

Platform

January 2025 No.20

The World Anti-imperialist Platform

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





Contents

Work	The Crisis Has Matured 2 V.I. Lenin
Article	The heroic December of '44 and our duties today 8 Dimitrios Patelis Revolutionary Unification (Greece)
	What is the 'Revolutionary Communist Party' and why is it so heavily promoted? 12 Joti Brar Communist Party of Great Britain (Marxist-Leninist)
	The fall of Syria 19 Alexander McKay Communist Party of Great Britain (Marxist-Leninist)
	Liberation of the Syrian people or imperialist balkanization of Syria? 21 Union for Communist Reconstruction (URC, France)
	A Proletarian Approach to the Syrian Question 23 Mücadele Birliđi (Struggle Unity, Turkey)
	Statement of LCP on the situation in the middle east 32 Lebanese Communist Party
	Comment on the impeachment of Yoon Suk-yeol 37 Stephen Cho Coordinator of the Korean International Forum
	The escalating three major theaters 41 Stephen Cho Coordinator of the Korean International Forum

The Crisis Has Matured

V.I. Lenin

October 1917

I

The end of September undoubtedly marked a great turning-point in the history of the Russian revolution and, to all appearances, of the world revolution as well.

The world working-class revolution began with the action of individuals, whose boundless courage represented everything honest that remained of that decayed official “socialism” which is in reality social-chauvinism. Liebknecht in Germany, Adler in Austria, MacLean in Britain—these are the best-known names of the isolated heroes who have taken upon themselves the arduous role of forerunners of the world revolution.

The second stage in the historical preparation for this revolution was a widespread mass discontent, expressing itself in the split of the official parties, in illegal publications and in street demonstrations. The protest against the war became stronger, and the number of victims of government persecution increased. The prisons of countries famed for their observance of law and even for their freedom—Germany, France, Italy and Britain—became filled with tens and hundreds of internationalists, opponents of the war and advocates of a working-class revolution.

The third stage has now begun. This stage may be called the eve of revolution. Mass arrests of party leaders in free Italy, and particularly the beginning of mutinies in the German army,^[1] are indisputable symptoms that a great turning-point is at hand, that we are on the eve of a world wide revolution.

Even before this there were, no doubt, individual cases of mutiny among the troops in Germany, but they were so small, so weak and isolated that it was

possible to hush them up—and that was the chief way of checking the mass contagion of seditious action. Finally, there developed such a movement in the navy that it was impossible to hush it up, despite all the severity of the German regime of military servitude, severity elaborated with amazing minuteness of detail and observed with incredible pedantry.

Doubt is out of the question. We are on the threshold of a world proletarian revolution. And since of all the proletarian internationalists in all countries only we Russian Bolsheviks enjoy a measure of freedom—we have a legal party and a score or so of papers, we have the Soviets of Workers’ and Soldiers’ Deputies of both capitals on our side, and we have the support of a majority of the people in a time of revolution—to us the saying, “To whom much has been given, of him much shall be required” in all justice can and must be applied.

II

The crucial point of the revolution in Russia has undoubtedly arrived.

In a peasant country, and under a revolutionary, republican government which enjoys the support of the Socialist-Revolutionary and Menshevik parties that only yesterday dominated petty-bourgeois democracy, a peasant revolt is developing.

Incredible as this is, it is a fact.

We Bolsheviks are not surprised by this fact. We have always said that the government of the notorious “coalition” with the bourgeoisie is a government that betrays democracy and the revolution, that it is a government of imperialist slaughter, a government that protects the capitalists

and landowners from the people.

Owing to the deception practised by the Socialist-Revolutionaries and the Mensheviks, there still exists in Russia, under a republic and in a time of revolution, a government of capitalists and landowners side by side with the Soviets. This is the bitter and sinister reality. Is it then surprising, in view of the incredible hardship inflicted on the people by prolonging the imperialist war and by its consequences, that a peasant revolt has begun and is spreading in Russia?

Is it then surprising that the enemies of the Bolsheviks, the leaders of the official Socialist-Revolutionary Party, the very party that supported the “coalition” all along, the party that until the last few days or weeks had the majority of the people on its side, the party that continues to harry and abuse the “new” Socialist-Revolutionaries, who have realised that the policy of coalition is a betrayal of the interests of the peasants—is it surprising that these leaders of the official Socialist-Revolutionary Party wrote the following in an editorial in their official organ, *Dyelo Naroda* of September 29:

“So far practically nothing has been done to put an end to the relations of bondage that still prevail in the villages of central Russia.... The bill for the regulation of land relations in the countryside, which was introduced in the Provisional Government long ago, and which has even passed through such a purgatory as the Judicial Conference, has got hopelessly stuck in some office.... Are we not right in asserting that our republican government is still a long way from having rid itself of the old habits of the tsarist administration, and that the dead hand of Stolypin is still making itself strongly felt in the methods of the revolutionary ministers?”

This is written by the official Socialist-Revolutionaries! Just think: the supporters of the

coalition are forced to admit that in a peasant country, after seven months of revolution, “practically nothing has been done to put an end to the bondage” of the peasants, to their enslavement by the land owners! These Socialist-Revolutionaries are forced to give the name of Stolypins to their colleague, Kerensky, and his gang of ministers.

Could we get more eloquent testimony than this from the camp of our opponents, not only to the effect that the coalition has collapsed and that the official Socialist-Revolutionaries who tolerate Kerensky have become an anti-popular, anti-peasant and counter-revolutionary party, but also that the whole Russian revolution has reached a turning-point?

A peasant revolt in a peasant country against the government of the Socialist-Revolutionary Kerensky, the Mensheviks Nikitin and Gvozdyov, and other ministers who represent capital and the interests of the landowners! The crushing of this revolt by military measures by a republican government!

In the face of such facts, can one remain a conscientious champion of the proletariat and yet deny that a crisis has matured, that the revolution is passing through an extremely critical moment, that the government’s victory over the peasant revolt would now sound the death knell of the revolution, would be the final triumph of the Kornilov revolt ?

III

It is obvious that if in a peasant country, after seven months of a democratic republic, matters could come to a peasant revolt, it irrefutably proves that the revolution is suffering nation-wide collapse, that it is experiencing a crisis of unprecedented severity, and that the forces of counter-revolution have gone the limit.

That is obvious. In the face of such a fact as a peasant revolt all other political symptoms, even

were they to contradict the fact that a nation-wide crisis is maturing, would have no significance whatsoever.

But on the contrary, all the symptoms do indicate that a nation-wide crisis has matured.

Next to the agrarian question, the most important question in Russia's state affairs is the national question, particularly for the petty-bourgeois masses of the population. And at the "Democratic" Conference, which was fixed by Mr. Tsereteli and Co., we find that the "national" curia takes second place for radicalism, yielding only to the trade unions, and exceeding the curia of the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies in the percentage of votes cast against the coalition (40 out of 55). The Kerensky government—a government suppressing the peasant revolt—is withdrawing the revolutionary troops from Finland in order to strengthen the reactionary Finnish bourgeoisie. In the Ukraine, the conflicts of the Ukrainians in general, and of the Ukrainian troops in particular, with the government are becoming more and more frequent.

Furthermore, let us take the army, which in war-time plays an exceptionally big role in all state affairs. We find that the army in Finland and the fleet in the Baltic have completely parted ways with the government. We have the testimony of the officer Dubasov, a non-Bolshevik, who speaks in the name of the whole front and declares in a manner more revolutionary than that of any Bolsheviks that the soldiers will not fight any longer.^[2] We have governmental reports stating that the soldiers are in a state of "agitation" and that it is impossible to guarantee the maintenance of "order" (i.e., participation of these troops in the suppression of the peasant revolt). We have, finally, the voting in Moscow, where fourteen thousand out of seventeen thousand soldiers voted for the Bolsheviks.

This vote in the elections to the district councils in Moscow is in general one of the most striking

symptoms of the profound change which has taken place in the mood of the whole nation. It is generally known that Moscow is more petty-bourgeois than Petrograd. It is a fact frequently corroborated and indisputable that the Moscow proletariat has an incomparably greater number of connections with the countryside, that it has greater sympathy for the peasant and is closer to the sentiments of the peasant.

In Moscow the vote cast for the Socialist-Revolutionaries and the Mensheviks nevertheless dropped from 70 percent in June to 18 per cent. There can be no doubt that the petty bourgeoisie and the people have turned away from the coalition. The Cadets have increased their strength from 17 to 30 per cent, but they remain a minority, a hopeless minority, despite the fact that they have obviously been joined by the "Right" Socialist-Revolutionaries, and the "Right" Mensheviks. *Russkiye Vedomosti* states that the absolute number of votes cast for the Cadets fell from 67,000 to 62,000. Only the votes cast for the Bolsheviks increased—from 34,000 to 82,000. They received 47 per cent of the total vote. There can be no shadow of doubt that we, together with the Left Socialist-Revolutionaries, now have a majority in the Soviets, in the army, and in the country.

Among the symptoms that have not only a symptomatic, but also a very real significance is the fact that the armies of railway and postal employees, who are of immense importance from the general economic, political and military point of view, continue to be in sharp conflict with the government,^[3] even the Menshevik defencists are dissatisfied with "their" Minister, Nikitin, and the official Socialist-Revolutionaries call Kerensky and Co. "Stolypins". Is it not clear that if such "support" of the government by the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries has any value at all it can be only a negative value?

V

Yes, the leaders of the Central Executive Committee are pursuing the correct tactics of defending the bourgeoisie and the landowners. And there is not the slightest doubt that if the Bolsheviks allowed themselves to be caught in the trap of constitutional illusions, “faith” in the Congress of Soviets and in the convocation of the Constituent Assembly, “waiting” for the Congress of Soviets, and so forth—these Bolsheviks would most certainly be miserable traitors to the proletarian cause.

They would be traitors to the cause, for by their conduct they would be betraying the German revolutionary workers who have started a revolt in the navy. To “wait” for the Congress of Soviets and so forth under such circumstances would be a betrayal of internationalism, a betrayal of the cause of the world socialist revolution.

For internationalism consists of deeds and not phrases, not expressions of solidarity, not resolutions.

The Bolsheviks would be traitors to the peasants, for to tolerate the suppression of the peasant revolt by a government which even Dyelo Naroda compares with the Stolypin government would be to ruin the whole revolution, to ruin it for good. An outcry is raised about anarchy and about the increasing indifference of the people, but what else can the people be but indifferent to the elections, when the peasants have been driven to revolt while the so-called “revolutionary democrats” are patiently tolerating its suppression by military force!

The Bolsheviks would be traitors to democracy and to freedom, for to tolerate the suppression of the peasant revolt at such a moment would mean allowing the elections to the Constituent Assembly to be fixed in exactly the same way as the

Democratic Conference and the “Pre-parliament” were fixed, only even worse and more crudely.

The crisis has matured. The whole future of the Russian revolution is at stake. The honour of the Bolshevik Party is in question. The whole future of the international workers’ revolution for socialism is at stake.

The crisis has matured...

September 29, 1917.

Everything to this point may be published, but what follows is to be distributed among the members of the Central Committee, the Petrograd Committee, the Moscow Committee, and the Soviets.

VI

What, then, is to be done? We must *aussprechen was ist*, “state the facts”, admit the truth that there is a tendency, or an opinion, in our Central Committee and among the leaders of our Party which favours waiting for the Congress of Soviets, and is opposed to taking power immediately, is opposed to an immediate insurrection. That tendency, or opinion, must be overcome.^[4]

Otherwise, the Bolsheviks will cover themselves with eternal shame and destroy themselves as a party.

For to miss such a moment and to “wait” for the Congress of Soviets would be utter idiocy, or sheer treachery.

It would be sheer treachery to the German workers. Surely we should not wait until their revolution begins. In that case even the Lieberdians would be in favour of “supporting” it. But it cannot begin as long as Kerensky, Kishkin and Co. are in power.

It would be sheer treachery to the peasants. To allow the peasant revolt to be suppressed when we control the Soviets of both capitals would be to

lose, and justly lose, every ounce of the peasants' confidence. In the eyes of the peasants we would be putting ourselves on a level with the Lieberdans and other scoundrels.

To "wait" for the Congress of Soviets would be utter idiocy, for it would mean losing weeks at a time when weeks and even days decide everything. It would mean faint-heartedly renouncing power, for on November 1-2 it will have become impossible to take power (both politically and technically, since the Cossacks would be mobilised for the day of the insurrection so foolishly "appointed"^[5]).

To "wait" for the Congress of Soviets is idiocy, for the Congress will give nothing, and can give nothing!

"Moral" importance? Strange indeed, to talk of the "importance" of resolutions and conversations with the Lieberdans when we know that the Soviets support the peasants and that the peasant revolt is being suppressed! We would be reducing the Soviets to the status of wretched debating parlours. First defeat Kerensky, then call the Congress.

The Bolsheviks are now guaranteed the success of the insurrection: (1) we can^[6] (if we do not "wait" for the Soviet Congress) launch a surprise attack from three points—from Petrograd, from Moscow and from the Baltic fleet; (2) we have slogans that guarantee us support—down with the government that is suppressing the revolt of the peasants against the landowners! (3) we have a majority in the country; (4) the disorganisation among the Mensheviks and the Socialist-Revolutionaries is complete; (5) we are technically in a position to take power in Moscow (where the start might even be made, so as to catch the enemy unawares); (6) we have thousands of armed workers and soldiers in Petrograd who could at once seize the Winter Palace, the General Staff building, the telephone exchange and the large printing presses. Nothing will be able to drive us out, while agitational work in the army will be such as to make it impossible to

combat this government of peace, of land for the peasants, and so forth.

If we were to attack at once, suddenly, from three points, Petrograd, Moscow and the Baltic fleet, the chances are a hundred to one that we would succeed with smaller sacrifices than on July 3-5, because the troops will not advance against a government of peace. Even though Kerensky already has "loyal" cavalry, etc., in Petrograd, if we were to attack from two sides, he would be compelled to surrender since we enjoy the sympathy of the army. If with such chances as we have at present we do not take power, then all talk of transferring the power to the Soviets becomes a lie.

To refrain from taking power now, to "wait", to indulge in talk in the Central Executive Committee, to confine ourselves to "fighting for the organ" (of the Soviet), "fighting for the Congress", is to doom the revolution to failure.

In view of the fact that the Central Committee has even left unanswered the persistent demands I have been making for such a policy ever since the beginning of the Democratic Conference, in view of the fact that the Central Organ is deleting from my articles all references to such glaring errors on the part of the Bolsheviks as the shameful decision to participate in the Pre-parliament, the admission of Mensheviks to the Presidium of the Soviet, etc., etc.—I am compelled to regard this as a "subtle" hint at the unwillingness of the Central Committee even to consider this question, a subtle hint that I should keep my mouth shut, and as a proposal for me to retire.

I am compelled to tender my resignation from the Central Committee, which I hereby do, reserving for myself freedom to campaign among the rank and file of the Party and at the Party Congress.

