

Platform

February 2025 No.21

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.





Contents

Work	The Military Programme of the Proletarian Revolution 2 V.I. Lenin
Article	The development of the theory of the socio-economic formation by V.I. Lenin 9 Victor Alexeyevich Vaziulin
	The political stance of the Communist Party of Greece... a communist stance? - Conclusions 18 Chilean Communist Party (Proletarian Action)
	War Continues in Rojava 27 Communist Labour Party of Turkey/Leninist
	Opportunism is not fought by attacking anti-imperialists 31 Miguel Ángel Unión Proletariá (Spain)
	Can “anti-globalist” conservatism be the ideological basis of the anti- imperialist movement? 44 Dimitrios Patelis Revolutionary Unification (Greece)
	Comments on the Arrest and Detention of Yoon and “January 19 Riot” 51 Stephen Cho Coordinator of the Korean International Forum
	Korean people will prevent civil war and the war in the “Republic of Korea”, bringing forward a new world of people’s democracy 55 Stephen Cho Coordinator of the Korean International Forum

The Military Programme of the Proletarian Revolution

V.I. Lenin

September 1916

Among the Dutch, Scandinavian and Swiss revolutionary Social-Democrats who are combating the social-chauvinist lies about “defence of the fatherland” in the present imperialist war, there have been voices in favour of replacing the old Social-Democratic minimum-programme demand for a “militia”, or “the armed nation,” by a new demand: “disarmament.” The Jugend-Internationale has inaugurated a discussion on this issue and published, in No. 3, an editorial supporting disarmament. There is also, we regret to note, a concession to the “disarmament” idea in R. Grimm’s latest theses.^[1] Discussion have been started in the periodicals *Neue Leben*^[2] and *Vorbote*.

Let us take a closer look at the position of the disarmament advocates.

I

Their principal argument is that the disarmament demand is the clearest, most decisive, most consistent expression of the struggle against all militarism and against all war.

But in this principal argument lies the disarmament advocates’ principal error. Socialists cannot, without ceasing to be socialists, be opposed to all war.

Firstly, socialists have never been, nor can they ever be, opposed to revolutionary wars. The bourgeoisie of the imperialist “Great” Powers has become thoroughly reactionary, and the war this bourgeoisie is now waging we regard as a reactionary, slave-owners’ and criminal war. But what about a war against this bourgeoisie? A war, for instance, waged by peoples oppressed by and dependent upon this bourgeoisie, or by colonial peoples, for liberation? In Section 5 of the Internationale group these we read: “National wars are no longer possible in the era of this unbridled imperialism.” That is obviously wrong.

The history of the 20th century, this century of “unbridled imperialism,” is replete with colonial wars. But what we Europeans, the imperialist oppressors of the majority of the world’s peoples, with our habitual, despicable European chauvinism, call “colonial wars” are often national wars, or national rebellions of these oppressed peoples. One of the main features of imperialism is that it accelerates capitalist development in the most backward countries, and thereby extends and intensifies the struggle against national oppression. That is a fact, and from it inevitably follows that imperialism must often give rise to national wars. Junius, who defends the above-quoted “theses” in her pamphlet, says that in the imperialist era every national war against an imperialist Great Power leads to intervention of a rival imperialist Great Power. Every national war is thus turned into an imperialist war. But that argument is wrong, too. This can happen, but does not always happen. Many colonial wars between 1900 and 1914 did not follow that course. And it would be simply ridiculous to declare, for instance, that after the present war, if it ends in the utter exhaustion of all the belligerents, “there can be no” national, progress, revolutionary wars “of any kind”, wages, say, by China in alliance with India, Persia, Siam, etc., against the Great Powers.

To deny all possibility of national wars under imperialism is wrong in theory, obviously mistaken historically, and tantamount to European chauvinism in practice: we who belong to nations that oppress hundreds of millions in Europe, Africa, Asia, etc., are invited to tell the oppressed peoples that it is “impossible” for them to wage war against “our” nations!

Secondly, civil war is just as much a war as any other. He who accepts the class struggle cannot fail

to accept civil wars, which in every class society are the natural, and under certain conditions inevitable, continuation, development and intensification of the class struggle. That has been confirmed by every great revolution. To repudiate civil war, or to forget about it, is to fall into extreme opportunism and renounce the socialist revolution.

