monster of German nazism and the axis, the main aim of which was the extermination of communism, “Judeo-Bolshevism” and the acquisition of a colonial “hinterland” in the East for German capital, which was given the short straw in the division of the global imperialist plunder. As if they were not the ones who exhausted all diplomatic and conspiratorial means to turn this abomination against the first victorious early revolution of the 20th century, the young USSR, in order to nullify any subsequent attempt at the revolutionary emancipation of humanity. As if they were not the ones who hoped to achieve this goal to the end, and to that end they kept postponing the opening of the second front, which they did safely in June 1944, when the Red Army was already advancing and they were worried that

they might lose the entirety of Europe... Did they not show their true colours when, in August 1945, without the slightest operational necessity and in the face of the overwhelming defeat of Japan (especially with the entry of the USSR into the war against it), they used the atomic bomb in Hiroshima and Nagasaki as brutal war criminals? Would the imperialists (fascists or “allies”), have hesitated to use the atomic bomb to intercept the Red Army, which at that time did not have such a weapon of mass destruction, had they developed it earlier?

That’s why they want to brainwash the people with the insidious concept of the equation: nazism = socialism-communism = USSR = “totalitarianism”... In order to destroy the hope that the October Revolution, the anti-fascist victory, the early socialist revolutions and the anti-imperialist movements of the 20th century as a whole gave to the people, and above all: to prevent the imminent glorious revolutions of the 21st century, which will be their end... They try to convince us to abandon any idea of a struggle for dignity, for the liberation of humanity from exploitation and oppression, because it would supposedly lead to “dictatorship” and “totalitarianism” like that of Hitler... They try to convince us that the brutality of “globalised” imperialism of the multinational corporations is a one-way street for humanity... They try to convince us that the only “realistic” way of life is voluntary slavery...

Imperialism and fascism in WWII & WWIII

There is a relationship of continuity-discontinuity between WWII and WWIII. As I have shown in previous writings, global conflicts are an inherent element of the imperialist stage of capitalism, manifesting themselves with a periodicity corresponding to that of large-scale structural systemic crises. This periodicity also includes waves of revolutions and counter-revolutions.

The crushing of fascist Germany and its allies by

the forces of the anti-fascist coalition in 1945 was a great defeat for fascism. After WWII, fascism was temporarily weakened but not completely eradicated.

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

The current stage of imperialism, is the stage of transnational monopoly imposition, of the attempt to completely subordinate humanity to the most powerful international multi-branch monopoly groups, the Transnational corporations (TNCs) to the most powerful in terms of capital, to the imperialist countries and their transnational organs. The sphere of circulation (export of goods and capital) no longer plays a dominant role in the structure of the relations of production of the present stage of imperialism. This role is now played by the sphere of production itself, distributed on a planetary scale and rooted in the technologies and organisation of this production. At this stage, the division of the world between the most powerful international multi-branch monopoly groups and between the most powerful imperialist countries in terms of capital (which are the main TNCs countries of residence) on the basis of inequality and the extraction of monopoly super-profits on a global scale has been completed, while a rapid shift of power is taking place with the rapid progress of the PRC and the emergence of a new pole led by the latter and Russia (BRICS, etc.): the pole of the forces of socialism and anti-imperialism.

WWIII is leading to the rapid shrinking of the parasitic capacities of the pole of the traditional imperialist centres. Imperialism led by USA,

despite the rampant push towards fascism in the countries of its territory, no longer has the need to establish outright fascist regimes in the frontline imperialist countries (as in inter-war Germany) with the claim to develop an antagonistic military-industrial complex and armed forces competitive with those of the USA, independent and self-sufficient. This would challenge the de facto US hegemony in this axis. The regime in the imperialist countries and the satellite countries of its near periphery today succeeds in effectively manipulating the working class and the wider popular strata through consensual means and ways.

Fascism today is even more deeply linked to the ideology and practices of extreme neo-liberalism, social Darwinism and “post-modern” irrationalism. The US-NATO-EU imperialist axis is instrumentalising and “exporting” fascism and nazism to install its subordinate regimes in countries that until the 1980s were part of the USSR, Yugoslavia or other countries that passed through phases of early socialism in Europe, South Korea, etc.

During WWIII, fascism functions as an instrumentally useful and expendable “strike force” in proxy wars against those who resist the continuation of its domination, against the forces of anti-imperialism and socialism. This is evident in the way the imperialists are treating the people of Ukraine today (as “cannon fodder”) against the people of the rebellious Donbass since 2014, and against Russia and its allies since 2022. The same fate awaits tomorrow the peoples of Poland, the Baltic States, South Korea, Taiwan, Greece and other Balkan countries, etc. This is also the role of the Zionist racist formation of Israel, the war arm of the US-led axis, which has been the brutal occupying power in Palestine for 7 decades, launching repeated genocidal operations against the Palestinian people, while acting as an aggressive imperialist bulwark and arm of the axis in this

strategically important region.

During WWII, the formation of an anti-fascist front at national and global level to crush the fascist/anti-communist/anti-Comintern axis constituted a strategic objective. The USSR, the Third International and the global communist movement concentrated their forces on this objective. The Soviet foreign policy and diplomacy exploited the inter-imperialist contradictions with extraordinary skill in order to divide the imperialist world of that time, to inactivate a significant part of the imperialist powers (Great Britain, USA, France, etc.) and to integrate them in the anti-fascist alliance against the axis. During WWII, the strategically important frontal policy, the victorious policy of alliances, had to prioritise anti-fascism/anti-nazism and only through this to pursue the anti-imperialist and socialist aims of the communists.