For it is my profound conviction that if we "wait" for the Congress of Soviets and let the present moment pass, we shall ruin the revolution.

N. Lenin

September 29.

P.S. There are a number of facts which serve to prove that even the Cossack troops will not go against a government of peace! And how many are there? Where are they? And will not the entire army dispatch units for our support?

Notes

[1] The reference is to the revolutionary action by German sailors in August 1917, who were led by a revolutionary sailors' organisation numbering 4,000 members (late July 1917). It was led by sea men Max Reichpietsch and Albin Köbis of the Friedrich der Grosse. The organisation decided to fight for a democratic peace and prepare for an uprising. Manifestations broke out in the navy in early August. Sailors of the warship Prinzeregent Luitpold, which was at Wilhelmshaven, took absence without leave to fight for the release of their comrades who had earlier been arrested for staging a strike; on August 16, the firemen of the Westphalia refused to work; at the same time the crew of the cruiser Nürnberg, which was out at sea, staged an uprising. The sailors' movement spread to the ships of several squadrons at Wilhelmshaven. These manifestations were put down with great savagery. Reichpietsch and Köbis were shot and other active participants were sentenced to long terms of hard labour.

[2] The reference is to what an officer, Dubasov, said at a meeting of the Petrograd Soviet on September 21 (October 4), 1917. He had just returned from the front and declared: "Whatever you may say over here, the soldiers will not fight". [p. 80]

[3] The reference is to the nation-wide strike of railwaymen for higher wages. It started on the night of September 23 (October 6), 1917, and threw the Provisional Government into a panic. The bourgeois press attacked the striking railwaymen.

The strike was discussed by the Central Committee of the R.S.D.L.P.(B.) on September 24 (October 7), 1917. In an appeal, "Let's Help the Railwaymen", which was published in Rabochy Put (The Workers' Path), the Central Committee exposed the counter-revolutionary policy of the Provisional Government and called on the proletariat to express full sympathy for the railwaymen, protect them from the provocative attacks of the counter-revolutionaries and do everything to prevent their strike from being isolated and defeated. The strike ended on the night of September 26 (October 9), 1917, when the Provisional Government satisfied some of the railwaymen's demands.

[4] The reference is to the attitude of Kamenev, Zinoviev, and Stalin and their followers. Kamenev and Zinoviev opposed Lenin's plan for an armed uprising, declaring that the working class of Russia was incapable of carrying out a socialist revolution. They slid down to the Menshevik position of demanding a bourgeois republic.

[5] To "convene" the Congress of Soviets for October 20 in order to decide upon "taking power"—how does that differ from foolishly "appointing" an insurrection? It is possible to take power now, whereas

on October 20-29 you will not be given a chance to.

[6] What has the Party done to study the disposition of the troops, etc? What has it done to conduct the insurrection as an art? Mere talk in the Central Executive Committee, and so on!

The heroic December of '44 and our duties today

Dimitrios Patelis | Revolutionary Unification (Greece)

At the peak of World War II (WWII), 80 years ago, the imperialists with their local collaborators, trapped the Greek national liberation movement, launching a crushing attack on its weakest section in the capital, Athens. On 3 December 1944, two months after liberation from the fascist yoke and violating every pretext of democracy and anti-fascism, the British attempted to put in power their agents and subservients to serve their colonial and anti-communist objectives.

Revolutionary Unification deems necessary the scientific research of this crucial turning point in history, on the basis of the creative application and development of revolutionary theory and methodology. Here we will settle for a few critical remarks in the light of the duties posed by the ongoing World War III (WWIII).

The conflict at that period focused on the diametrically opposed interests and the corresponding approaches of the British imperialists and their local subservients, on the one hand, and those who actually liberated the country, the forces of EAM^[1] and ELAS^[2], on the other hand, i.e., the forces of counter-revolution and revolution, as far as the most crucial issues on the agenda of the situation were concerned: 1. the constitutional question (preservation or abolition of the foreign-imposed monarchy); 2. the trial and prosecution of the corrupt collaborators of the occupier; 3. the formation of a national army and police force, with the integration and/or disarmament of the partisans; and 4. the escalation of the revolutionary process from one of national liberation to a socialist revolution.

On 1 December, the British, along with the government, demanded the one-sided disarmament

of ELAS and the liberation movement. The members of EAM had just resigned from this government, having been deceived on the first three of the above mentioned imperative issues.

Instead, defying the government ban, the movement proceeded to the mass unarmed rally called by EAM on 3 December and to a general strike on 4 December. During the rally, the paramilitary and police forces—at the command of Ronald Scobie (a British general, commander of the army that was now orchestrating the British occupation) and the bourgeois politician George Papandreou (British agent), executed by Angelos Evert (police director of the occupation authorities, under the SS High Command of Greece, who retained his post under the new, British occupation); opened fire on the demonstrators, as a consequence of which at least 33 people were killed and 148 wounded. On 4 December the strike was general. As the people of Athens and Piraeus were on strike and at the same time mourned their dead in a grand procession, there was another murderous attack that took place, leaving a further 40 dead and 70 wounded. This was followed by 33 days of heroic fighting by the city's reserve and poorly equipped ELAS against the British forces and their local collaborators, which ended with a ceasefire on 11 January under the overwhelming superiority of the imperialist forces.

In order for the British to be able to lead the Greek liberation movement to compromise, they were forced to transfer military forces from the Italian front, which shows that the Greek issue was of equal, if not greater, strategic importance than the front against the Axis. Since the regular ELAS army was not involved in the armed

confrontation that was confined to Athens-Piraeus, it had an inherently defensive character on the part of the Greek liberation movement. This fact, despite the unparalleled heroism and self-denial of our partisans, resulted in the bloody defeat of the armed uprising of the people of Athens-Piraeus—inadequately armed and cut off from the main, experienced armed force of ELAS—by the overwhelmingly superior forces of the new occupier on land, air and sea. A defeat that led to the unacceptable Treaty of Varkiza (February 12, 1945) and the disarmament of the military wing of the uprising.

Of course, history is not written with the help of retrospective assumptions and speculations. However, at a moment when the enemy's forces are superior, in order to avoid a certain crushing blow with irreparable consequences for the revolutionary movement, it is clear that the optimal tactic lies both in avoiding the entanglement in a direct confrontation on the enemy's terms, as well as in the suspension/ postponement of this confrontation, with the preservation and development of the strength of the revolutionary army, in order to choose, if not the optimal, at least the most favorable conditions for the victory of the revolutionary movement on a local and global scale.

In the case of Greece, we had not only the exposure of the most unprepared, detached from the main force and inadequately equipped part of the movement in the capital to a crushing blow from imperialism, but also the self-destructive negation of the possibility and necessity of a victorious confrontation through the disarmament of the military wing of the uprising. From this point of view, the fact that the leadership was dragged into the shameful Treaty of Varkiza was an act of suicide for the movement and for the people.

This is a fundamental principle of revolutionary theory and practice, which was confirmed by the

tragedy of our heroic December, the escalation of white terrorism and the subsequent defeat in the last round of our defeated revolution, in the Greek Civil War and imperialist intervention (1946-1949). One can endlessly argue over all the probable and improbable mistakes, all the oversights or even betrayals on the part of the at-the-time subjective factor of the country's armed revolutionary movement. However, unfortunately, that which remains completely out of the scope of most historical and ideological-political studies and debates is the following: the confrontation of the communist-led victorious armed revolutionary movement with the forces of the British imperialist invaders and their collaborators, precisely because of the imperialist schemes, took place at a historical circumstance in which at least five more months of bloody fighting by the Red Army and other anti-fascist forces were required before the red banner of victory was planted on the Reichstag.

The communists were at that time called upon to face problems of escalation and revolutionisation of the Greek national liberation struggle in a socialist direction that were unprecedented in history and still unresolved in theory, while the anti-fascist war of liberation required long and relentless confrontations until its formal termination.

The relentless aggression of the British, who invoked the treaty/alliance obligations of EAM & ELAS, while creating ultimatums, as well as handing over the initiative to the headquarters of the Middle East of the initiative of the movements (which could be used as a tactical manoeuvre to gain time and preserve/develop the military wing of the uprising), combined with the surprisingly hesitant and indecisive attitude of the Greek partisan leadership, is largely explained precisely by this historically unique circumstance.

Any hesitation and reluctance to fight until the end is not compatible with the Marxist-Leninist approach to armed uprising.

However, here we have a confrontation in which the reactionary imperialist forces of the “allies” are waging a swift pre-emptive war of annihilation against a victorious communist movement of the anti-fascist alliance, which made an extraordinary contribution to the defeat of the then Anti-Comintern axis. In an unsurprising display of British cynicism, ELAS was viewed as an operational branch of the Soviet Army and of the communist movement.

The Greek communists were faced with tasks of phenomenal complexity in an unfavourable situation in terms of the global balance of forces. Not only did they have to deal with the problem of transition from a national liberation revolution to a socialist revolution in the country through the urgent solution of practical questions of the structures and characteristics of the transitional power. They were called upon to solve these extremely complex questions in conditions where any all-out attack on the new invader could be perceived by USSR officials as an undermining of the anti-fascist alliance in Europe and in the world, which was already fragile until the end. After all, the secret negotiations between the Anglo-Saxons and the Nazis and the plans for a mutual attack on the USSR up to the last months of the war, are well known. In these circumstances, the battle of December, which was doomed from the start, and the resulting disarmament of the revolutionary forces had fatal consequences for the movement.

The December conflict was practically a prelude to post-war developments, a precursor of the coming “Cold War” between the imperialist camp and the emerging camp of early socialism, before the end of WWII.

It is impossible to scientifically evaluate the experience of the conflict between revolution and counter-revolution and the imperialist intervention of the 1940s in our country under the prism of a short-sighted Ethnocentrism or Eurocentrism at

best, as if it was and is the history of the Greek revolutionary movement detached from the law governed escalation of the global revolutionary process. Greece was of strategic importance for the post-war balance of forces, was obviously one of the weak links of the global system, with a revolutionary situation in progress and a massive popular base of the movement, which led the British and later the American imperialists to the well-known brutal pre-emptive intervention and occupation, which continues and deepens to this day, under the regime of foreign bases.

Despite our tragic defeat in December ‘44 as well as in the next round of the confrontation, with the heroic epic of the Democratic Army of Greece (DAG) [Greek: Δημοκρατικός Στρατός Ελλάδας (ΔΣΕ)], this struggle, precisely in the light of the world revolutionary process, was in many respects not a futile one.

It is worth pointing out the following: although the forces of imperialist reaction may have defeated the heroic Greek communists and their allies on the fields of uneven battles, their comrades at the time achieved proud victories on other strategically important fronts of the global revolutionary struggle!

The mere fact that until August 1949 important imperialist strike forces remained confined in Greece, far from the other theatres of warfare of the global revolutionary process, constitutes in itself de facto internationalist aid of unparalleled historical importance to those victorious early socialist revolutions (in Korea, China and Vietnam).

The narratives/ideologies that are fabricated by the opportunists of our time (mainly by the leading group of Communist Party of Greece) are extremely short-sighted, anti-scientific and counter-revolutionary, in their insistence on attributing the defeat of that time to the very tactics of the anti-fascist front decided by the Third Communist International. They dare to stain the heroic epic

of the EAM (without which the Democratic Army of Greece would not have existed), calling it “opportunist”, in the context of the unprecedented revision of revolutionary theory and history that is part of their incessant scheming. Similar is their metaphysical view on “strategy”, which is abstracted from any tactics, from any historically specific gradual escalation of the means and ways of the formation and development of the subject of the revolution. In spite of this unprecedented opportunism and revisionism, all the victorious early socialist revolutions that emerged through the flames of WWII and its legacy, without exception, were the result of frontal revolutionary movements, led by communists, where they dialectically combined frontal tactics with a commitment to the strategic purpose of the socialist revolution. Today, the forces of imperialism, losing ground rapidly (against the strengthening coalition of the forces of early socialism, anti-imperialism and weaker capitalist countries oriented towards this alliance), cannot afford to be divided into two camps, as in WWII.

The Great December of 1944 inspired, is inspiring and will continue to inspire our struggles. It is of particular didactic importance today for the stance of the communist and progressive forces, in the historically unprecedented glow of the forthcoming victorious anti-imperialist and socialist revolutions that the rapidly escalating WWIII is carrying and delivering.

The present US-led axis of imperialism must be shattered by a powerful global anti-imperialist front. This is a condition for the survival of humanity. It is an indispensable step for the coordinated victorious escalation of the global revolutionary process.

This requires the theoretical and practical-organisational struggle for the militant coordination of the anti-imperialist forces in every country and around the world, with the consistent communist forces in its vanguard.

Honour and glory to the heroes of December ‘44!
Long live the World Anti-Imperialist Platform!
Victory to the unbreakable global front of the forces of anti-imperialism and socialism.
Victory to the coming unstoppable wave of anti-imperialist and socialist revolutions.

Notes

[1] EAM: National Liberation Front (N.L.F.) [Greek: Εθνικό Απελευθερωτικό Μέτωπο (E.A.M.), a Greek World War II Resistance Revolutionary Movement.

[2] ELAS: Greek People’s Liberation Army

[Greek: Ελληνικός Λαϊκός Απελευθερωτικός Στρατός (E.Λ.Α.Σ.)].

What is the ‘Revolutionary Communist Party’ and why is it so heavily promoted?

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

Back in May, former home secretary Suella Braverman took part in an 18-minute chat-show segment on GB News with an articulate young woman who came across to the uninitiated as very brave and appealing. This free advertisement was clearly designed to signpost her rebranded organisation to the revolutionary-minded youth of Britain.

Within days, Michael Gove (a high-level Tory party apparatchik, former leadership contender and just then secretary of state for—don’t laugh!—‘levelling up, housing and communities’!) had reinforced this promotional message by standing up in Parliament, apparently to denounce as ‘antisemitic’ the Palestine encampments that had been invigorating the Palestine solidarity movement. In the process, he specifically stated his opposition (without suggesting any repressive measures) to the Socialist Workers Party (SWP), the Socialist Party (SP) and the Revolutionary Communist Party (RCP) as the organisations with which he most disagreed on Israel, labelling them all as “antisemitic”.

Gove’s melodramatic and widely reported denunciations were aimed entirely at Trotskyist organisations. Why?

It is ridiculous to believe that Gove would even know about the existence of the RCP were it not a state asset. Why single out a small and relatively unknown group that has existed for less than six months in its current form?

A form, moreover, that has been specifically designed to be confused with Britain’s really revolutionary communist party—the CPGB-ML.

Rebranded ‘revolutionary communists’ heavily promoted by the state

The RCP’s new website and content is being

algorithmically promoted. Elon Musk himself recently retweeted a video of some US actors in New York, dressed up like communists and waving hammer and sickle flags. There was no hint of a broader message or campaign context. Just a huge signpost to the ‘Revolutionary Communist Party of America’. Musk’s comment was simply “!”.