Thirdly, the victory of socialism in one country does not at one stroke eliminate all wars in general. On the contrary, it presupposes wars. The development of capitalism proceeds extremely unevenly in different countries. It cannot be otherwise under commodity production. From this it follows irrefutably that socialism cannot achieve victory simultaneously in all countries. It will achieve victory first in one or several countries, while the others will for some time remain bourgeois or pre-bourgeois. This is bound to create not only friction, but a direct attempt on the part of the bourgeoisie of other countries to crush the socialist state's victorious proletariat. In such cases, a war on our part would be a legitimate and just war. It would be a war for socialism, for the liberation of other nations from the bourgeoisie. Engels was perfectly right when, in his letter to Kautsky of September 12, 1882, he clearly stated that it was possible for already victorious socialism to wage "defensive wars". What he had in mind was defense of the victorious proletariat against the bourgeoisie of other countries.

Only after we have overthrown, finally vanquished and expropriated the bourgeoisie of the whole world, and not merely in one country, will wars become impossible. And from a scientific point of view it would be utterly wrong—and utterly unrevolutionary—for us to evade or gloss over the most important things: crushing the resistance of the bourgeoisie—the most difficult task, and one demanding the greatest amount of fighting, in the transition to socialism. The "social" parsons and opportunists are always ready to build dreams of future peaceful socialism. But the very thing that distinguishes them from revolutionary Social-Democrats is that they refuse to think about and reflect on the fierce class struggle and class wars

needed to achieve that beautiful future.

We must not allow ourselves to be led astray by words. The term "defense of the fatherland", for instance, is hateful to many because both avowed opportunists and Kautskyites use it to cover up and gloss over the bourgeois lie about the present predatory war. This is a fact. But it does not follow that we must no longer see through to the meaning of political slogans. To accept "defense of the fatherland" in the present war is no more nor less than to accept it as a "just" war, a war in the interests of the proletariat—no more nor less, we repeat, because invasions may occur in any war. It would be sheer folly to repudiate "defense of the fatherland" on the part of oppressed nations in their wars against the imperialist Great Powers, or on the part of a victorious proletariat in its war against some Gallifet of a bourgeois state.

Theoretically, it would be absolutely wrong to forget that every war is but the continuation of policy by other means. The present imperialist war is the continuation of the imperialist policies of two groups of Great Powers, and these policies were engendered and fostered by the sum total of the relationships of the imperialist era. But this very era must also necessarily engender and foster policies of struggle against national oppression and of proletarian struggle against the bourgeoisie and, consequently, also the possibility and inevitability; first, of revolutionary national rebellions and wars; second, of proletarian wars and rebellions against the bourgeoisie; and, third, of a combination of both kinds of revolutionary war, etc.

II

To this must be added the following general consideration.

An oppressed class which does not strive to learn to use arms, to acquire arms, only deserves to be treated like slaves. We cannot, unless we have become bourgeois pacifists or opportunists, forget that we are living in a class society from which there is no way out, nor can there be, save through the class struggle. In every class society, whether based on slavery,

serfdom, or, as at present, wage-labor, the oppressor class is always armed. Not only the modern standing army, but even the modern militia—and even in the most democratic bourgeois republics, Switzerland, for instance—represent the bourgeoisie armed against the proletariat. That is such an elementary truth that it is hardly necessary to dwell upon it. Suffice it to point to the use of troops against strikers in all capitalist countries.

A bourgeoisie armed against the proletariat is one of the biggest fundamental and cardinal facts of modern capitalist society. And in face of this fact, revolutionary Social-Democrats are urged to “demand” “disarmament”! That is tantamount of complete abandonment of the class-struggle point of view, to renunciation of all thought of revolution. Our slogan must be: arming of the proletariat to defeat, expropriate and disarm the bourgeoisie. These are the only tactics possible for a revolutionary class, tactics that follow logically from, and are dictated by, the whole objective development of capitalist militarism. Only after the proletariat has disarmed the bourgeoisie will it be able, without betraying its world-historic mission, to consign all armaments to the scrap-heap. And the proletariat will undoubtedly do this, but only when this condition has been fulfilled, certainly not before.