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

These conditions also radically change the character of today's fascism/nazism, transforming

it into an instrument of war, intervention and coups d'état, into an "exportable" model of transnational monopoly imposition of regimes that act as subordinates, outposts and strike forces of the unique and deadly aggressive unified US-NATO-EU axis.

On the character of the frontal struggle during WWIII. On the specificity of the Russian ruling class.

Therefore, in contrast to WWII, today, during WWIII, the strategically important frontal policy, the victorious policy of alliances, must give priority to the consistent and militant anti-imperialism, to the prioritisation of the aggressor united US-NATO-EU axis as the №1 enemy of humanity, whose tool is the current versions of fascism. Therefore, it is only through the consistent frontal anti-imperialist struggle that anti-fascism/anti-nazism today gains meaning and is organically linked to the socialist aims of the communists. Those who do not put forward consistent anti-imperialism in today's struggle are objectively acting in a disorientating and undermining way.

This is impossible to understand through the irrational metaphysical dogma of the "imperialist pyramid", which the present leadership of the KKE boldly proclaims and which presents all the countries world as "imperialist"! In this way it denies the very existence of the forces of socialism and anti-imperialism in the contemporary world. Today, this party is quick to denounce any mention of a front with these forces as "opportunism"!

Individuals and organisations which considered the participation in the anti-fascist alliance of the imperialist frontline countries during WWII (as a result of the masterful policy and diplomacy of the USSR) as tactically correct in every way, today, as WWIII escalates, tremble even at the thought of countries that the imperialists want to dismantle, conquer and completely colonise (for example,

Russia, Syria, Iran, Yemen, Venezuela, Brazil etc.) and countries to which their stereotypes do not allow “certificates of socialist purity”..., joining the pole of the forces of anti-imperialism and socialism.

The attitude of the present bourgeois regime of the Russian Federation (RF) towards the war deserves special mention. The achievements of a great revolution cannot be completely erased from history. However, after the counterrevolution and the restoration of the capitalist state, little remained of the achievements of early socialism in the present RF and in the other countries that emerged from the dissolution of the USSR. The RF is not the unionist Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic, and the “Eurasian Economic Union” (EAEU), [RF, Belarus, Kazakhstan, Armenia, the leadership of which—after its defeat by Azerbaijan in Nagorno-Karabakh—has set its sights firmly on full integration into Euro-Atlantic institutions], does not represent a renaissance of the USSR, despite the propagandistic cries of the axis to the contrary.

Because of their own position and role in society, these bourgeoisie, in order to achieve and secure comparative advantages in the next negotiations, can shamelessly concoct “ideological mixtures” that are abhorrent in their eclecticism, with elements of neo-liberalism, anti-communism and the exploitation of popular nostalgia for the USSR, patriotism and imperial monarchism, nostalgia for the tsarist White Guard with a little praise to Vlasov^[5], mixed even with elements of actual fascism^[6]. All this is fully inscribed in the “logic” of bourgeois practice and the ideologies of—according to V. Putin—“conservative pragmatism”...

The anti-fascist uprising in Donbass, the war in Ukraine and the subsequent economic war (with sanctions, manipulation of the prices of hydrocarbons, etc.) acted as steps in large-scale operations, with tactics that allowed the Euro-Atlantic axis to increasingly encircle Russia, with

the ultimate aim of minimising or even neutralising the deterrent power of the strategic nuclear arsenal inherited from the USSR. This mechanism led to the escalation of the war with the “special military operation” in Ukraine from 24 February 2022 as an existential response to the aggression of the US-led axis.

How will the regime of the present capitalist Russia and the other targeted powers be able to stand their ground? What will the rallying point for the people be, under what banner will they counter-attack? What will the ideological basis be? The patchwork of neo-liberalism, white-guard monarchism, nationalist-fascist admiration for Vlasov and 19th century obscurantism of Eurasian mysticism proposed by the leadership? Even elementary anti-fascism (in the conditions of global structural crisis and WWIII) is lacking without a consistent struggle against the financial oligarchy, against the capitalist system that inevitably produces fascism and war.

The ruling class of today’s Russia is trying to take advantage of the glory of the anti-fascist victory, trying to impose the view that this victory was supposedly achieved “in spite of the socialist regime” and not precisely because of the existence of socialism! It tries to do this by rewriting history so that it can be incorporated, distorted by bourgeois/reactionary ideologies, into the official narrative of the “more than a millennium long glorious history of Russia”... If pro-nazi, fascist and/or fascist forces had not prevailed and dominated the politics and ideology of neighbouring countries with the full support of the EU and NATO (Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, which as EU members have proclaimed nazi collaborators as “national heroes”, and Ukraine, where an openly pro-nazi junta has been imposed since February 2014), the revision of history by the current bourgeois leadership of Russia would have gone much further.

Revision not only in the spirit of denigrating the revolution, the Bolsheviks, Lenin, Stalin, etc. and sanctifying the tsarist regime and the counterrevolutionary white guard (the collaborators of the imperialist invaders in the suppression of the young Soviet Union), but also in the spirit of increasingly hagiographic glorification of the Russian counterrevolutionaries who fully collaborated with the nazi invaders and fought against the peoples of the USSR. This became evident by the relatively recent installation of a memorial plaque by the authorities in St. Petersburg in memory of the Finnish fascist E. Mannerheim^[7] with full military honours (which was torn down after popular opposition), by the open appeals of mainstream propagandists in the Russian media for the erection of a monument in honour of the nazi collaborator P.N. Krasnov^[8], etc.