Given that he has 40 million worldwide followers, and is not known for promoting communism, it is legitimate to ask why he might signpost an allegedly anti-establishment party, while our own party’s social media and mainstream media presence is consistently censored and suppressed. Indeed, the ‘RCP’ website and newspaper rebrand carries a banner that could easily be mistaken for our own: ‘The Communist’.

Our comrades have been arrested and had trumped-up charges related to the public order and terrorism acts thrown at them. Our homes have been raided in the middle of the night, and we have been ordered to keep off the streets and prevented from distributing literature. Our leaflets—ultimately found to have been entirely lawful—were nonetheless confiscated by S015 ‘anti-terror’ police and burned, rather than returned.

Our comrades have been harassed at work by the state, their families have been harassed by social services, we have been prevented from “entering Westminster” or “leaving the country” under the threat of being arrested again if we breach any of these conditions.

Our Comrade Ranjeet Brar has been publicly doxed (in the globally circulating Daily Telegraph and by the Jewish Chronicle, well-known Zionist and imperialist organs) as an ‘antisemite’, and his professional body has been pushed into investigating his fitness to continue practising

medicine.

All of this has been carefully orchestrated between high-level zionist operatives, high-level policing bodies and officers, and cabinet-level politicians.

Yet Mr Gove chose to focus his denunciations on ‘revolutionary communist’ and ‘socialist’ groups that spend almost as much time denouncing the Palestinian resistance (‘ Hamas’) as they do the Israeli regime. One would think that a Tory government minister would be more friendly towards these groups given how much common ground they share.

Clearly, something else is going on here.

When we look more closely, what we see is a classic attempt to divert working-class young people by presenting them with a well-packaged but controlled (and ultimately harmless) opposition. One young activist was promoted nationally and her organisation’s name was immediately on the lips of cabinet ministers as ‘the alternative’ with whom the hated Tories ‘disagree’.

Let us not forget that this was the same Michael Gove who proposed referring young people expressing communist sympathies to the Prevent ‘anti-radicalisation’ programme and who wants to redefine Britain’s ‘anti-terrorism’ legislation to cover communists and socialists. And even as Gove attempted to mobilise this supposedly ‘anti-terror programme’ against our party and against those in the wider working class who are turning to communism, no mention is to be made of our party itself, lest the flames of our popularity be fanned among the mass of British workers.

It seems the British state has been thinking since the rise of the Palestine solidarity movement, which is beginning to move on from opposing the genocide in Gaza to opposing the entire world order that backs and is ultimately responsible for that genocide. One can almost hear the ‘brainstorming’ session convened by Braverman, Sunak and Gove, in cooperation with various MI5 officers, Met police commanders and media moguls.

A couple of months after the first arrest of our

party comrades went viral, helped along by mobile phone footage from several protestors, which showed our comrade Ranjeet explaining to the arresting officers that they were complicit in war crimes and were enforcing a regime of political policing, the RCP produced slick footage of another arrest. This one had some remarkable parallels—and more remarkable differences.

A young ‘activist’ steps forward to complain that the police are arresting their member. Pan left, and witness ... the carefully choreographed ‘arrest’ of a ‘young Indian doctor’ (Raj, not Ranjeet) being led to a police van (quite calmly, by City police, on cue and without the handcuffs our own comrades had to endure) and politely driven away (to be released a few hours later). The whole performance was fortuitously live-streamed by an RCP paid full-timer, Jack Tye Wilson. All that was missing was a final step back to witness the director, clapperboard in hand!

It seems clear that this was a copycat algorithm promotion device. The newly rebranded ‘revolutionary communists’ aimed to get themselves a boost from the legitimate wave of sympathy our party received following police repression. They want to create confusion between their pseudo-revolutionary organisation and our genuinely revolutionary one in the eyes of casual internet surfers and newcomers to left-wing politics.

And it is clear they have the full backing of the ruling class in this effort. Domination of internet search engines is a major part of the ruling class’s armoury in preventing workers from finding our party. We know we have been targeted by spies. We know we have been subject to systematic shadow banning and algorithm suppression on major social media platforms. What other electronic methods are used against us we cannot at this stage find out, but we have no doubt there are more.

Ruling-class media—including supposedly ‘left-wing’ and ‘independent’ media—have an unwritten rule that is very rarely broken never to mention our party or any of its leaders by name and never

to invite us onto their platforms. Thus the path for many who do eventually stumble across Britain's only real communist party is long and tortuous, often taking many years and much persistence. Many give up, assuming the organisation they were looking for simply does not exist.

If the RCP really were a threat to the system, it would suffer the same treatment we do. Instead, it is being promoted everywhere and its content is pushed by, rather than being suppressed by, the social media giants, all of whom are known to be hand in glove with US and British secret services.

'Left' liberal misdirection: Double Down News

It is notable that Roger Waters, the lead singer of Pink Floyd—a band particularly known for its celebration of the fall of the USSR and the eastern European socialist states—was drawn into appearing in a video for the RCP's Fiona Lali, pushing her as an individual, her ideas and her candidature in the 4 July general election when she stood against Halima Khan in Stratford and Bow, thus helping her to split the vote of the established pro-Palestine and antiwar (Workers party) candidate.

In that interview, Lali asserted that communists were a leading force in the "black" (civil rights) struggle in the USA "until Stalinism put them all off". What is needed, said Lali, is a "total revolution" (whatever that might be). She then announced that we need a "planned economy (quite right) ... which has absolutely nothing to do with the Stalinism of the USSR" (although the USSR's economy during the Stalin era is by far the strongest example of a planned economy that the world has so far seen).

A clearer example of an anticommunist posing as a communist in order to discredit communism would be hard to find.

Mr Waters took the opportunity to denounce the Soviet intervention that suppressed a fascist counter-revolution in Hungary in 1956—an event that had apparently led his own mother to leave the Communist party and become a Labour party

activist.

Whether Waters is aware of the nuances of Trotskyism and who he was promoting was not absolutely clear from this. He seems to all intents and purposes to be a well-intentioned liberal. But the effect of this promotion of a state agent was deeply harmful and, at very least, stupidly played into the hands of the very imperialist forces that are really responsible for the genocide in Palestine.

Marxist analysis and organisation more needed than ever

The economic and political crisis of imperialism is intensifying, and its consequent war drive is accelerating. On every side, the working class of Britain is beset by problems as the ruling class pushes the burden of the present crisis onto workers' backs.

As anger grows, the British bourgeoisie is doubling down on its centuries-old strategy of running interference in the working-class movement in the hope of diverting and disorganising its potential power. It makes use of anti-immigrant rhetoric, race-baiting and the open persecution of progressives and anti-imperialists. In a multipronged attack, the British state also invests heavily in the creation of fake opposition parties and media, whose job is to mislead and confuse those who are starting to look for answers.

Trotskyism in Britain has been playing this state-sponsored provocative role since its earliest days. It works by spreading incorrect analyses amongst workers and students, particularly amongst those who are new to politics and attracted by the 'ultra-revolutionary' clothing in which Trotskyism's pro-imperialist politics are routinely dressed.

It is therefore important that all class-conscious workers understand the history, current practice and dubious nature of the organisation now calling itself the 'Revolutionary Communist party' and why it should be outed as the reactionary state-sponsored agent it really is.

What is Trotskyism and why must it be understood?

Trotskyism is a varied and eclectic movement, just as the collected writings of its founder are incoherent and self-contradictory. But there are common points amongst the groups who follow (intentionally or not) Trotsky's anti-worker, anti-Marxist tradition.

A common approach such groups share with their guru is the penchant for ultra-revolutionary phrasemongering. Trotskyite groups are well known for making themselves (and more importantly the communist movement) ridiculous by their bombastic but essentially empty declarations with no practical, definitive programme of action that will bring the working class to the stated goal of 'general strike now' or 'revolution everywhere'.

It is notable that, rather than skilfully and steadily building up the forces needed for working-class victory, these groups often push for reckless advances when the tide is against the workers' movement but argue for caution and compromise when the revolutionary masses are surging forward. Unsurprisingly, no Trotskyite group has ever built, led or won a revolution, despite more than a century of their proclaiming themselves the 'vanguard' and 'true proponents' of Leninism.

Despite their claims to be the upholders and inheritors of the October Revolution, the truth is quite the opposite. The main essence of Trotskyism has always been opposition to Lenin and Leninism. Trotsky himself worked consistently against Lenin and the Bolsheviks from the moment of their split from the Menshevik faction in 1903 until the last months before the socialist revolution of October 1917.

The origin of that split was on the question of organisation, and Trotsky was firmly of the Menshevik view that a broad mass organisation of self-enrolling members was all that was required to make revolution, while Lenin and the Bolsheviks argued that a disciplined, centralised organisation would be needed to harness the power of the

working class and enable it to strike successfully against its powerful enemies.

Without organisation, said Lenin, the working class has nothing. But the intellectual individualists recoiled from the idea that anyone should 'dictate' to them as if they had been the common herd. They refused point blank to be held accountable for their work or to follow a line they might not have been instrumental in creating.

When socialist revolution was in the offing, and the Bolsheviks had defied all Trotsky's theories and predictions by building a party of the masses along Leninist lines, Trotsky jumped ship at the last minute and joined them just in time to proclaim himself a key leader of the party whose development he had done everything to oppose for a decade and a half. He later wrote a self-aggrandising history of the revolution that was excellently refuted in Josef Stalin's 1924 article 'Trotskyism or Leninism?'

Among Trotsky's more notorious errors were his refusal to recognise the revolutionary potential of the poor peasants (condemned out of hand as 'petty-bourgeois') in Russia and his corresponding refusal to recognise the revolutionary potential of the oppressed nations (condemned out of hand as 'bourgeois') in the Russian empire. In Trotsky's world, only a pure proletarian could be revolutionary.

In opposition to this line, the Bolsheviks successfully carried out Lenin's programme of building an alliance between the workers, the poor peasants and the oppressed nationalities of the Russian empire, all of whom had a strong interest in bringing down the Russian tsarist autocracy. This alliance was further developed to become the foundation for the socialist revolution and the building of the Soviet Union.

Trotsky's mistake regarding the poor peasantry led him to the view that the revolution in Russia, since it would necessarily be carried out by a tiny proportion of the population (the urban working class at a time when Russia's population

was overwhelmingly peasant), would have to be supported by workers from western capitalist countries, who would be needed to back up the Russian workers in putting down the peasants' opposition.

This is what is meant by the theory of the 'permanent revolution', also known as the theory of 'permanent hopelessness' since it dictates that all enemies must be fought simultaneously and therefore dooms the working class to defeat.

In fact, it now appears that the originator of this self-defeating theory may not have been Trotsky himself but his émigré close friend and mentor Alexander Parvus, a shady character in Russian socialist circles abroad who made money as a gun runner during WW1, and who is known to have worked with both British and German intelligence.

After Lenin's death, Trotsky dressed up his continued opposition to the politics of Lenin in revolutionary Russia as a 'defence of Leninism' against Lenin's successor Stalin. In fact, it was Stalin who upheld Lenin's ideas and successfully led their implementation by the party and the people, who were thus the first and most spectacularly successful builders of a socialist state.

Trotsky, like his modern political spawn, never understood the necessity of persuasion if the party wanted to bring the masses over to the side of the socialist revolution. As the arguments in the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU) of the 1920s repeatedly show, a majority of party members (led by Stalin) repeatedly made the point that the party must carry the people with them through argument and experience, not via coercive measures.

Trotsky, on the other hand, seemed to believe that shouting his demands loudly enough was all that was required. If that didn't work, he was ready to turn to military and bureaucratic methods of coercion—as was revealed by his attitude towards trade unions in the USSR.

Pervading all this was personal arrogance, a contempt for discipline and organisation, a

contempt for the poor and uneducated—all the hallmarks, in fact, of a petty-bourgeois intellectual.

And these errors continue to be replicated in the actions of those who follow Trotskyite organisations like the RCP in the present day. They advance ultra-revolutionary-sounding slogans such as "Regional workers revolution" in the middle east while ignoring or denigrating those who are already waging the anti-imperialist struggle in that region, none of whom meet their criteria for support.

Such an attitude can only lead those who follow them down a path of disorientation and disillusion. Who but the imperialist ruling class stands to gain from the promotion of such a method?

Where did the RCP spring from?

The organisation now calling itself the RCP is a rebrand of a group called Socialist Appeal (SA), which is connected to an international organisation known as 'International Marxist Tendency' (IMT). Along with many other Trotskyite sects, the SA was organised inside the imperialist Labour party for many decades, firstly as 'Militant' and then as 'Socialist Appeal'.

The group's rebrand occurred towards the end of 2023, when its members suddenly started calling themselves 'communists'—a word they'd barely ever used before—and started adopting a Soviet aesthetic in their material.

Some may argue that organisations change over time, but there is reason to be very suspicious of this rebrand given that it happened very suddenly and saw the organisational relaunch not just of its British section but of its entire international network. It is currently running an extensive (and expensive) advertising campaign across Britain, Europe and the USA—with generous funding from an unknown source, state promotion by government ministers, and corporate media sponsorship spanning the gamut of imperial organs from the Daily Telegraph and the Daily Mail to the information empires of Elon Musk and Rupert Murdoch.

All of this takes considerable resource, as does employing numerous full-time organisers, which the RCP is doing in many countries. Yet none of the IMT's local sections ever had a large membership, so where has the funding come from for this slick operation?

One is forced to conclude that the RCP relaunch is being funded either indirectly, via a substantial grant from some member of the Anglo-American capitalist class, or directly by the British and/or the US state and security services—perfectly timed to coincide with the rapid growth of interest in real revolutionary change and in communism—and that this is essentially a spoiler operation.

That is the role that Trotskyite operations have played for 90 years, and this one is no different.

Why would they have chosen the IMT? Likely because the relationship is longstanding. Veteran IMT/RCP leader Alan Woods has a long history of attempting to infiltrate and influence the Venezuelan leadership of Hugo Chávez, via his lesser-known brother Adan Chávez, with the ideas of Trotskyism. This seems to have been largely unsuccessful, but can hardly be described as accidental.

The relaunch of the IMT/Socialist Appeal as the 'RCP' comes at a time when the Trotskyite parties that used to dominate left-wing politics in Britain and the USA have lost almost all their credibility and traction. Clearly a new vehicle was needed to keep the influence of this pernicious ideology alive amongst the workers.

What are the RCP's main positions on the important questions of the day?

When it comes to the two biggest crises facing US and British imperialism today, the RCP's analysis is so wrong that it ends up essentially supporting the propaganda of British imperialism.

If we examine its position on the Ukraine war, for example, which is the defining issue of the present era, we discover that the RCP's ultimate conclusion is that it is an "interimperialist" war, in which

aggressive imperialist Russia is waging an unjust war of conquest against Ukraine.