The escalating war in Ukraine as well as the war in Syria (with the corresponding bargaining and vacillations of the Russian leadership towards the Euro-Atlantic axis, zionist Israel and Turkey) have shown that the Russian bourgeoisie and its political personnel are in the grip of global and internal economic, social, military, administrative, ideological, etc. contradictions, the solution of which is in principle impossible from a bourgeois position. This war is rapidly and vividly demonstrating the historical limitations of the bourgeoisie, making them a dangerous anachronism. The very survival of Russia and the countries that have emerged in the post-Soviet space, the salvation of these peoples and others tested by the Euro-Atlantic axis, is unattainable from the positions of neo-liberal capitalism. From these positions, a fundamental re-industrialisation, a breakthrough in science and technology, a transition of the economy to a wartime trajectory is unattainable.

As we have shown, the Russian bourgeoisie would naturally like to become an organic part

of, or a competitor to, the established imperialism of the axis. However, the axis did not leave them any room for development in this direction, as it eagerly sought and still seeks to perpetuate Russia's position and role as an exporter of energy and raw materials to imperialism, and ultimately the weakening, disarmament, fragmentation and complete enslavement colonisation of the territory of the former Soviet Union. Therefore, the Russian bourgeoisie did not declare war because they suddenly became anti-imperialist and pro-socialist. On the contrary, they were inevitably dragged into the war for existential reasons, with the well-known criminal vacillations and bargains they are familiar with from their own comprador tenure. Thus, taking the side of the anti-imperialist and socialist forces in the war does not mean unconditional cooperation with the Russian bourgeoisie or any other bourgeoisie that happened to be dragged into the conflict.

The suffocating sanctions of the US-NATO-EU axis of aggression and the escalation of its involvement in the battlefields of Ukraine have led the Russian ruling class to a major revision of its domestic and foreign policies. It has achieved a significant level of reactivation of the potential of the military-industrial complex inherited from the USSR and has proceeded to reorient its diplomatic, political, economic and military-technical relations and alliances, to alliances and cooperation with the forces of socialism and anti-imperialism.

However, the Russian ruling class presents no assurances of consistency in the struggle against the axis. On every occasion, and even without one, it rushes to declare its "readiness for all-out negotiations" in the war, as if it were ready for a complete return to the familiar role of comprador wholesaler, mediator in the predatory disposal of natural resources to imperialism! Only bound by a network of strong mutual commitments and obligations with the forces of early socialism and

anti-imperialism, under the pressure of a robust and consistent global anti-imperialist movement, will it be able to advance more consistently in the struggle against the axis.

Conclusion

So, let us consider what the world would be like today if the anti-fascist forces led by the USSR and the Red Army had not crushed the horrors of fascism in 1945... The main lesson of this victory is one: the enemy, the most aggressive forces of imperialism, are not invincible when the peoples decide to take their destiny into their own hands.

The superficial and ahistorical anti-fascism, detached from consistent anti-imperialism, lacks any perspective during WWII. What is necessary today is a coordinated anti-fascist struggle within the framework of a global militant anti-imperialist front, with the communists as its vanguard. Equally necessary is the unceasing theoretical, ideological and practical struggle against the forces of opportunism and revisionism, which sow confusion and discord, which reject the necessity of a frontal anti-imperialist and anti-fascist struggle, and separate fascism from imperialism.

The role of the World Anti-imperialist Platform is to act as a catalyst, coordinator and leader in this struggle.

The anti-fascist victory with the decisive contribution of the USSR is a legacy for the future victories of the peoples.

The axis of the present will also be crushed! Victory to the forces of socialism and anti-imperialism!

Notes

[1] John Loftus—"The Dutch connection", The Guardian: "How Bush's grandfather helped Hitler's rise to power"

[2] U.S. Department of Defense VICTORY IN EUROPE DAY: TIME OF CELEBRATION, REFLECTION

[3] Human losses of World War II by country

[4] For the glorious and contradictory developmental path of socialism, see the collective volume of the Greek section of the international

school THE LOGIC OF HISTORY: The October Revolution and early socialism in the Logic of History. Issues of revolutionary theory, methodology and practice. 2017. [Η Οκτωβριανή Επανάσταση και ο πρώτος σοσιαλισμός στη Λογική της Ιστορίας. Ζητήματα επαναστατικής θεωρίας, μεθοδολογίας και πρακτικής. Αθήνα, ΚΨΜ, 2017.]

[5] Vlasov Andrey Andreyevich (1901-1946) was a Soviet general who became a collaborator with the nazi occupiers in WWII. They made him commander of the "Russian Liberation Army" under the command of the Wehrmacht.

[6] A typical example is the demand for the establishment at the former Academy of Social Sciences under the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the current "State University of Humanities" (РГГУ) of Moscow, of a Philosophy Department, which will bear the name of the fascist "philosopher" (a servant of the nazis and a favourite "thinker" of V. Putin) Ivan Ilyin, under the direction of the prominent wavering irrationalist, mysticist fascist, Alexander Dugin! For the reaction of the students, see «Против учебно-научного центра имени Ивана Ильина в РГГУ».

[7] Baron Carl Gustaf Emil Mannerheim was a Finnish marshal and politician. He was a Tsarist officer when Finland was part of the Russian Empire. He was a pioneer in the suppression of revolution in Finland and in the massacre/extermination of communists. He became regent of Finland in 1918, took part in the Soviet-Finnish War and the siege of Leningrad on the nazi side as supreme military commander of the Finnish forces, and was a personal friend/collaborator of Hitler during WWII.