Our party has been debunking every aspect of this specious argument for a decade, so there is no need to go into it further here, except to note that it is an 'analysis' that denies all history, all context and all economic fact and only serves to bolster the narrative created by the imperialists to hide their aggression, their use of fascist proxies, their destruction of Ukraine's sovereignty, their theft of Ukraine's wealth and their sacrifice of Ukraine's people on the altar of imperialist profit.

The RCP's analysis of the Gaza war is also incorrect when it comes to the resistance movements. It denounces the actually existing Palestinian resistance, in which Hamas and its military are the leading force, and brands the entire liberation struggle as futile. The RCP's 'analysts' refute the real anti-imperialist struggle that is now being waged and assert that the only thing that can defeat imperialism in the middle east is a region-wide workers' revolution.

Well if wishes were fishes, we'd all have tea!

Of course, no one is going to object to a region-wide socialist revolution, but the RCP seems to have no idea how the conditions to bring about such an event might develop. It is clear to anyone with eyes to see that the resistance against the imperialist domination of Palestine is today being conducted by Hamas, Palestinian Islamic Jihad (PIJ), the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine and others. And that on the regional level, these are being supported by the Iraqi, Lebanese and Yemeni resistance movements. All of which are doing real damage to imperialist interests and are well on course to achieving the final defeat and destruction of Anglo-American imperialism's settler colony of Israel in the coming period.

Some of these resistance groups are nationalist groups inspired by Islam, while others are secular socialist groups (PFLP and DFLP, for example). The Palestinian Marxist groups are part of a broad alliance with Hamas and others, and they operate

on the basis of a common programme, forming a united front against US-led Zionist occupation. They correctly identify their primary enemies as US imperialism, British imperialism and their Zionist colony.

The RCP position ignores what is actually going on inside Palestine and opposes to it an imaginary “region-wide workers’ revolution” that has no connection to reality—to how the struggle against imperialism is actually developing on the ground.

This is a mistake which has its roots in Trotsky’s own works. Throughout his career, Trotsky would routinely advance ultra-left slogans that were completely out of line with social forces, both before and after the revolution.

In the 1920s, he did this over the trade union question, over collectivisation of the land (which he wanted to forge ahead with when the conditions were not yet ready and which he denounced when they were), and over the programme for Soviet industrialisation.

We cannot give workers’ enemies free rein

We are often asked why the party criticises the RCP on our social media platforms. Is this not ‘divisive’ and ‘sectarian’?

For all the reasons outlined above, one cannot but regard the RCP as an asset of the British state. Its leaders are directly or indirectly serving imperialism, and its members—many of whom are no doubt sincere individuals who genuinely want to contribute to building a revolutionary movement in Britain—need to be made aware of that fact.

By denigrating the forces who are fighting imperialism, and who are dying in large numbers in Ukraine and Palestine, the RCP is misleading potential revolutionaries and leading them down a dead end. Its analyses serve imperialism. Its slogans create confusion and bring the true revolutionary movement into disrepute.

As communists, it is our duty to be honest with the working class about the true nature of such groups as the RCP: who they are and what they

represent. We remain ready to engage honestly with all those who have been misled and to offer them a better path.

As Stalin himself observed in 1937, Trotskyism long ago moved from being a mistaken trend in the workers’ movement to being an asset of the intelligence services of the imperialist powers. The RCP is but one plank in a raft of measures adopted by the capitalist class to sabotage the historic mission of the working class to rise to the position of ruling class, and to build a bright socialist future.

These Trotskyite tailers remain, of course, a subordinate plank to the mainstream Labour social democrats, but as the Labour party loses all credibility along with the rest of the British political ‘mainstream’, in the gathering storm of political and economic crisis, the capitalist class and its state are using the RCP to target the rise of Marxist understanding and sympathy—and to keep workers away from our party in particular, as the vehicle of that much-needed scientific ideology, understanding and organisation.

We must be absolutely clear as to the dangers that can come from such organisations and do our best to help workers steer clear of their poisonous misdirection.

The fall of Syria

Alexander McKay | Communist Party of Great Britain (Marxist-Leninist)

The collapse of the government of Bashar al-Assad is a grave setback for anti-imperialist forces from which we must learn.

The resignation of Syrian president Bashar al-Assad and the handing over of Damascus to US-backed terror gangs is a victory for US imperialism. The Anglo-American imperialists have long sought to subjugate all of Syria and now they think they have the opportunity to do so.

There are those who call themselves 'socialists' who are celebrating the fall of the Syrian government and the end of the Syrian Arab Republic, but as soon as it was declared that President Assad had gone into exile, US and Israeli warplanes started bombing runs all over the country and the Israeli regime began to annex more Syrian territory.

The US-led war on Syria began in 2011 in the period referred to as the 'Arab Spring', during which mass street protests broke out in Tunisia and then Egypt and in both countries longstanding leaders aligned with the USA were forced out. The USA and its imperialist allies responded quickly to the situation and began to actively manipulate and even create protests in other countries, including in Syria and Libya.

Their aim was to rapidly escalate any peaceful protests that did occur into violent confrontations spiralling into civil war that could then be used to justify 'humanitarian' intervention by the imperialist camp. This is what was done in Libya and which had such horrific effects on the Libyan people, with the nation now divided in two and with open slave markets operating in Tripoli.

In Syria at this time, the USA unleashed a giant cover action campaign that was codenamed

'Operation Timber Sycamore'. This consisted of a huge programme of arming gangs of extremely reactionary fundamentalists, who at various times went under the names of al-Qaeda, Isis, the Syrian National Army, Jabat Al Nusra and now Hayt-Tahrir Al Sham. This multitude of names disguises that they are (at root) the same group, which has been working with the USA in many countries since at least the time of the Afghan war in the 1980s.

Their way of war is always the same, and it involves the mass killing of civilians and countless other war crimes that the US pretends to oppose. Along with this campaign of mass terror came the economic sanctions, which in many ways were even more devastating than the actions of the terror gangs.

A brutal and strangulating siege

Since 2011, Syria has suffered under brutal and strangulating imperialist sanctions that have severely prohibited its ability to fulfil even the most basic functions such as feeding its population. Even after intervention by the Russians and Iranians in support of the Damascus government, over one third of the country remained controlled by the al-Qaeda-type groups and by Kurdish forces (also aligned with the USA) in parts of the north and north-east. Meanwhile, US military directly occupied the country's major oil and wheat producing areas.

The aim of all this was to create a state of siege in the country, and the aim of any siege is to break the will of the opponent to resist by making life in the besieged land as unbearable as possible. This is what was being done to Syria from 2011

onwards, and it was done in order to bring down the government led by Bashar al-Assad and replace it with one that is totally subservient to US diktat.

What happened over the course of last week was that the years of siege warfare appear to have finally paid off and a significant number of commanders in the Syrian army simply refused to fight the latest incursion of US and Turkish-backed HTS-led forces.

The cumulative effect of the siege warfare seems to have finally broken the will to fight of many in the Syrian army, and President Assad himself left the country as part of a deal with the US-backed forces. Now Syria is a country without a functioning state, with no army to defend it, and no allies. It is being bombed continuously by Israeli and US warplanes, the imperialists clearly being determined to make sure that not a shred of Syria's defensive capabilities remain. Territory is being seized by Israel in the south and there is a high likelihood of a direct Turkish invasion in the north.

Thirteen years of war, hundreds of thousands dead and millions turned into refugees. This is the legacy of the imperialists' dirty war on Syria, and now they have won their grim victory it is likely that only chaos and more destruction awaits the Syrian people.

The enemy within

The question must be asked: why did so many on the British left support this imperialist war? Why did left-social-democratic and Trotskyists such as Owen Jones, Paul Mason, Aaron Bastani, Zarah Sultana and so many other 'leftist' luminaries support the destruction of this anti-zionist country?

The answer lies in the fact that all of these 'leftists' are rabid supporters of US imperialism. Whether the war is on Russia or on Syria, Britain's fake left will line up either to support it directly or to indirectly justify it by hiding behind dumb phrases like "Assad is a dictator". These traitors to the working class

will move on and forget this war as the news media turns away and Syria is torn to pieces by the rabid dogs of imperialism.

The lesson for true socialists is that when this war was first being pushed by David Cameron back in 2011 a much more serious antiwar campaign should have been waged. Instead the pro-imperialist left agreed with much of the propaganda being pushed by the imperialists and ended up doing little or nothing to mount any real opposition to the 13-year-long siege on and destruction of a nation that was an important part of the anti-imperialist resistance axis.

This is yet another shameful episode of collaboration by the British 'left' with our class enemies. Until we purge our movement of the influence of this bribed and treacherous fifth column, we will come not a single step closer to our own liberation.

Liberation of the Syrian people or imperialist balkanization of Syria?

Union for Communist Reconstruction (URC, France)

Since the flight of Syrian President Bashar Al-Assad, declarations from French political representatives on the right and far right, as well as on the “left”, have multiplied to congratulate themselves on the “liberation” of the Syrian people. But are we really in the presence of a liberation that the peoples of the world could welcome because it would herald a better tomorrow for the Syrian people? On the contrary, aren’t we in the presence of a new novel masking the essence of reality, like those about the “liberation” of the Iraqi or Libyan people? Communists, for their part, stick to the facts, their contextualization and the lessons of history.

The facts are, first and foremost, the nature of the pseudo-liberators. The main player in this pseudo-liberation is the “Hayat Tahrir al-Sham” group [Levant Liberation Organization], whose main component [the former Al-Nosra Front] was affiliated to the notoriously barbaric Al-Qaeda organization. The second is the Syrian National Army, also claiming to be “jihadist” and sponsored by the Turkish government. With such “liberators”, the Syrian people can expect no better tomorrow.

The facts are also the announcement by the US government of its intention to maintain its illegal military occupation of part of Syrian territory, where oil and wheat are produced for the Syrian people taken hostage, and the entry of Israeli troops into Syria, already illegally occupying the Golan Heights, and their annexation of part of Syrian territory in defiance of international law, as well as the control of several regions by the Turkish army and/or its local auxiliaries. The “liberation” hailed

by the entire political class and our media is in fact nothing more than the balkanization and chaotic break-up of the Syrian nation.

Finally, the facts are the first public executions, targeting not only supporters of the old regime, but scientists and even anti-terrorist Muslim scholars, which our media hailing the “liberation” are careful not to show us.

Contextualizing these facts is a reminder that our world, from the Ukraine to the Sahel, from the Americas to the China Sea, etc., is engaged in a fierce struggle between US hegemonism and its Western allies on the one hand, and numerous countries and nations refusing this domination and aspiring to a multipolar world on the other. Contextualization also means recalling the evolution of the war in Ukraine, which makes it necessary for the Western alliance to force Russia to fight on several fronts in order to disperse its forces. Contextualization also means recalling the murderous military aggressions since 2011 and the murderous economic blockade imposed on the Syrian people by US imperialism, as well as the plundering of its oil in the so-called “liberated” zones. As in the case of 40 other countries around the world, the United States has imposed “sanctions” on this country, which have only one result: to starve its people and destroy its health and education services.

Contextualization means, last but not least, the resistance of the Palestinian people, who for a year have been facing the first televised genocide in the history of mankind, with total impunity from the Zionist genocidal state. This relentless resistance

led the Zionist state to attack Lebanon and wage all-out war for two months. The impossibility of achieving the main goal of the war, the destruction of Hezbollah, led the Zionists and their allies to change tactics and decide to attack Syria, which was the rear base of support for the Palestinian and Lebanese resistance in the region.

The lessons of history are the balance sheets of previous “liberations” promoted directly by Western imperialist armed intervention, or supported indirectly and applauded by the same political and media forces as those who speak of “Syrian liberation”: Sudan, shattered and at war; Libya, just as atomized and the site of confrontations between several foreign powers; Iraq, durably bled dry by the scale of the human hecatomb and the destruction of infrastructure, etc. These are the “liberations” of the past. Such are the “liberations” in the Arab world, as elsewhere in the world, that accompany the predatory interests of the imperialists.

Facts, contextualization and the lessons of history all help to characterize the tragic events unfolding in Syria. Far from being a “liberation”, this tragedy of the Syrian people is first and foremost the work of the United States, Israel and Turkey, all three of whom have a vested interest in the balkanization of Syria, the strengthening of the Zionist state as local manager of the interests of the imperialist system, the weakening of Iran until it can be balkanized in its turn, and the isolation of the resistance and the Palestinian people as a condition for the project of their annihilation. These different objectives are tools for the control of this strategic region due to its geographical location [at the intersection of three continents] and its oil and gas wealth, on the one hand, and to weaken the multipolar world project supported by countries as diverse as China, Russia, India and Venezuela, on the other.

Far from being a “liberation”, the current Syrian reality is a severe blow firstly for the Syrian people, then for the Palestinian and Lebanese peoples,

and finally for progressive and anti-imperialist forces the world over. This is why we Communists pledge our solidarity with all political forces mobilizing to preserve Syria’s territorial integrity. The Syrian Communist Party, aware of the dangers of balkanization and its effects on its people and the region as a whole, has already set itself this objective in its December 9 communiqué. This is also why we will continue to mobilize all our forces in support of the Palestinian resistance, which remains intrepid and exemplary.

History is a series of advances and retreats, of victories and defeats, which enable peoples to gain experience and prepare the way for victory. “The night is never as dark as before dawn”.

The struggle continues, and the peoples of the world will rise to the challenge!

A Proletarian Approach to the Syrian Question

Mücadele Birliği (Struggle Unity, Turkey)

The Syrian regime collapsed faster than anyone expected, even its enemies. The rapid collapse of a state whose modern history spans more than a hundred years has naturally led to polemics. The answers to the questions of how and why this destruction took place are likely to lead to controversy among communist and revolutionary parties, as well as among all parties and sectors.

I. The Correct Approach to the Issue

First of all, let us underline the following in order to avoid any misunderstanding and misinterpretation: It was necessary and correct to support the Syrian state in its war against imperialism, Arab reactionaries, Turkey, and the religious fascist gangs fed and supported by the Turkish government. Revolutionary communists in Turkey and Kurdistan defended this line from the beginning and fulfilled its requirements.

But what did it mean to follow a political line of supporting the Syrian state in this war against imperialism and reaction and wanting the Syrian army to triumph over its enemies, and? Did it mean unconditional support for those holding political power in Syria? Or should it have?

Of course not! Communists cannot, indeed must never, discard class considerations in such cases. In such a situation the question must be asked and the answer must be clear: What is the class character of the Syrian state, the Baathists holding power? For communists, the answer to this question is clear: The Baath government is a bourgeois government. Therefore, the communists' support for such a government is not and cannot be unconditional and unlimited... Communists' support for this government must be conditional and limited. The condition is that it is determined in the war

against imperialism and reaction; its limit is within the framework of this war. Apart from this, the communists, whether in Syria or elsewhere, carefully protect the independent class interests of the proletariat and defend these interests against any bourgeois class. In fact, this is the political line that the Syrian Communist Party (SCP) must defend. We can go one step further and say the following: Even in the midst of the war, in the struggle against imperialism, reaction and fascism, the SCP should have defended an independent class line, taking great care that the interests of the proletariat were not dissolved in the interests of the bourgeois class.

This does not mean, of course, that one should copy and apply the slogan of "turning foreign war into civil war" that some idiots learned from Lenin. To propose such a policy would amount to the same kind of philistinism that leads to the implementation of imperialist plans, nothing more.

One can ask the question: How is it that bourgeois class is able to fight against imperialism and reaction today? The answer lies in the present conditions of the imperialist-capitalist system and in the policy of "full annexation" which it imposes on dependent and semi-dependent countries or those that not yet been fully integrated into the imperialist-capitalist system. We cannot evaluate imperialism as it was in the past decades. We have to understand and take into account the gigantic dimensions reached by the imperialist finance capital, the resulting crisis and collapse of the imperialist-capitalist system, and the policies pursued by imperialist states to get out of this crisis and collapse.

In short, the imperialist states and imperialist finance capital have reached a point where they

cannot be content with exploiting the dependent and semi-dependent countries and countries that are not yet fully integrated into the system with the “old-style” of exploitation in order to overcome the crisis, to continue expanded reproduction and capital accumulation. It is now forcing countries that are not yet fully integrated into the system to surrender, imposing “full economic annexation” on them. To seize the banks, industry, agriculture, land, and natural resources of “neo-colonial” countries, the current imperialist policy increases exploitation to the most intensive level possible and continues the accumulation of capital. Countries and states that do not submit to this policy are destroyed and dismembered. Yugoslavia is one example; Gaddafi’s oil-rich Libya, which was later revealed to have “good relations” with France under Sarkozy, is another example of which there are many more.

Of course, in order to reach the right conclusions, we have to address the problem as a whole and analyze it accordingly. The global civil war launched by the imperialist states, especially the USA, and the imperialist finance oligarchy against the working class and toiling peoples of the world, against the socialist countries, especially Cuba and the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, and against the popular-democratic governments oriented towards socialism, such as Venezuela and Nicaragua, cannot be considered separately from the “full annexation” policy. The main characteristic feature of our epoch is the collapse of the imperialist-capitalist system and the period of proletarian revolutions. In the words of the imperialists (NATO), we are in the “century of uprisings”. In other words, we are in the century of social revolutions. The imperialist states and NATO made this determination just before the 2000s and started political and military preparations for the new period. The provocation of September 11 was also imperialism’s declaration of a global civil war against the world proletariat and toiling

peoples and global communist and revolutionary forces. Without placing this phenomenon at the center of our evaluations, it is not possible to correctly understand and analyze all the political developments, wars and all the machinations of the imperialists since then. Global civil war and “full annexation” are the spirit and basis of the policies pursued by the imperialist states and imperialist finance capital today.

The states that refuse to submit to the policy of “full annexation” are forced to fight imperialism in order to protect their conditions of existence. Syria is one of these states. The imperialist states (USA, UK, EU) first wanted to subjugate Syria and make the religious fascist gangs their “partners in power.” Turkey was given the task of implementing this policy; In 2011, just before the fundamentalist fascist gangs mobilized against Syria, Turkish Foreign Minister Ahmet Davutoğlu traveled to Damascus with a proposal to bring religious fascists into the government. In fact, the imperialists and the reactionary regional states, including Turkey, had prepared everything to mobilize the religious fascist gangs. If Assad had accepted Turkey’s offer, the imperialists would have overthrown the government without the need for war. Assad and his government did not submit to this. Because they resisted the gangs were mobilized. The Syrian government in the person of Assad resisted imperialism and reaction in order to protect itself, that is, to maintain its own conditions of existence.

II. Syria in the Crosshairs

Why Syria, one may ask? The answer is very simple: Because Syria occupies an important position in the Middle East (West Asia). The “full annexation” of Syria was above all important for Israel’s security. Likewise, the “fall” of Syria was vital for the imperialist states in order to cut the lines of communication between the forces and states resisting imperialism, to destroy the logistics lines and cut the arteries of the Palestinian

revolution; to tie Russia's hands in the region by completely destroying its influence in the Eastern Mediterranean; and to make Lebanon fall completely into the lap of the imperialists. And of course, one of the most important goals was to turn Syria into a country that nourishes and breeds religious fascists. With the fall of Syria, we can see with our naked eyes how the lines of communication of the forces resisting the imperialist states were broken and how they were dragged into a vortex of great difficulties.

The question of "why Syria?" can be answered not only in terms of "full annexation" or oil, but more importantly, Syria was one of the most suitable places to become the "religious fascist production and distribution farm" that the imperialists needed for their war against the world proletariat, working peoples, revolutionary and communist forces, against socialist and socialist-oriented popular-democratic states. We know that they sent these religious fascist gangs from Caucasian countries to Ukraine through Turkey, and from there to African and Central Asian countries. Boko Haram, Al-Shabaab in countries such as Mali, Niger, Chad, Libya and ISIS, Al-Qaeda, etc. in the Middle East are just some of them. Undoubtedly, the Hitlerian fascists called "Neo Nazis" organized by the secret services in Europe are part of all these in terms of purpose and function.

These religious fascists, which some revolutionaries and communists wrongly describe as "jihadists," could and are being used as a counter-revolutionary force capable of committing all kinds of war crimes and atrocities. Ukraine is no exception. We see everywhere, from Africa to Ukraine, how much the imperialists need and use such a counter-revolutionary mob.

Like every government, the Baathist regime has a past and a present. Leaving aside its founding years, especially after the 1960s, the Ba'ath Party was an Arab nationalist, secularist party strongly influenced by socialism and that embraced Pan-

Arabism. After protracted internal struggles, the Syrian Ba'athist government, identified with Hafez al-Assad, was established in November 1970 as a result of a military coup led by Hafez al-Assad.

The Ba'athist government led by Hafez al-Assad aimed at Pan-Arabist goals and used the discourse of socialism. As can be seen from this, the socialism of the Ba'ath government was not scientific socialism, but petty bourgeois socialism. The power was in the hands of petty bourgeois forces influenced by socialism, thanks to the great prestige and sympathy that socialism and the Soviet Union had gained worldwide. Syria had an economic structure based on agriculture with backward industry. Despite the developing capitalist mode of production, feudal institutions, such as the "clan," were not completely dissolved, especially in rural areas. The sum of all these reasons, despite the existence of the Syrian Communist Party, did not allow the working class to become an effective force.

The petty bourgeois Ba'athist government, which had existed in Syria for many years, never outlawed private ownership of the means of production, although it limited it. The influence of socialism paved the way for the Ba'athist government to maintain close relations with the Soviet Union on all fronts: military, economic and political. The reverse is also true. Close and intimate relations with the Soviet Union kept the Syrian Baathist government close to socialism. However, contrary to the claims of the Baathist government, this fact did not mean that the relations of production in Syria were socialist relations of production. The capitalist mode of production on the basis of private ownership of the means of production, despite the restrictive measures taken by the Baathist government, continued to develop, and thus, at one pace or another, to develop a bourgeois class.

Nevertheless, the relationship between the Baath government and the Soviet Union prevented the Soviet Union from being encircled by the

imperialist states. Because of the same tendency towards petty bourgeois socialism, the Baath government for many years functioned as a “front line” for both the revolutionary forces in the region and the Palestinian revolution. Suffice it to say this much: Hafez al-Assad’s government played an active role in protecting the revolutionary and communist movement in Turkey and Kurdistan from the military fascist coup of September 12, 1980. The fact that Palestinian revolutionary organizations used Syria as a source of material income and as a training, and logistics area with armed training camps, educational, health institutions and workshops for the Palestinian people in Syria is an example in itself.

But all the while, a section of the petty bourgeoisie was accumulating capital in various forms, becoming bourgeois all while trying to influence the government. This is what actually happened in Syria in the 1980s, when Hafez al-Assad said “we are preparing for the transition to the dictatorship of the proletariat”. This change in class relations also had an impact on political power. Although Hafez al-Assad’s strong personality balanced this effect, it was not enough to eliminate it. Against the backdrop of capitalist relations of production, capital, despite the restrictions imposed by law, always finds a canal to flow through, a way to develop. We know that small private property, and the capitalist mode of production based on it, incessantly gives rise to capitalist production.

The capitalist class in Syria was growing and accumulating its capital through gold and foreign currency smuggling, bribery, embezzlement of state property and many other means, and trying to centralize it by driving small producers and small capital owners into bankruptcy. By the years in question, the bourgeois class had reached a power that was influential on the government and was forcing the government of Hafez al-Assad to develop relations with European imperialists, especially France, instead of the Soviet Union.

It cannot be said that these efforts of the bourgeois class, which gradually swelled and turned its face towards the imperialist states, were fruitless. Especially from the second half of the 80s onward, the Syrian state, under pressure from the bourgeois forces that wanted to establish ties with the imperialists, began to take measures to restrict the movement of Palestinian revolutionary organizations. The same measures were applied to the revolutionary organizations of Turkey and Kurdistan, but more stringently. Their freedom of movement was significantly restricted and their political activities were put under control. This was the reflection of the change in class relations on revolutionary organizations.

III. Breaking Point

Of course, this does not mean that the bourgeoisie completely took over the state and dominated everything. This was a process that took years, and the first practical effects of this process were beginning to emerge. However, the Kurdish Freedom Movement (KFM) continued to exist on the Lebanon-Syria corridor until the end of the 90s and the leadership of the KFM remained in Damascus, Syria. Despite all the pressure and insistence of Turkey, the reactionary Arab states and the imperialists, the Hafez al-Assad regime did not remove the leadership of the PFLP from Syria-Damascus until the end of 1998.

It is important to note here how petty bourgeois governments have changed over time. Not only in Syria, but in every country where they have been in power, petty bourgeois governments have changed over time and turned into bourgeois governments. This is because the petty bourgeoisie itself, as an intermediate class between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, is not a permanent but a temporary class. Within the relations of capitalist production, a large part of this intermediate class falls into the proletarian stratum, while a small part rises to the bourgeois stratum. The reflection

of this change in class relations on power is an inevitable development. This reality shows how fragile victory becomes when we limit the struggle for independence to the anti-imperialist struggle without taking it to an anti-capitalist level. In our age, it is no longer possible for any “national” bourgeois power to survive by preserving this characteristic.

One of the most important breaks in Baathist rule occurred in October 1998. As a result of Turkey’s threat of war, Hafez al-Assad, realizing the seriousness of the threat of war with the intervention of Hosni Mubarak, was forced to ask the leader of the KFM, Ocalan, to leave Syria. The threat of war was taken seriously because Turkey had made it on the basis of NATO, the US, Zionist Israel and British imperialism. This is what Hosni Mubarak’s intervention meant. On October 9, 1998, the leader of the KFM, Öcalan, left Syria and was subsequently caught by the CIA-Mossad duo in Nairobi, Kenya, on February 19, 1999. It was clear that the arrested of the KFM leader was the work of NATO, the USA and Zionist Israel. Even Ecevit, the Turkish Prime Minister then, admitted that he was not aware of the situation when he said, “I don’t understand why the US gave us Öcalan”.

The pro-imperialists in the Baathist government had obviously gotten rid of a “weight”. Without wasting any time, the “Adana Memorandum” was signed with Turkey on October 20, 1998. Syria had now closed its door to revolutionary forces. Soon Syrian security forces captured five Kurdish revolutionaries who wanted to cross the border to the Turkish side and handed them over to Turkey. Thus, Syria, which hosted revolutionary forces and protected them from fascism, turned into a Syria that captured revolutionaries and handed them over to fascism.

The imprisonment of Öcalan, the leader of the KFM, was the result of the plans and efforts of the NATO-US-Israel triangle; there is no debate about this. In addition to this major blow to the

KFM, Turkey received the greatest support from the US, Germany and NATO in particular, against the great revolutionary uprising of the 90s, which took the form of a civil war. In the 1990s, it was these imperialist powers that saved the fascist state from the revolution of Kurdistan in particular and the united revolution of Turkey and Kurdistan in general. One of the major aims of the US in the Middle East (West Asia) was, and still is, to liquidate the KFM and the united revolution.

In an interview with Deutsche Welle in 2021, James Jeffrey, Special Envoy for Syria under the first Trump administration, summarized US policy on this issue.

The journalist asks:

“There have been very serious accusations against the United States from Turkey at the highest level. Let me ask you bluntly: Does the US support the PKK? Is it paving the way for the PKK to establish a state in Syria with its support for the SDF?”

The answer to this question among social chauvinists is “yes”. But the US representative, J. Jeffrey, responds a bit angrily:

“Wait a minute, hold on here... The US has a long history of treating the PKK as a terrorist organization. There is a very serious and extensive support from the United States, much of it classified as secret, for the Republic of Turkey’s fight against the PKK. The United States is on the side of the Republic of Turkey in this struggle, there is no doubt about that.”

But there are those who doubt this. The social chauvinist parties and organizations that indirectly support the Turkish state in the struggle against the Kurdish nation’s right to self-determination, were “doubting” and propagandizing that the US was not on the side of Turkey but on the side of the KFM.

It is worth quoting James Jeffrey’s “valuable”

confessions. Elsewhere, this bloodsucking representative of the US, describing its policies regarding the PKK, says the following:

“We want to see PKK cadres out of Syria. This is the root cause of the tension with Turkey in northeastern Syria. We want to reduce this tension. Because we work in very close coordination with Turkey in all regions except the northeast. Even in the northeast, as I said, we have a military agreement with Turkey.”

Yes, they have a military agreement with Turkey even in Rojava. A secret agreement, of course. We will return to James Jeffrey’s confessions and explanations later.

While the concrete facts are like this, the propaganda of the social chauvinist parties and organizations—TKP (“Communist” Party of Turkey) being the most prominent among them—claims that the US supports the KFM, that support for Kurds is pro-US.” This is a great deception and only serves the Turkish state! The truth is that the US and EU imperialists are the biggest enemies of the united revolution in Turkey and Kurdistan, and therefore the biggest enemies who want the liquidation of the KFM. To think otherwise is to not recognize imperialism. Imperialism works not for the freedom of the people, not for the right of self-determination, but to enslave people. It is the basic characteristic line of imperialism to divide the nations of the world into oppressor and oppressed nations. Imperialism and imperialist finance capital do not seek freedom but domination. It is this revolutionary theory that will enlighten our path about the Kurdistan question.

IV. Attempts at Reconciliation

Soon after the “Adana Accord” and the imprisonment of the leader of the KFM, Ocalan, there was a significant change in the Baathist government. The father Hafez al-Assad died and was replaced by his

son Bashar al-Assad. In the first years of his rule, Bashar al-Assad always turned his face towards the “West”, that is, towards the imperialist states. The fact that one of his first foreign trips was not to Moscow but to London in 2002 points to this. His relations with Erdoğan and the religious fascist government went so far as to vacation together in 2008. Assad visited France and then Moscow in the same period.