[8] Pyotr Nikolayevich Krasnov (1869-1947) was a Don Cossack officer, promoted to lieutenant general when the revolution broke out in 1917, and one of the most bloodthirsty leaders of the counter-revolutionary White movement against Soviet rule. In 1919, after the defeat of the counter-revolutionaries, Krasnov fled to Western Europe, where he continued his anti-Soviet/anti-Communist activities and was one of the founders of the Brotherhood of Russian Truth, an openly fascist anti-Communist organisation with a secret network in Russia. During WWII, Krasnov was tasked with organising and leading Cossack units of white emigres and Soviet (mostly Cossack) prisoners of war armed by the nazis. At the end of the war, Krasnov and his men surrendered voluntarily to British forces in Austria. On 28 May 1945, Pyotr Krasnov was handed over to the Soviets by the British authorities during Operation Keelhaul. He was sentenced to death by the Military Court of the Supreme Court of the USSR, along with General Andrei Shkuro, Timofei Domanov and Helmuth von Pannwitz. He was executed by hanging on 17 January 1947.

‘Stop the boats!’ The political football of the ‘immigration debate’ in Britain

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

How the ruling class divides workers against one another and distracts our attention from the true causes of our misery.

The concepts of ‘real’ versus ‘bogus’ asylum-seekers, the distinction between ‘legal’ and ‘illegal’ immigrants are aimed not at really stemming immigration flows but at reinforcing the myth that immigrants are the cause of British workers’ poverty, and that our rulers are trying to protect us from these ‘invaders’. Anti-immigration legislation and its associated public debates and punitive enforcement mechanisms aim to tie British-born workers to their own ruling class and to divide them from their fellow workers.

In Britain, as in every other imperialist country today, there is an increasingly heated and vitriolic debate around the question of immigration. The more that living standards for British workers fall, the louder and more insistent this debate becomes.

While some debate is focused on the relatively larger numbers of migrants who come legally to study and work (a proportion of whom then go on to become ‘illegal’ by overstaying their visa limits), the majority of hysteria is centred on the small minority of migrants who have arrived in Britain via ‘illegal’ means from the start—very often in the hope of claiming asylum once they get here.

As legal methods of entry for asylum seekers using official international mechanisms have been choked off, a significant number of refugees are forced to travel by dangerous underground routes. In the last few years, a clamp-down on alternative means of entry has led to an increase in the

numbers of migrants arriving on small boats across the English Channel.

According to the Refugee Council: “The majority of people crossing the Channel in small boats are fleeing war-torn or oppressive countries where no safe and formal routes exist for making an asylum claim in the UK.” Four in ten who cross the Channel come from just five countries—Afghanistan, Iran, Syria, Eritrea and Sudan—which currently have asylum grant rates of between 82 and 98 percent.

Despite the fact that so many who come by boat are genuine refugees who can find no other way to make an asylum claim, the much publicised shift in their method of entry has been used to justify a further ratcheting up of the heat surrounding the topic of immigration, and to the promotion of the demand to ‘Stop the boats!’

The threat of numberless “floods” or “hordes” of what are often ominously described as “military aged men” arriving on our shores to ‘steal jobs’ and/or ‘sponge on our benefits system’, ‘occupy our council houses’ and otherwise use up ‘our’ valuable and supposedly limited resources forms a daily background hum in Britain’s media—especially in those popular media designed for consumption by the broad mass of poorer working-class people.

Politicians and media compete with one another to be toughest in this regard, claiming (as in the days of the Napoleonic invasion scare) to be working on a plan to keep Britain’s 11,000 miles of coastline “protected” from this foreign “invasion”, and castigating their opponents for being soft on this question (if in opposition) or for having “lost control” (if in government).

A drop in the ocean

To put this rhetoric in context, the population of Great Britain is around 65 million people, most of it centred in the south-east and central areas of England. The numbers of migrants coming to Britain on small boats, around whom so much incendiary debate has been centred, is thought to have been less than 50,000 at its peak two years ago. Available statistics show this number falling considerably since November 2021. Last year, the number is thought to have been around 30,000.

Official statistics are often sketchy and incomplete, and government methodology has recently changed, making comparisons difficult, but official figures indicate that the number of migrants arriving in Britain via legal channels from outside the European Union has been rising since Brexit, alongside a parallel movement of European workers out of the country. There have been particularly large spikes in visas for students (as deregulated universities seek to maximise their income by actively recruiting overseas students and charging them astronomical international fees) and for skilled workers (who have been asked to plug gaps in the British workforce, it being cheaper to use labour trained elsewhere than to educate and train skilled workers at home).

In terms of the number of asylum applications per head of population, the UK ranks 22nd in Europe (just eight per 10,000 of the population, as against 23 for Germany), despite being one of the richest countries in the region (and the world), and despite its obligations under the Geneva conventions. In contrast to the deliberately “hostile environment” that greets most asylum seekers to Britain, however, more than 200,000 applicants from Hong Kong and Ukraine have had their claims expedited in the last three years—clearly because their admission was in line with propaganda supporting British imperialist aggression against China and Russia.