There is no doubt that the bourgeois class was behind this change in the policy of the Baathist government, which has accumulated capital in various ways and is constantly getting fatter and fatter. Because the capitalist class could only develop and consolidate its rule in relation to imperialist capital, Assad’s turn towards “liberal economic policies” and the opening of the country’s territory to imperialist capital were the result of this. These policies led to a deep impoverishment of the Syrian working class and laborers. Where capital accumulated, the spread and increase of poverty is inevitable.

There is no doubt that the war in Syria that started in 2011 is a counter-revolutionary war organized by the US-France-Britain-NATO, the reactionary Arab states in the Middle East (West Asia) and Turkey. However, as true as this is, it is also a fact that the religious fascist gangs deployed on the ground have found a certain mass support in Syria. Without forgetting the existence of religious fascist gangs recruited from all over the world by the intelligence services of the imperialist countries and Turkey, it is not wrong to say that these gangs have found more or less mass support in various regions of Syria. Idlib, Hama and Homs are among the places where religious fascist gangs have found mass support. To explain that this support stems from the religious-sectarian divide is to take the easy way out. Although such a distinction has an effect, the essence of the conjuncture is the reaction to factors such as poverty, exploitation, corruption in the state, etc.

We also know that behind this mass support is the decades-long activity of the “Muslim Brotherhood” gang in Syria, which enjoys the full support of the Turkish intelligence services. The counter-revolutionary uprisings in Hama and Homs in 1982 and the bombings that killed dozens of people in Damascus in 1986 were some of the results of the activities of these gangs.

It was on this basis that the US-NATO and other imperialists, the reactionary Arab states and Turkey organized a counter-revolutionary war in 2011. We can easily assert the following: While Assad was on a family vacation with Erdogan in August 2008, Turkish intelligence services were preparing the religious fascist gangs that would be deployed for a bloody war three years later. The 2011 bloody counter-revolutionary war was not prepared in a day. Likewise, the armed and well-organized religious fascist gangs that are springing up everywhere did not acquire the capacity for such a war in a month or a year. It is clear that such an organization requires a long period of time.

The imperialists imposed full annexation on Assad and his government, demanding his submission and surrender. Assad and the main cadres of the government rejected this and chose the path of fighting back against the imperialist plans. This was a path that should have been followed by the Syrian working class and communist forces, and it was. However, while the communists and the working class are going to war against the imperialists and the religious fascists, they are obliged to implement these policies without dissolving the independent class interests of the working class in the interests of the bourgeois class. The same distinction applies to the world communist parties and revolutionary forces. The communists could have taken part in this war against the imperialists by protecting the independent class interests of the proletariat and relying on their own forces just as the Bolsheviks protected the independent class interests of the proletariat by acting separately from the Kerensky

forces also fighting against, when fighting against Kornilov.

“Self-interest”, in the same sense of the word “private interest”, is a principle of bourgeois society. The bourgeoisie pursues its own private interests first and works for the realization of these interests under all circumstances. This does not change under conditions of war, nor does the bourgeoisie sacrifice his private interest for his “homeland”. On the contrary, the bourgeoisie seeks to make the most of the conditions of war. Throughout the long years of war in Syria, the bourgeoisie has not deviated from this principle. The working class and toiling masses were intensively exploited by the bourgeois class itself; they were left in hunger and poverty. The material and moral burden of the war was borne not by the bourgeois class, but by the working class, laborers and poor masses. It was inconceivable that the material destruction, war fatigue and low morale of the working class and laboring masses in the long years of war would not affect soldiers who were closely linked to the masses. The relations of some cadres in the upper bureaucracy of the state, including the army, with the bourgeois class, and the reaction to the decay and corruption in this section of society had broken the desire and will of the army to fight.

No one can help an army that does not want to fight. In this sense, if the allegation that Russia and/or Iran “sold Syria out” is not a deliberate lie, it can only be the result of deep-seated “Russophobia.” Neither Russia nor Iran had any interest in negotiating or “selling” Syria. On the contrary, it is these two states that have suffered the most from Syria falling into the hands of Zionist Israel and Turkey, and thus into the hands of the US, NATO and other imperialists. But we have to reiterate once again: No one, including Russia and Iran, can help an army that does not want to fight.

Undoubtedly, Palestine, Lebanon, Hezbollah, Russia and Iran, as well as the Kurdish people, have suffered the most from the fall of Syria. However,

far from being over, the fight is just beginning.

V. Rojava in Danger

At this point, it is necessary to dwell on Rojava, albeit briefly. The Rojava issue is an issue that social chauvinist parties and organizations—once again the TKP being the most prominent among them—often use to stand on the side of “their own state”, Turkey, in the fight for the Kurdish nation’s right to self-determination. The main argument they use in this regard is the Rojava administration’s relations with the US. Turkey’s social chauvinist parties and organizations point to these relations and use the US as an excuse to oppose the Kurdish nation’s fight for freedom.

Is the US really behind the freedom struggle of the Kurdish people of Rojava? We have already mentioned that theoretically this cannot be so; the character of imperialism will not allow this. Now let us briefly look at what is the reality.

The practical image is that the US is equipping the armed forces of Rojava, the SDF, with trucks full of weapons. The truth is admitted by James Jeffrey as follows:

“Is there any evidence that we have given the YPG, the SDF, any weapons that would allow them to take action against Turkey? Look at what the Turkish army has done, what they have been able to do to the YPG in Afrin and then in northeast Syria. We didn’t give them any heavy weapons other than machine guns. We didn’t give them guided anti-tank missiles, the kind of weapons that ISIS used against the Turkish army in al-Bab. We didn’t give them heavy weapons, artillery... They don’t have an effective military force, they don’t have the capability to attack Turkey, they haven’t launched any attacks on Turkey from northeast Syria, and we have been very careful about that.”

These words are facts, nothing more, nothing less. Every fighter on the ground, especially those

fighting against ISIS, can testify to this.

It is known that the invasions of Afrin, Tel Abyad and Serakaniye by the Turkish army took place with the permission, approval and all kinds of military technical and intelligence support from the US. Without such permission, approval and support, Turkey could not even think of attempting to occupy territory. The fact that the invasion was halted instantly as a result of Trump’s insulting letter to Erdogan, which read “be smart, don’t be stupid,” is the biggest proof of this claim.

“No one in Washington gave military guarantees to the Kurds against Turkey,” James Jeffrey said, while admitting the following about troop withdrawals:

“Troop withdrawals? There has never been a troop withdrawal. When the situation in northeastern Syria became quite stable after defeating ISIS, Trump was inclined to withdraw. Each time we decided to develop five better arguments for why we should stay in the region, and each time we succeeded. That’s the story.”

Yes, “this was the story”, which consisted of real facts, and “this was the story” that those who took a stance against the Kurdish people’s freedom struggle did not want to bring to mind or remember.

Now we are at the beginning of a “story of the sale” just like in Serakaniyeh in October 2019. In reality, the “story” began to be written at the beginning of the last Syrian war, when Kurdistan’s forces were driven out of Tel Rifaat and its surroundings, Menbij and the western bank of the Euphrates by the Turkish army and its religious fascist gang SMO. Of course, the religious fascist gang HTS were with them. In all these attacks and occupations, Turkey would not have been able to take a single step without the permission of the US. Trump explains this situation as follows:

“Those who have taken over in Syria are controlled by Turkey. This is not a problem. Turkey is very

smart. Turkey carried out an unfriendly takeover in Syria without too many casualties.”

Yes, indeed, the occupation of Rojava by Turkey and its religious fascist gangs, the SMO, was “not a problem” for the US. With the same recklessness, Trump explains why it is not a “problem” as follows:

“The US can be more effective in Syria with its NATO ally Turkey,” Donald Trump said, answering a journalist’s question, “What are you going to do about the 900 US troops in Syria?” Trump replied, “There must be another way to do it. One of them is Turkey.”

One has to admit that this “outspoken” man is too blunt. The US will be “more effective” in Syria not with its own troops, but through the Turkish military! As long as there are Turkish troops, there is no need for US troops to be present. Moreover, it is known from the “Korean War” that the cost of Turkish soldiers is very low. During the “Korean War” it was twenty-three cents; now it is probably a few dollars. Of course, this man who is trying to rule the US with a calculator knows this better than anyone else!

We pointed out that a new sales story is being written in Tel Rifat, Membij and its surroundings. Trump’s words should be taken as a sign that the story will continue in the second Trump term. The Rojava issue is not a one-and-done process. Therefore, we need to wait a bit to see what kind of a plan US imperialism has in Rojava. But one thing is certain: “The US supports all initiatives between Turkey and Iraq aimed at defeating the PKK.” (J. Jeffrey) In short, the US is against the Kurdish nation’s fight for the right to freedom.

And this is a fact: Within the Kurdish national liberation movement, including in Rojava, there are individuals, sectors and forces in favor of cooperation and alliance with the US. Do these petty bourgeois and bourgeois militant forces of the oppressed nation bear responsibility for the

heavy destruction in Syria? No doubt they do, and also they have a share in the great suffering of the Kurdish people now. However, it would be incomplete and therefore erroneous to see the problem only from this point of view. The Baathist government under Assad is as responsible for the heavy destruction in Syria and the great suffering of both the Syrian Arab people and the Kurdish people as these forces are, and even more so.

The chauvinist attitude of the Arab nationalist Baathist government headed by Assad was the biggest obstacle to the unity of struggle of the Kurdish and Arab peoples. We know that Russia has worked hard to bring Assad and the Rojava administration closer to each other because she realizes that the defeat of Turkey’s attempts and plans with and all the religious fascist gangs under its command depends on the unity of struggle of the two peoples and the peoples of other national communities. Russia even prepared a draft constitution envisioning a federal country. This failed. Although Kurdish pro-US factions played a role in the failure, the policy of the Arab nationalist, annexationist, chauvinist Baathist government was decisive.

Once again: The process continues; nothing has gone yet. Even if the gangs and the imperialists that patronize them declare a decisive victory, this is the reality. The Kurdish and Arab peoples will have the last word! Nevertheless, there are important lessons to be learned for the coming period of struggle. Foremost among these lessons is that the victory of the peoples over all exploitative powers, whether in Syria or in Turkey, depends on the unity of the peoples’ struggle.

The Kurdish nation will exercise its right to self-determination. The duty of communists in this regard is to unconditionally defend this right of the Kurdish nation. Communists cannot allow the slightest shadow of social chauvinism to fall on them. This is the basic line of Leninist thought and policy on the national question.

Statement of LCP on the situation in the middle east

Lebanese Communist Party

December 24, 2024

The peoples of the world are going through a phase in which the risks to their existence are increasing, and with it their political, economic and social suffering, as humanity is on the threshold of enormous changes due to the aggravation of the contradictions of capitalism in its most brutal and bloody imperialist phase in its current colonial wars. The wars of imperialist aggression led by the United States are expanding and escalating at a frightening pace ahead of Donald Trump's assumption of the US presidency on 20 January 2025. The map of expansion and escalation has included targeting Russia through Ukraine, Gaza and the West Bank to liquidate the Palestinian cause, Lebanon, Syria, Iraq, Yemen, Iran, Venezuela and Cuba in preparation for opening the major battle against the People's Republic of China. The imperialist escalation uses various aggressive methods: trade and economic sanctions and blockades, rejecting international resolutions to stop the Zionist aggression on Gaza, attacking international institutions, most recently the International Criminal Court and the International Court of Justice and before that UNRWA, covering up the shredding of the UN Charter, providing the Zionist entity with the most advanced weapons in the fields of technology and information. The wars we are living through today are not like the ferocity of previous wars: Crimes and genocidal massacres against the Palestinian people, who resisted the Zionist enemy in the most heroic epic and continue to do so; Zionist aggression against the Lebanese people, who resisted the barbaric attacks and stopped them thanks to their national unity and the blood of martyrs and resisters; the incursion and occupation of more Syrian territories and the destruction of all Syria's military capabilities. On the other hand, despite the imbalance of power, the

resistance to this aggression continues and is open on all fronts and by various means, because the confrontation is long and will not stop, offering the most expensive sacrifices for the national liberation of our Arab peoples who suffer impoverishment, marginalisation and tyranny from their local capitalism and the social disasters caused by the imperialist-Zionist aggression: Destruction, killing, displacement, migration, refugees, hunger, malnutrition, epidemics, unemployment and indebtedness.

And no: International and Arab Section

The US presidential election and its implications

For the first time since 2000, Republicans in the United States have won an unprecedented and overwhelming majority in the House of Representatives and the Senate. Trump's vote is only up a few percent from the previous cycle. In contrast, the Democratic vote declined for many reasons, including the abstention of segments of Arabs, Muslim groups, the left, and progressives.

Trump's victory was a victory for populism, religious thought, isolationism, "America First" and "America the Great". The appointments he is now making to his administration (a lineup of Zionists, big financiers and the far right) reflect the forms and types of economic and commercial wars he will adopt once he takes office. Thus, the scene of military, economic and trade wars will be completed simultaneously, in light of the growing rise of populism and racism in the countries of the capitalist centre as a clear expression of the dangerous extent to which the crisis of capitalism has reached.

Implications of Trump's election

Based on the titles of Trump's policy of ending military wars before entering the White House and devoting himself to confronting China and Iran and implementing his election promises, all this will entail changes at the international and domestic levels, whether in terms of his divergent positions from those of the Biden administration, or in terms of his approach to crises and explosive wars, including:

His stated position that the war in Ukraine must end with a settlement with Russia, and if he fails, he will leave the consequences of its continuation on the shoulders of Europe.

The escalation of the Biden administration, Britain and the European Union by allowing Ukraine to bombard the Russian depths with ballistic missiles, and the Russian response by signing the updated nuclear doctrine, may be aimed at creating a state of tension that is difficult for Trump to address and prevents Russia from achieving the settlement required by it, thus continuing the war and weakening both Russia and Europe. His rejection of the establishment of a Palestinian state, even according to the "two-state solution". His support for the Zionist entity in annexing the West Bank and Gaza while supporting its expansion policy according to Netanyahu's expansionist map. Trump will push for the completion of the Abraham Accords, activate the Indian Corridor despite its inability to compete with land and sea trade in the existing international corridors, and push Saudi Arabia to normalise with the Zionist entity, in exchange for political and security guarantees, abandoning the two-state solution and settling for the establishment of municipalities that improve the living conditions of the Palestinians. Trump adopts the Israeli position to strike or modify the Iranian nuclear programme, but he may first follow the method of pressure, increase sanctions and provoke ethnic and economic clashes inside Iran, after its external influence has been greatly undermined, so that it will retreat to take care of

its internal issues and is easier to contain, in line with US interests. This approach may mitigate the likelihood of launching foreign wars in the first period of his presidency while keeping the military option as a last resort in Iran. Trump believes that the US relationship with the EU, NATO, and international institutions in general must change, as they are a drain on the US economy and taxpayers, and the EU must bear the burden of its security and pay for US military bases in Europe. He will rely on the economic and trade war with China by raising tariffs to adjust the trade balance and strain the Chinese economy, which, for its part, will respond in kind and in Taiwan under the heading of one China.