In their case, no pogroms were whipped up

and the usual discussion about floods, hordes and overstretched services was quietly dropped. On the contrary, financial incentives were paid to British families prepared to host Ukrainians fleeing the war, communities were urged to provide support and a warm welcome, and refugees were immediately able to collect benefits and look for work. As a result of having safe legal channels through which to claim asylum in the UK, none of these Ukrainian or Chinese migrants had to risk the dangers of (or pay the fees for) a small-boat Channel crossing.

Since most migrants to Britain have homes to go to and are permitted to work, they quickly become invisible, merging into the workforce, sending their children to local schools etc.

The treatment of migrants who arrive by illegal means, by contrast, makes their presence very much more noticeable to the local populations amongst whom they are housed, although their absolute numbers remain small. In 2019, just 0.6 percent of the population consisted of people who had come to Britain as an asylum seeker. Over half of these had been living in the country for more than 15 years, putting into context the alarmist notion that Britain has been inundated by a recent ‘flood’ of such people.

Meanwhile, what can appear to be ‘significant numbers’ of unprocessed asylum seekers are routinely placed in extremely impoverished ‘post-industrial’ communities of low employment and high social deprivation. In this context, where education, healthcare and housing provision, along with other social services and community facilities, have been cut to the bone and are now totally inadequate to the needs of the population, even the presence of a fairly small number of immigrants in a run-down hotel can easily be made to seem inflammatory.

The system of placing asylum seekers in neglected areas, of denying them the right to work and of

keeping them dependent on beggarly hand-outs (£7 per day for all expenses) while their applications are bogged down in a process that might take years, can be and regularly is used as an excuse to drum up outrage about ‘scroungers’ and to whip up pogroms based on supposed (usually entirely fabricated) ‘threats’ to local women and children. The fear of Asian and African men in particular has been stoked by decades of dehumanising islamophobic propaganda that has accompanied British imperialist aggression against the people of Somalia, Afghanistan, Iraq, Syria, Lebanon, Libya, Iran, Palestine, Yemen and elsewhere.

Election year bidding war under way

At any time of political or economic difficulty for the ruling class, it is noticeable that the background hum of immigration chatter is ramped up. In an election period (and the pre-election campaigning period is getting longer with each election cycle), this hum acquires the volume of a symphonic finale, complete with double brass fanfare and a full chorus. The framing of the ‘debate’ means that discussion of immigration is presented as part of a ‘culture war’ that creates plenty of heat but very little light.

It is an accepted trope amongst bourgeois commentators that migration controls are a ‘demand’ that originates spontaneously amongst the poorer members of the working class, and that in making this demand workers must be acting from an inherent racist backwardness. Politicians, so the story goes, then find themselves compelled to act on this demand in order to placate the public. The fact that three generations of workers have been endlessly informed that immigration is the cause of their problems while their living standards declined is left out of this convenient narrative.

Members of the liberal intelligentsia, meanwhile, are presented as being far more enlightened in their attitude and in their opposition to the racism of the

poor. Their ‘supportive’ arguments for immigration focus on the idea that migrants ‘do the jobs we don’t want to’ (ie, that they are prepared to subsidise British living standards by working for very low wages in very poor conditions).

Those from the privileged classes who join the debate on the anti-immigrant, supposedly ‘working-class’ side (and there are very many of these) present themselves as representing ‘common sense’, as wanting to defend a ‘shared British culture’, and as ‘defenders’ of the rights of indigenous British-born workers. Britain’s ‘way of life’ is described as being ‘under threat’ from what former prime minister David Cameron described in 2015 as a “swarm”.

But a closer look reveals that whether avowedly liberal or openly racist, all sections of the British bourgeois political spectrum are in agreement that immigration is a ‘problem’ that ‘strains our services’, and that measures must be put in place to curtail it. Media from the rabidly reactionary Sun tabloid newspaper to the liberal Guardian, politicians from the left wing of the Labour party as well as the right wing of the Tory party all routinely agree that ‘something must be done’, and the only real question is exactly what form anti-immigrant measures should take.

As elections approach, the roar of the media that ‘something must be done’ becomes deafening and bourgeois political parties, who have no answers for the real material problems facing working-class people, get into what amounts to a bidding war regarding who can be relied upon to be ‘toughest’ on immigration.

As an adjunct to this process, the entire debate is endlessly shifted to the right by steady normalisation of openly fascist approaches to the poor of the world. On the one hand, the constant stream of anti-immigrant hysteria in the ‘mainstream’ press and from ‘mainstream’ politicians normalises the idea that immigration is

a big problem. This gives fuel to the rabid utterings of the fascistic right wing, who merely take these talking points to their logical extreme. On the other hand, the ‘mainstream’ justifies the constant shifting of its discourse to the right by claiming that if it doesn’t, it will lose ground to open fascists. By means of this carefully choreographed ballet, the fascistic discourse and most overt institutional racism is increasingly presented as ‘normal’.

It is particularly ironic that anti-immigrant demagogues try to scare British workers with the narrative that there is a ‘British gene pool’ and a ‘British culture’ that are under threat as a result of mass migration to our shores. As a small island on the edge of Europe, our whole history has been one of waves of migration. There is no ‘British’ genotype and no eternal ‘British culture’. Britain has always been a melting pot, and its culture and people have always been in flux. Moreover, the culture of the British ruling class is in many respects quite different from the culture of the British working class, who have more in common with workers elsewhere than with their exploiters at home.

The capitalist class, however, while ruthlessly pursuing its own selfish interests at the expense of the working class, seeks to portray its own exploitative interests as being ‘national’ and therefore in the interest of both rulers and workers. Anti-immigration sentiment, love of king or queen and country, reverence for the armed forces and their imperial escapades, respect for the police force and its oppressive actions against the working poor, Union Jack worship at every sporting and cultural occasion—all these are examples of the ‘values’ British workers are asked to imbibe in order to tie them to their ruling class.

As the 2024 general election approaches, Britain’s political parties are mired in a new version of the same old bidding war. In the 1960s, the Tory party scared voters with the slogan “If you want a nigger for a neighbour, vote Labour” and Labour

in government responded by instituting virginity tests for Asian brides. In the more recent past, the Labour government of Tony Blair built detention centres (prisons) on British soil in which asylum seekers, including young children, continue to be held for unlimited periods in horrendous conditions while their claims are processed.

Today, not only are some asylum seekers being returned to countries through which they have transited without their claim even being assessed by Britain, but the remainder are being threatened with a third-country processing regime that Britain’s supreme court has ruled as unlawful and the United Nations refugee agency (UNHCR) has condemned as a violation of Britain’s international responsibilities.

As this article was being written, the present Tory government was passing new legislation through Parliament that aims to offshore the asylum process altogether by paying a designated third country (Rwanda) to assess asylum claims from afar and to offer successful applicants a home there rather than allowing them to come to Britain.

The morning after the Rwanda bill was passed through Parliament (Monday 22 April), news came in of yet another disaster in the Channel. Five of the 112 people on board an overcrowded boat had fallen overboard and were drowned—three men, one woman and a seven-year-old girl.

While shedding crocodile tears for this entirely preventable tragedy and claiming to be acting from motives of “compassion”, British prime minister Rishi Sunak used the news as an opportunity to present the new legislation as a ‘solution’ that will create an atmosphere of “deterrence”. According to the logic of Sunak and his government, deaths at sea are not the result of refugees having no safe or legal routes through which to apply for asylum in Britain, but are entirely the result of the unscrupulousness of the human trafficking operations that organise the boats.

What is this really all about?

Despite the huge hype around the Rwanda bill, the scheme is expected to end in homes for just 200 migrants initially. Clearly the real aim is not to house but to deter and criminalise asylum seekers—and to promote the idea that the government is indeed (and quite rightly) ‘getting tough’ on immigration.

The ruling class’s agenda becomes clear when one considers that the cost of imprisoning refugees is far higher than the cost of settling them and allowing them to work and support themselves.

Meanwhile, the provisions of the new legislation are removing altogether the right to asylum in Britain and criminalising those who attempt to come here, creating an inhumane machinery of scapegoating, imprisonment and deportation that the United Nations has repeatedly pointed out are a violation of the 1951 convention on refugees and the right to asylum.

It is clear that people will continue to be forced to leave their homes to escape wars, hunger and other crises that threaten their existence. These problems—war, underdevelopment and impoverishment—have their roots in imperialist exploitation and domination; no government measure can ‘stem the tide’ of mass migration around the globe without addressing these root causes.

So what is the real purpose and actual effect of the refugee policy of Britain’s government? Clearly, it seeks merely to divert attention from the failings of the capitalist-imperialist system, under which the oldest imperialist country, which remains one of the largest hubs of accumulated wealth in the world, is unable to provide a decent living for a large and growing proportion of its people.

The latest and much-hyped ‘stop the boats’ immigration legislation seeks to stigmatise refugees from war as ‘fake’ asylum seekers by penalising them for the fact that they are unable to apply for

asylum in their countries of origin. Not only do wars inevitably make this process impossible, but now the new act is deliberately and brutally closing off whatever was left of the ‘legal’ asylum routes into Britain.

The concepts of ‘real’ versus ‘bogus’ asylum-seekers, the distinction between ‘legal’ and ‘illegal’ immigrants are not actually aimed at stemming immigration flows but at reinforcing the myth that immigrants are the cause of British workers’ poverty, and that our rulers are trying to protect us from these ‘invaders’. Anti-immigration legislation and its associated public debates and punitive enforcement mechanisms aim to tie British-born workers to their own ruling class and to divide them from their fellow workers.

This is particularly clear when one realises how small a proportion even of ‘illegal’ migration to Britain will be affected, since most ‘illegals’ in Britain entered the country on a student or tourism visa and stayed on without permission. Clearly, the Rwanda bill cannot possibly have any effect on this, by far the largest, number of ‘illegal’ migrants in Britain.

The entire immigration ‘debate’ should therefore be understood as a smokescreen to divert workers from recognising the fundamental systemic issues that cause their problems. Instead, it offers them a seductive ‘solution’: If only the foreigners were removed from Britain, our lives would be better—there would be jobs, houses, school places, doctor’s appointments and hospital beds for all and the stress of our present precarious existence would be done away with.

Unfortunately for those who are taken in by this narrative, it is pure fantasy: a chimera with which to hypnotise and misdirect the attention of those who have not yet understood that problems of unemployment, inequality and poverty, that housing and health crises and all their associated miseries are a feature of the capitalist system of

production for profit.

It is worthwhile noting here that the welfare-state concessions made to British workers in the special period after WW2, the loss of which we are now told is owing not to a shift in the balance of class forces or the return of the global overproduction crisis but to an ‘impossible strain’ caused by ‘too many immigrants’, were largely funded through the increased exploitation of Britain’s colonies—a fact tacitly understood and accepted by labour movement leaders.