International Criminal Court

The party welcomed the decision of the International Criminal Court (ICC) to issue arrest warrants against enemy Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu and former War Minister Yulav Galant for war crimes against the Palestinian people in Gaza. This decision is binding on all 124 signatories to the ICC's founding charter, most of which have expressed their initial commitment to international law. In this context, the US rejection of the court's decision, which the US government has not joined since its establishment, is a condemnable and brazen expression of US aggression and its partnership in the aggression and covering it up through arming, funding, information sharing and exercising its veto power in the Security Council. The implementation of this resolution and the follow-up of the other lawsuit filed by the State of South Africa in the International Court of Justice, and the commitment of Member States to it, would constitute a clear expression of the international isolation facing the Zionist entity and an international legal deterrent that encourages the resistance of the Lebanese and Palestinian peoples to end the occupation and stop the aggression and genocidal war.

The Zionist genocidal war on Palestine

The war of genocide against the Palestinian people continues in the Gaza Strip, where dozens of martyrs are killed daily amid a siege that prevents the entry of humanitarian aid into Gaza, and settlement, aggression, assassinations and arrests continue in the West Bank at an escalating pace.

With the martyrdom of the head of the political bureau of Hamas, Yahya al-Sinwar, the occupation is still seeking to displace the Palestinian people, first from the north to the south of Gaza in preparation for the displacement of all Gazans abroad in the second phase, in addition to adopting various methods and methods of pressure and intimidation to control and control the land, including the establishment of an expanded buffer zone in the Netzarim axis to separate Gaza City from the rest of the central and southern cities, and strengthening the technical and military presence in the Philadelphia axis on the border with Egypt in violation of the normalisation agreement with it. As for the next stage, the Palestinian resistance will be under intense pressure, after Netanyahu considers that it has become weak after the ceasefire agreement on the Lebanese front, the fall of the regime in Syria, the withdrawal of Iran, and the decline in the effectiveness of the Iraqi and Yemeni front. Despite all this, the Palestinian people have no choice but to resist, and they continue their heroic qualitative operations against the Zionist occupation forces, causing more losses, deaths and injuries in their ranks, while maintaining a basic pressure force regarding the detainees to stop the war on the Palestinian people. The Lebanese Communist Party renews its support for the Palestinian resistance in all its factions, especially the Palestinian left forces, expressing its regret for the fighting in the West Bank between the Palestinian Authority forces and some factions in Jenin, which only benefits the Zionist enemy, calling for an end to it, and stressing the strengthening of solidarity campaigns in support of the Palestinian cause, including demonstrations,

movements, legal cases and political initiatives in local and national parliaments, and activating the presence of the party, its organisations and leftist and communist forces in the world in these solidarity campaigns to impose a ceasefire and save the Palestinian people from the machine of brutality and cruelty of the Zionist occupation.

The fall of the regime in Syria

The Syrian regime fell suddenly, quickly and unexpectedly, without any resistance, and Bashar al-Assad left without addressing a single word to the Syrian people. This fall was preceded by failed political attempts by Russia to hold negotiations leading to a political solution in Syria, followed by another attempt by inviting Erdogan to hold a summit meeting to normalise relations with Turkey. However, President Assad remained unresponsive amid his inability to address his regime's political, economic and social crises and to secure the popular support to defend it, which led to his rapid fall. This fall - an earthquake with regional repercussions—came after the large-scale offensive—outside the de-escalation agreement according to the Astana process—launched by Hayat Tahrir al-Sham (formerly Jabhat al-Nusra) and a number of factions with the full support of Turkey seeking to hit the SDF. The timing of the attack came after the ongoing genocidal war in Gaza, the Zionist strikes on Iranian sites, the announcement of the Lebanese-Israeli agreement, Russia's preoccupation with Ukraine, and the lack of response from most parties to the political solution to the crisis that Russia wanted to achieve to spare Syria the fall of the regime and its geopolitical repercussions on the region and the international balance of power.

Within five days of the offensive, the armed factions were able to topple the regime under the leadership of Hayat Tahrir al-Sham, which used a peaceful and moderate rhetoric that was received by the Syrian people with satisfaction and hope, but not without caution, fear and anticipation following

the occurrence of violations, killings and thefts that led to a large wave of refugees from some areas to Lebanon. Today, military forces and groups share the Syrian geography, occupying and controlling it.

The Zionist enemy occupies the Golan Heights and is expanding its occupation by controlling the buffer zone and the highest peak in Mount Hermon after hitting most military sites in Syria until Syria is now demilitarised with no army or civilian police. Hayat Tahrir al-Sham took power and controls the north and centre, and Turkey occupies two areas on the northern border. The SDF controls the northeast, the US occupies al-Tanf base, and the Southern Operations Room controls the southern region. This geopolitical map is a moving map as the battles in northern Syria continue with the Turkish army mobilising its forces on the border in preparation for striking the SDF. This map of the distribution of forces justifies fears of the project of dividing Syria if a political solution is not possible and chaos erupts. Al-Joulani unilaterally formed his interim government of 11 ministers, all from Hay'at Tahrir al-Sham, and these same ministers formed the "government of Idlib".

Positions of Syrian parties

The National Front parties declared their support for the interim government and condemned the defunct era, along with the People's Assembly, the regime's government, and the leadership of the Baath Party. The United Syrian Communist Party, the People's Will Party and the Communist Labour Party in Sazaria, together with nationalist parties and Syrian democratic and independent personalities, announced distinct positions individually and jointly through signed statements and declarations, while the Arab Communist Parties issued a statement condemning the Zionist aggression against Syria supported by the US and calling for the unity and sovereignty of Syria.

The party's position

In a statement, the party declared that the fall of

the regime and the departure of Bashar al-Assad are historic moments in which the system of tyranny that ruled the country for decades was dismantled and its power extended to our country Lebanon, which had its share of the practices of the security and repressive system integrated with the system of looting and corruption, in terms of supporting and consolidating the capitalist alliance and the sectarian quota system in the post-Taif agreement period.

The party also considered that Bashar al-Assad's departure came as a result of the fall of the regime and the failure of its policies to fulfil the duties of the national cause and address economic and social issues and general democratic freedoms, which weakened and exhausted Syria and created a favourable environment for extremism in light of the imperialist and Zionist ambitions and projects, which opened the doors for turning the popular uprising into a civil war and for foreign interventions, all of which led to hundreds of thousands of deaths, displaced millions and witnessed the most horrific crimes committed by most parties to the bloody conflict on both sides of the conflict, especially extremist takfiri and terrorist groups on top of them.

The party also considered that the suffering and pain of the Syrian people was shared by the Lebanese people and their national forces, and the communists and progressives had a large share of their wounds and pains. The party believes that the Syrian people today feel a mixture of hope, fear and caution: Hope for a better future, based on internal political solutions to Syrian issues, building a just and democratic national state for all its citizens of all affiliations, building the economy, reconstruction and the return of refugees to their homes, and fear and caution against chaos and the renewal of other forms of conflict and infighting or the rise and tyranny of extremist forces in light of the external dangers and ambitions that stand behind them.

The first of these dangers facing Syria today is

embodied in the Zionist enemy's ambitions and the continued intensification of its aggressive strikes, the destruction of all state capacities, especially those of the Syrian army, the expansion of its control in the Golan Heights, the cancellation of the ceasefire agreement signed in 1974, and the expansion of its control over large parts of southern Syria. It is also thwarting the peaceful transition of power and preventing the return of normal life to Syria by striking state institutions and disrupting their services to citizens, in order to spread chaos.

This calls for placing the issue of liberating the Golan and the occupied Syrian south from the Israeli occupation and restoring sovereignty over it at the top of the priorities of the national cause in Syria. The Turkish ambitions in the north, the Turkish government's quest to establish a buffer security zone covering thousands of kilometres, its direct military intervention in Kurdish-majority areas, and its ambition to impose its political influence on the Syrian government constitute an existential challenge to the future and progress of the Syrian people. The US project in the region in general, including in Syria, is still working vigorously on sedition, fragmentation and partition through many tools, and the US maintains military bases and active forces on the ground in most areas of eastern and southern Syria.

The process of radical and comprehensive political and socio-economic regime change and the building of sovereign and just states is far more complex than just the departure of one president and the arrival of another. This requires coordination, integration and unity among the various national, democratic, secular, progressive and communist forces in Syria, to form a balanced polarity that contributes to reshaping and shaping the political future of the country away from sectarian quotas and projects of foreign influence and hegemony over the Syrian national decision.

On the Lebanese level, the party called on the government to immediately follow up on some fateful issues, foremost of which is securing the

appropriate conditions for the return of Syrian refugees to their country after the security concerns are removed. The government should also work to secure the northern and eastern borders, noting the deployment of the Lebanese army in anticipation of any negative developments in the future, and to follow up with all its diplomatic strength on the issue of the missing Lebanese in Syrian prisons, whose governments of both countries falsely declared their non-existence in the past, while many of them are now found in the prisons of the collapsing regime, a sensitive humanitarian issue that concerns hundreds of Lebanese families.

The Party considers that the will of the Syrian people has opened a new page full of hope towards achieving a political solution as soon as possible to turn the painful page of the past and open a new page that can fulfil and guarantee their aspirations and sacrifices and their great national history. The Syrian people have the right to determine their own destiny away from foreign interference. The party reiterates its support for the forces of the left, progress and democracy in Syria in their struggle to achieve full freedom for the Syrian people, social justice, reconstruction of the country and the return of the displaced, strengthening national unity and restoring sovereignty over the entire Syrian national territory, and building the best friendly and fraternal relations based on cooperation and integration between our two countries.

Comment on the impeachment of Yoon Suk-yeol

Stephen Cho | Coordinator of the Korean International Forum

December 15, 2024

- On December 14, the National Assembly of the “Republic of Korea (ROK)” passed the impeachment motion against the “ROK” President Yoon Suk-yeol with 204 votes in favor. This number of votes, exceeding 200—two-thirds of the incumbent lawmakers, indicates that 12 ruling party lawmakers voted in favor in addition to 192 opposition party lawmakers. Just a week ago, the impeachment motion had been rejected with only 195 votes, but it was passed with the votes of ruling party lawmakers after a week.

- As time went on, the public sentiment for Yoon’s impeachment grew stronger. The organizers of the rallies around the National Assembly put the number of people gathering to call for impeachment at a million on December 7 and 2 million on December 14. Although these numbers might be somewhat exaggerated, it is objective that the number of people joining the rallies has been increasing, and the public opinion for impeachment has been escalating. No one can deny that.

- By the National Assembly’s votes to impeach Yoon on December 14, he was suspended from presidential office. However, in order for Yoon’s impeachment to be finalized, the Constitutional Court needs to uphold the decision. At least six of the nine judges of the Constitutional Court must agree. For reference, the impeachment of former President Park Geun-hye in March 2017 was approved by all of them. Yoon’s case is simpler and clearer than Park’s. There is little to no dispute over the facts. It was even acknowledged in Yoon’s urgent address to the nation on December 12. For that reason, the Constitutional Court’s decision is expected to be made in a shorter period of time than the three-month period under Park.

- If the Constitutional Court is upheld, the presidential election will be held in 2 months. If it’s upheld in January, the presidential election will be held in March. As in the case of Park previously, it’s very likely that the opposition party’s candidate, especially the leader of Democratic Party candidate, Lee Jae-myung, will win the election. There are “judicial risks” against Lee, but they have all been fabricated by the “political prosecutors” thoroughly controlled by Yoon. Given the time required for legal proceedings, it is highly unlikely that these cases will be resolved before the presidential election. In short, if the presidential election is held, Lee will become president unless an unexpected event happens.

- After Yoon was suspended from the presidency, Deputy Prime Minister Han Duck-soo is acting in his place. This is in accordance with the law. Han should be held accountable as a state council member for his role in martial law, but the opposition is tolerating his acting role in order to stabilize the country. It’s virtually impossible for Han, the acting president, who is expected to act passively, to veto the special prosecution law passed by the National Assembly, as Yoon did in the past. If a special prosecution law is passed to investigate the insurrection and corruption of Yoon and his wife Kim Keon-hee, it will further damage Yoon’s clique and the ruling People Power Party by revealing facts that have not been verified.

- However, the problem is that the risk of a second martial law still remains. In the Korean Peninsula, where localized war could break out at any time, the forces that pushed for the first martial law are in de facto control of all institutions of power, including the military. Above all, Yoon’s group is

facing the worst crisis as they could be sentenced to death for the failure of martial law, which is essentially an insurrection or rebellion. It is reasonable to assume that they would do anything to turn the tables.

- On December 14, there were two important reports just before the impeachment. One was the announcement of Yoon's urgent address to the nation on December 12. In this speech, Yoon viewed the opposition as an "anti-state force" as in the announcement of martial law on December 3 and condemned its activities as "frenzied sword dance". He affirmed that he would "fight to the end". This means that Yoon will not recognize the impeachment resolution in the National Assembly and will fight legally in the subsequent trial process at the Constitutional Court, and could impose a second martial law. Since Yoon's group still controls the military and other institutions of power, a second martial law is not an impossible goal.

- Another significant development on December 13 was the testimony of a prominent YouTuber in the National Assembly and an interview with the US Congressman. The YouTuber testified that he had been informed from an allied nation's embassy, revealing plans for a "False Flag" operation. It involved the "ROK"'s special forces, disguised as the "Korean People's Army," carrying out acts such as the assassination of ruling party leader Han Dong-hoon. This claim was further confirmed by Congressman Bradley James Sherman in an interview on MBC, a major media in the "ROK". Sherman, a 15-term Democratic congressman and Korea expert, explicitly stated that the US was aware of the December 3 martial law declaration and warned that if the "ROK" government were to execute such a staged operation, the US would expose them to the world. The testimony and broadcast interview became a pivotal moment, stirring unrest among ruling party lawmakers and encouraging greater public participation in the

impeachment decision on December 14. It also heightened awareness among the opposition and the public of the possibility that Yoon's group could stage such fabricated incidents, potentially leading to a second martial law declaration.

- On the evening of December 3, the day of the martial law, US Ambassador Thomas H. Goldberger called the Foreign Minister and the Deputy Chief of the National Security Office of the "ROK", but they did not answer. Around the time of the martial law was imposed, unusually, U2 reconnaissance plane of the US military conducted reconnaissance activities to monitor the "ROK" military in the sky of the "ROK", not in the sky of the DPRK. It was also revealed that the US military was preparing to move from Pyeongtaek, the largest foreign military base of US in the world, to Seoul. Comments from the US State Department spokesperson and others were also actively released. The National Assembly testimony of a Korean YouTuber, the interview of a US congressman, and some other facts together confirm three things: First, the US knew in advance of the martial law on December 3; Second, the Yoon group was trying to carry out the "False Flag" operation; Third, the US was also aware of the "False Flag" operation and warned of it through reports from the US embassy and a broadcast interview of a US congressman. The "embassy of a friendly country" mentioned in the National Assembly testimony is presumed to be the US embassy based on various pieces of information.