The plain truth is that the problems which plague working people would exist even if every worker of foreign origin was removed overnight from British soil. The export of capital in search of ever-greater profits (and the consequent deindustrialisation of the home territory) is a process that was already underway at the turn of the 20th century. Notwithstanding some temporary reversals in the position of the working class during the postwar reconstruction boom, this process continues to accelerate, and to underpin much of the misery of British workers.

Today’s ‘harsh measures’ of immigration control, while designed to terrorise migrants and create an easily-identifiable scapegoat in our midst, do not and cannot work—and they are not even really meant to. The capitalists of Britain benefit greatly from the existence of an intimidated ‘illegal’ migrant workforce, which puts very little demand on the state machinery but contributes mightily (through its slave-labour pay and conditions) to capitalist profit margins, enabling rates of superexploitation usually only available in the oppressed countries.

Some people have been confused about the essence of the latest legislation because of the skin colour of those proposing it (both the current prime minister and his home secretary have Asian/African family origins). But racism doesn’t have to come from a white man; brown-skinned people are

quite capable of serving the system of imperialist rule. The concerted attempt to rebrand the imperialist west as a ‘defender of human rights’ by placing black faces in high-profile public positions is simply PR cover for the system’s continued colonial, racist and anti-working-class nature.

What needs to be understood in this context is that racism is not inherent to people of any particular colour; it is a necessary tool of a minority exploiting class that needs to keep workers divided in order to stay in power. Using dark-skinned people to promote and implement racist policies is just one of many ways our ruling class tries to hide its true nature.

Mass migration in the modern world is a phenomenon that has been entirely created by the activities of global capital—in particular by the financiers’ need for a cheap and mobile workforce that can be brought to wherever it is needed. The first mass migrations in Britain took place from the countryside to the newly-forming industrial cities. The next wave came from Britain’s Irish colony. Throughout the 19th century, ‘excess’ European populations were transported to settle and control its ‘new world’ colonies. After WW2, large numbers of workers were moved from poor colonies to the imperial heartlands to reinforce the supply of cheap labour as demand for labour-power was increasing.

Socialists and trade unionists who support an anti-immigrant position in the name of ‘defending workers’ pay and conditions have misunderstood the nature of both capitalism and imperialism. Since so much of the world’s wealth has been transferred to Britain, it is inevitable that people will migrate from their ravaged homelands in search of the decent living that has been denied to them by imperialist looting.

Those countries in the oppressed world that try to keep their wealth where it is—by nationalising their core industries, for example—routinely find themselves targeted by imperialist war or sanctions

(or both). This inevitably creates a further flow of refugees and asylum seekers as the infrastructure and economy of entire countries are laid waste by economic strangulation, B-1 bombers and depleted uranium rounds.

One of the pitfalls some on the left fall into when opposing immigration to Britain is to conflate the conditions of capitalism and socialism, referencing the border controls exercised by socialist countries that are surrounded by aggressive imperialist powers. But since we don't have state power, we are in no position to construct an immigration policy based on how we might run a future socialist society, whose possible internal or external conditions we have no way of predicting.

The job of socialists in the present conditions is to promote demands to our class that will facilitate its unity and strengthen its struggle for socialism. Once we understand that the immigration debate is not aimed at stopping immigration but only at promoting racist divisions and diverting workers' anger away from the capitalist ruling class and the capitalist-imperialist economic system, we can see that our primary duty is to bring this fact to workers' attention.

We must help to popularise the demand for an end to all divisive immigration legislation, which simply helps the ruling class promote racism, weakening our ranks and creating a superexploited underclass into the bargain—one that is extremely difficult to unionise or to bring into the wider working-class movement.

Many communists and socialists allow themselves to be drawn into such fruitless 'policy-making' discussions on all kinds of topics. In doing so, they forget that the job of a Marxist is not to imagine how they would run capitalism better than the capitalists, but to use socialist science and the workers' own experience to demonstrate the need for a revolutionary socialist transformation of society.

Only by this means can we introduce the rational planned economy that will enable us not only to solve such grievous problems as racism and poverty that capitalist production for profit has created, but also to build a society fit for human beings, in which the real needs of working people, rather than the drive for profit, decide all.

Further reading

H Brar, Capitalism and Immigration, CPGB-ML party pamphlet, second edition published 2022.

The most important feature of the “New Cold War”

Stephen Cho | Coordinator of the Korean International Forum

22 April 2024

The most important feature of the “New Cold War” is the position and role of the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea (DPRK) within the anti-imperialist camp. As the most thoroughly socialist country, the DPRK occupies a key position and plays a pivotal role in this alliance.

Of all the existing socialist states, the DPRK adheres to socialist principles most thoroughly. Its society implements socialist principles in all fields of politics, economy and culture, and is growing stronger and more robust. The DPRK is building a powerful socialist state with the complete victory of socialism as its strategic goal.

It is a historic miracle that the DPRK, which is not a big country, was able to win wars against the imperialist powers of Japan and the United States, to complete its socialist industrialization in 14 years under conditions of the most draconian economic blockade that has been imposed by the imperialists since the Korean War 70 years ago, and to go on to become one of the world’s handful of nuclear missile powers.

This is the result of the DPRK’s adherence to the principles of independence in politics, self-sufficiency in the economy, and self-reliance in defence, implementing the revolutionary essence of Marxism-Leninism in the specific conditions of Korea. This also explains why the Workers Party of Korea (WPK), a revolutionary party of the working class, is the longest-ruling party in the world today.

The essence of the present world situation must be understood in the context of world war. As of April 2024, the flames of World War 3, entirely provoked by imperialism, are spreading rapidly from Eastern Europe to the Middle East and are travelling towards East Asia. The military actions

of Russia, the Middle-Eastern resistance forces and Iran are all unavoidable and legitimate exercises of self-defence against the war provocations of imperialism and its proxies.

The war in Ukraine began with the Maidan coup d’état in 2014, intensified during the eight-year war in Donbass, and entered full swing in February 2022 with the launch of Russia’s “special military operation”. The war in the Middle East began its latest phase with the launch of Operation “al-Aqsa Flood” in October 2023, has been intensified by the actions of Hezbollah and Ansar Allah, and entered full swing with Iran’s Operation “True Promise” in April 2024. World War 3, which began with the launch of Russia’s special military operation and intensified with the latest outbreak of war in the Middle East, will enter full swing with the war in East Asia, which will be its climax.

The war in East Asia consists of the two wars that the imperialists are driving towards in South Korea and Taiwan. In their historic mutual-defence agreement of 1961, DPRK President Kim Il Sung and Chinese Premier Zhou Enlai agreed that if one party was attacked by imperialism, the other would automatically come to their aid. President Xi Jinping’s visit to North Korea in 2019 reaffirmed this pact.

Since then, China has actively resolved the Hong Kong issue and taken a firmer approach to the question of Taiwan separatism. For China, the Taiwan issue is a crucial one that must be resolved at all costs, since the imperialists would like to use it to trigger a chain of artificially created separatist movements in the country.

War in East Asia will be waged between socialist DPRK (North Korea), China and capitalist Russia

(with its socialist heritage) on one side and the US and Japanese imperialists with their principal puppets in Republic of Korea (South Korea) and Taiwan on the other. As in the other theatres of war, it will be a war between the anti-imperialist camp and the camp of imperialism and its local proxies.

While the USA will mobilize all its Indo-Pacific forces for such a war, both the DPRK and China have indicated that they are ready to use tactical nuclear weapons if their enemy should launch a pre-emptive strike against them. With its short vertical length (evidenced by the proximity of the two capitals), its high concentration of advanced and conventional weapons, and its hosting of the largest US military base in the world, the Korean Peninsula is bound to become the main focal point of such a war.

In January this year, the DPRK's leadership declared at the Supreme People's Assembly that they have defined the "ROK", which is "a group of outsiders' top-class stooges", as a "primary enemy state", and if the "ROK" provokes a war of invasion, the DPRK has made plans to immediately subjugate the southern half of Korea, eliminating the "ROK clan". To prove its words with actions, the DPRK has conducted intensive military exercises for an advance into the South, including hypersonic missile tests and state-of-the-art high-tech tank warfare in response to the "US-ROK" joint war exercises aimed at North Korea.

The DPRK's weapons tests and exercises are being conducted in a thoroughly practical manner in a series of concentric circles centered on the North to reach South Korea, Japan, Guam, Hawaii and finally the US mainland itself.

The expected war in South Korea, which would be the second Korean War, would be an antifascist, anti-imperialist war and a war for the subjugation. It must be the decisive trigger for the South Korean revolution. War in Taiwan would be an anti-

imperialist, liberation war and a war of Chinese national reunification.

Thus we can see that the coming wars in South Korea and Taiwan will decisively change the destiny of the peoples of South Korea and Taiwan. War in East Asia will be a trigger for a great turn not only in the region but in the whole world, just as the Battle of Stalingrad was in World War 2.

Both the DPRK and China are socialist countries, the DPRK being the most thoroughly socialist country without any condition like "Chinese characteristics". Through its victory, the socialist DPRK will significantly influence not only the South Korean people's revolutionary prospects but also the revolutionary future of the whole world in ideological and systemic ways.

The DPRK's historical experience of constructing a powerful state with independent politics, a self-sufficient economy, and a self-reliant military while overcoming the "Arduous March", during which it kept alive the principles of socialism during the most difficult conditions of the 1990s, is a precious asset of revolution for victory in the struggle against imperialism, fascism and reaction of all types. The process of a national-liberation democratic revolution in South Korea, a colonial semi-capitalist society, will infuse scientific conviction and revolutionary optimism into the oppressed and exploited people around the world, who are groaning under a deformed capitalist society which is completely subordinated to imperialist powers.

World War 3 will reach its height when the war spreads to East Asia. Its outcome will be decided by the overwhelming power of military force and united people, by the "all-people resistance" highlighted in the "January Speech" by Chairman Kim Jong Un. The possible expansion of the war into Eastern Europe and the fate of Zionist Israel will depend entirely on whether the imperialist camp persists in frantic maneuvers. The anti-imperialist camp would certainly prefer for World

War 3 to end in East Asia, but if the imperialist camp continues with its provocations, the anti-imperialist will respond them with dealing a crushing blow against imperialists.

The strongest anti-imperialist force in history is now taking shape. Within it are united the world's strongest nuclear and missile powers of the DPRK, China and Russia alongside the broad masses of the oppressed from around the world, including the majority of the world's two billion Muslims. This force is simultaneously and continuously striking at the already collapsing imperialist world, causing its leaders to tremble in fear of catastrophic destruction.

Today's great upheaval in world affairs will go forward to tomorrow's great transition and to a great upsurge of the future impelled by the great unity of the anti-imperialist camp. Socialism is the only future for humanity, and the DPRK is a beacon of that socialist future. Imperialism may have won a temporary victory in the Cold War, but it will inevitably find itself the ultimate loser of the "New Cold War".

The eventual defeat of imperialism, in its essence, means global independence heading to socialism.