- Additional facts regarding the "False Flag" operation by Yoon's clique continue to emerge. Agents of the Headquarters Intelligence Detachment (HID), a special forces unit trained for operations in the DPRK, were mobilized during the December 3 martial law declaration. It has been revealed that a former commander who effectively controlled this unit was in direct contact with Yoon and Minister of National Defense Kim Yong-hyun. Furthermore, it has been disclosed that Kim

Keon-hee, who has effectively been acting as the president, recently contacted former special forces personnel and incited far-right YouTubers to attack ruling party leader Han Dong-hoon. The HID is a unit designed to carry out special operations in the DPRK during emergencies, operating under the guise of Korean People's Army uniforms. If a "False Flag" operation or fabricated incident were to be staged in the "ROK," claiming that the Korean People's Army had carried out assassinations, the HID would be the most suitable unit for such a mission.

- The DPRK has responded to the "ROK"'s provocations for localized conflict, particularly in the latter half of the year, with a policy of "strategic patience." In October, when the "ROK"'s drones repeatedly infiltrated the airspace over Pyongyang to drop leaflets as a provocation, the DPRK responded with only a warning without any physical action. Similarly, when the "ROK" initiated launching trash balloons, to which the DPRK responded with sending its balloons, and even when it was revealed in November that the "ROK" Defense Minister Kim Yong-hyun had ordered striking the origin of these balloon launches but the Joint Chief of Staffs refused his order, the DPRK still refrained from responding. It also tolerated the "ROK"'s artillery fire toward the DPRK from an island in the West Sea, which would have been retaliated with counter-artillery fire in the past. Even when the "ROK" conducted fire with heavy artillery in central inland areas and launched threatening multiple rockets, albeit in the East Sea, the DPRK continued its patience.

- The DPRK's "strategic patience" policy culminated after the martial law on December 3. Since the declaration of martial law on December 3, the DPRK has issued only one news report and taken no further comments or actions. Its consistent and thorough silence convinced the "ROK" people and opposition lawmakers that the constant

military provocations from the "ROK" government would not escalate into localized conflict and that there would be no "wartime" situation—one of the key conditions for declaring martial law. As the passage of the Kim Keon-hee special prosecutor bill and the impeachment of Yoon became increasingly likely in the National Assembly in December, and with the impossibility of declaring a "wartime martial law" due to the DPRK's "strategic patience," Yoon's clique resorted to declaring emergency martial law even though the situation was not a wartime one. Furthermore, the DPRK's "consistent silence" did not provide any favorable pretext for Yoon's clique first to impose emergency martial and then conduct "False Flag" operations—a self-fabricated scenario—using agencies like the HID. The DPRK's "strategic patience" and "consistent silence" contributed to pushing Yoon's clique into self-destruction, forcing them to overreach themselves and take reckless actions. Especially, since the martial law on December 3, the "ROK" opposition lawmakers, press media, and people no longer believe Yoon's propaganda that the DPRK would militarily attack the "ROK" or send special forces for assassination or terrorist attacks.

- After the failure of the fascist self-coup on December 3, the United States has engaged in media manipulation to distance itself from the coup, even exposing Yoon's "False Flag" operation. However, all coups in the history of the "ROK," a complete colony of the US, were orchestrated by the US. This is a common occurrence in oppressed nations colonized by the US. Since the declaration of martial law on December 3, the US has consistently claimed that it had no prior knowledge. However, it can no longer deny that the US was aware of it. As history shows, the truth about the US orchestrating the fascist coup will inevitably be revealed in the near future.

- The imperialist US has been trying to turn the tide of World War 3 into an irreversible trend.

Since Trump's election, it has lifted long-range missile restrictions on Ukraine and collapsed the Assad regime in Syria. Meanwhile, a pro-American government's fascist self-coup has taken place in the "ROK". The coup in the "ROK" has sharply increased military tension on the Korean Peninsula, which will inevitably lead to a local war. It is no coincidence that the opposition parties in the "ROK" are warning of a second martial law and a local war. A local war is a war in the "ROK," which will inevitably expand into a war in East Asia and the Western Pacific, combined with a war in Taiwan. As the formation of the "Northeast Asia version of NATO" in August 2023 and the Washington NATO Summit in July 2024 confirmed, the "Pacification of NATO" is going on and on. It cannot be overemphasized how we must be alert to the war maneuvers that the imperialist US is constantly making in East Asia as part of the big picture of World War 3.

- The National Assembly's impeachment resolution on December 14 is a great victory for the people of the "ROK". The fact that the National Assembly voted to lift the martial law in just two hours, is also the same, representing the will of the people. The Yoon's clique tried to return the "ROK" society to the days of military dictatorship through a fascist self-coup, but the people blocked it through massive protests. The world vividly witnessed the anti-fascist democratic capacity and historical victory of the people of the "ROK", who neutralized the martial law in just two hours and impeached the president in just 11 days.

- In order to fundamentally prevent the "fascistization" of the "ROK" and make people the true masters of society, we must move beyond anti-fascist struggles to anti-imperialist and anti-fascist struggles. As practice shows, the People's Democracy Party is at the center of the revolutionary struggle that is developing the anti-fascist democratic front into a national democratic

front and hastening the final victory. The People's Democracy Party's role as the locomotive will continue to increase as the train of the people's uprising moves toward the final destination of popular sovereignty.

The escalating three major theaters

Stephen Cho | Coordinator of the Korean International Forum

December 28, 2024

The storm of World War 3, ignited by imperialism, is sweeping from Eastern Europe to the Middle East (West Asia) and now to East Asia. Recently, military tensions in these three theaters have increased dramatically.

Since Trump's victory in the US presidential election on November 5, imperialist forces have been provoking wars more frequently, more intensely, and more recklessly to turn the tide of World War 3 into an irreversible trend. Although Trump is not part of the anti-imperialist forces, he has opposed the imperialist forces' war policies. On July 13, an assassin's bullet grazed Trump's ear.

In Eastern Europe, the long-range missile restrictions were lifted. After the US and Britain removed the restrictions on long-range missiles they supplied to Ukraine, ATACMS missiles were launched to Russia on November 19, and Storm Shadow missiles on November 20. In response, Russia launched the Oreshnik missiles on November 21. Due to the overwhelming superiority of Russia's hypersonic missiles, this confrontation is resulting in a victory of Russia—a victory of the anti-imperialist camp.

In East Asia, on December 3, the president of the "Republic of Korea (ROK)" Yoon Suk-yeol declared emergency martial law, which was essentially a coup d'état in favor of the regime. However, within two hours, the National Assembly voted to lift it, and the government followed suit, rescinding martial law after just six hours. On December 7, a massive protest with one million participants took place, and on December 14, the number swelled to two million. Eleven days after the coup, the National Assembly voted to impeach Yoon, leading to his suspension from office. This pro-government

coup, orchestrated by the US, was thwarted, leading to a victory of the people of the "ROK"—a victory of the anti-imperialist camp—in this confrontation.

On December 8, the Assad regime in Syria collapsed. This marked the loss of a key link in the "Axis of Resistance," including Iran, endangering Russia's military bases in West Asia. Thus, in this confrontation, the anti-imperialist camp is at a disadvantage.

In the fierce confrontation over the past month, the anti-imperialist camp has been advancing in the Eastern European and East Asian theaters while retreating in the West Asian theater. It is important to note that, in World War 3, Eastern Europe and East Asia are strategic theaters, while West Asia is a tactical theater.

The theaters of East Asia and Eastern Europe are the main ones where the leading anti-imperialist countries directly face off with the major imperialist powers, such as the US and Western Europe. The fate of World War 3 will be determined in these theaters.

The collapse of the Assad regime in Syria is undoubtedly a significant blow to the anti-imperialist camp and has strategic aftereffects in the West Asian region. However, it should not be overlooked that, from a global perspective, its repercussions are primarily tactical rather than strategic.

In Eastern Europe and East Asia, there are nuclear missile powers like Russia, DPRK, and China, while in West Asia, Iran is a missile power but not yet a nuclear missile power. Nuclear weapons were the decisive factor in ending World War 2. It is not unreasonable to predict that at least tactical nuclear

weapons might be used in World War 3.

The DPRK and China, having observed the war in Ukraine has been going on for over a thousand days, have already devised plans to end potential wars in the “ROK” and Taiwan, which will be provoked by imperialism, within three days by using tactical nuclear weapons. They have long completed training for such operations.

Russia has also declared that, as the US and NATO have lifted missile restrictions, it will lift restrictions on tactical nuclear weapons. Following the US and NATO’s announcement in June of this year to gradually ease missile restrictions, they have proceeded to do so. The advantage of Russia’s “Oreshnik” missile is that it can achieve effects comparable to tactical nuclear weapons with conventional explosives alone. Of course, if launched with a tactical nuclear weapon, it would unleash 45 times the power of the Hiroshima atomic bomb, making it truly a game-changer.

It is noteworthy that the imperialist camp began a new offensive starting in August of this year. This occurred after the Washington NATO Summit on July 10 effectively declared the “Pacification of NATO.” From July to August, the imperialist forces carried out military drills and war exercises on an unprecedented scale across multiple domains in the Pacific to ensure the “Pacification of NATO.”

In Eastern Europe, they invaded Kursk, Russia in August, began to disseminate propaganda regarding the “dispatch of the DPRK troops” in October, and eventually lifted the restrictions on long-range missiles in November. In West Asia, Israel started to intensively attack Hezbollah in Lebanon in August, bombed Iran in October, and then HTS (Hayat Tahrir al-Sham), controlled and supported by the US and Turkey, was mobilized to collapse the Assad regime in Syria in December. In East Asia, Kim Yong-hyun—part of the ringleaders of the coup in the “ROK”—was appointed as the new Defense

Minister, and unprecedented provocations for localized conflicts against the DPRK were launched many times from September to November, and finally, emergency martial law was imposed in December.

Looking back, from the very beginning, the US and NATO had a plan to invade Russia. This started with Ukraine’s attempt to join NATO, and the invasion of Kursk and the lifting of long-range missile restrictions were merely part of a successive step-by-step process. Alongside this, the Moscow terrorist attack, drone strikes, and the “DPRK troop deployment” rumors were meticulously combined, all contributing to the gradual escalation of military tension.

The same is true in West Asia. Starting with the war against Hamas in Gaza, it expanded into a conflict with Hezbollah in Lebanon and eventually led to the collapse of Assad’s regime in Syria. This series of events signals that, by destroying the “Axis of Resistance,” including Iran, the imperialist proxy Israeli Zionists are aiming to not only control Palestine but to expand their dominance across the Levant region, including Lebanon and Syria, with their “Great Israel” strategy being really pursued.

The coup in the “ROK” was initiated by the Yoon Suk-yeol fascist clique, who had been discussing martial law in their internal meetings since the 2022 March presidential election. As loyal puppets of US imperialism, being influenced by the atmosphere of the 2022 war in Ukraine and the 2023 war in Palestine internationally, and by their corruption and incompetence, which put them in the greatest political crisis domestically, they began preparing for the coup in earnest in December 2023, eventually executing it in December 2024.

Between January and October this year, the US has conducted as much as the war drills against the DPRK as they did in the previous 20 years combined, and in this process, the fascistization of

Yoon Suk-yeol's clique and preparation for a coup have been accelerated.

In August 2023, the leaders of the US, Japan, and ROK met at the Camp David summit to establish the "Northeast Asian NATO". Then, in June 2024, they conducted the "Freedom Edge" joint military exercises for the invasion of the DPRK around the Korean Peninsula. During the "Freedom Shield" joint exercises between the US and ROK military in March 2024, Yoon's coup faction conducted martial law training under the name "Loyalty 8000". These were all unprecedented events and serve as undeniable evidence that both war and coup preparations were carried out meticulously.

It is fortunate that the DPRK strategically endured and did not respond militarily to any of the "ROK"'s local conflict provocations from September onwards, otherwise martial law would have been declared earlier in September, October, or November. And since such martial law had the justification of being "wartime martial law," the National Assembly would not have been able to vote to lift it, and the coup would have succeeded. It is not an overstatement to say the DPRK's "strategic patience" prevented the coup in the "ROK" and led to the victory of the anti-imperialist camp in the East Asian theater.

The "ROK" is a complete colony of the US, and the "ROK" army is nothing more than a puppet force under the US army's control. The idea that a pro-US puppet president could mobilize a pro-US puppet army to carry out a pro-US coup without the US knowing is nonsensical. Of the 17 coups in the "ROK"'s history, including 1961 Park Chung-hee's military coup and 1980 Chun Doo-hwan's military coup, not a single one occurred without US manipulation. The coup in 2024 involved 1,500 elite soldiers, helicopters, and even the HID, a "special force sent to the DPRK," and it is truly naive to think that the US was unaware or merely watched it.

Pro-US reformist and social democratic forces in the "ROK," opposing anti-USA, alignment with the DPRK, and world anti-imperialism, are keen to deny the fact that the US is behind Yoon Suk-yeol's coup. However, during Chun Doo-hwan's coup in 1980, reformist leader Kim Dae-jung was sentenced to death for "insurrection." The US's decision to allow Kim Dae-jung to exile to the USA was part of its traditional puppet-control strategy, placing the fascist forces and reformist forces on opposite sides of a seesaw to keep them in mutual check. Although 45 years have passed, just as the "ROK"'s colonial character has not fundamentally changed, neither has the method of imperialist domination.

In the meantime, the People's Democracy Party was established in the "ROK," the people's awareness of independence and democracy has grown, and the DPRK has emerged as a nuclear missile power.

The people in the "ROK" have historically defeated various forms of fascist rule: the civilian dictatorship of Rhee Syng-man through the April 1960 Uprising, the military dictatorship of Park Chung-hee through the October 1979 Uprising, and the military fascism of Chun Doo-hwan through the May 1980 Uprising and the June 1987 Uprising, and most recently, the December 2024 Uprising brought an end to Yoon Suk-yeol's fascist dictatorship.

When the people's struggle in the "ROK" evolves from anti-fascism to anti-imperialism, they can go beyond a reformist government to establish a revolutionary government.

This necessity stems from the character of the "ROK" society as a colonial and semi-capitalist society and the character of the "ROK" revolution as a national liberation and democratic revolution.

To advance the anti-fascist uprising into an anti-imperialist uprising, a national democratic front must emerge, surpassing the current anti-fascist democratic front. At the heart of the political struggle to transform the anti-fascist democratic

front into a national democratic front, stands the People's Democracy Party, the sole vanguard force of the revolution in the "ROK."

The darkest hour comes just before dawn.

To prevent war and defend peace in East Asia, to realize a people's democracy in the "ROK," and to secure victory for the anti-imperialist camp in World War 3, the People's Democracy Party remains steadfast in its unyielding struggle and resolute in advancing toward ultimate victory.

Platform



The World Anti-imperialist Platform