If the present war rouses among the reactionary Christian socialists, among the whimpering petty bourgeoisie, only horror and fright, only aversion to all use of arms, to bloodshed, death, etc., then we must say: Capitalist society is and has always been horror without end. If this most reactionary of all wars is now preparing for that society an end to horror, we have no reason to fall into despair. But the disarmament “demand”, or more correctly, the dream of disarmament, is, objectively, nothing but an expression of despair at a time when, as everyone can see, the bourgeoisie itself is paving the way for the only legitimate and revolutionary war—civil war against the imperialist bourgeoisie.

A lifeless theory, some might say, but we would remind them of two world-historical facts: the role of the trusts and the employment of women in industry, on the one hand, and the Paris Commune of 1871 and the December 1905 uprising in Russia, on the other.

The bourgeoisie makes it its business to promote trusts, drive women and children into the factories, subject them to corruption and suffering, condemn them to extreme poverty. We do not “demand” such development, we do not “support” it. We fight it. But how do we fight? We explain that trusts and the employment of women in industry are progressive. We do not want a return to the handicraft system, pre-monopoly capitalism, domestic drudgery for women. Forward through the trusts, etc., and beyond them to socialism!

With the necessary changes that arguments is applicable also to the present militarization of the population. Today the imperialist bourgeoisie militarizes the youth as well as the adults; tomorrow, it may begin militarizing the women. Our attitude should be: All the better! Full speed ahead! For the faster we move, the nearer shall we be to the armed uprising against capitalism. How can Social-Democrats give way to fear of the militarization of the youth, etc., if they have not forgotten the example of the Paris Commune? This is not a “lifeless theory” or a dream. It is a fact. And it would be a sorry state of affairs indeed if, all the economic and political facts notwithstanding, Social-Democrats began to doubt that the imperialist era and imperialist wars must inevitably bring about a repetition of such facts.

A certain bourgeois observer of the Paris Commune, writing to an English newspaper in May 1871, said: “If the French nation consisted entirely of women, what a terrible nation it would be!” Woman and teenage children fought in the Paris Commune side by side with the men. It will be no different in the coming battles for the overthrow of the bourgeoisie. Proletarian women will not look on passively as

poorly armed or unarmed workers are shot down by the well-armed forces of the bourgeoisie. They will take to arms, as they did in 1871, and from the cowed nations of today—or more correctly, from the present-day labor movement, disorganized more by the opportunists than by the governments—there will undoubtedly arise, sooner or later, but with absolute certainty, an international league of the “terrible nations” of the revolutionary proletariat.

The whole of social life is now being militarized. Imperialism is a fierce struggle of the Great Powers for the division and redivision of the world. It is therefore bound to lead to further militarization in all countries, even in neutral and small ones. How will proletarian women oppose this? Only by cursing all war and everything military, only by demanding disarmament? The women of an oppressed and really revolutionary class will never accept that shameful role. They will say to their sons: “You will soon be grown up. You will be given a gun. Take it and learn the military art properly. The proletarians need this knowledge not to shoot your brothers, the workers of other countries, as is being done in the present war, and as the traitors to socialism are telling you to do. They need it to fight the bourgeoisie of their own country, to put an end to exploitation, poverty and war, and not by pious wishes, but by defeating and disarming the bourgeoisie.”

If we are to shun such propaganda, precisely such propaganda, in connection with the present war, then we had better stop using fine words about international revolutionary Social-Democracy, the socialist revolution and war against war.

III

The disarmament advocates object to the “armed nation” clause in the programme also because it more easily leads, they allege, to concessions to opportunism. The cardinal point, namely, the relation of disarmament to the class struggle and to the social revolution, we have examined above. We shall now

examine the relation between the disarmament demand and opportunism. One of the chief reasons why it is unacceptable is precisely that, together with the illusions it creates, it inevitably weakens and devitalizes our struggle against opportunism.

Undoubtedly, this struggle is the main, immediate question now confusing the International. Struggle against imperialism that is not closely linked with the struggle against opportunism is either an empty phrase or a fraud. One of the main defects of Zimmerwald and Kienthal^[3]—on the main reasons why these embryos of the Third International may possibly end in a fiasco—is that the question of fighting opportunism was not even raised openly, let alone solved in the sense of proclaiming the need to break with the opportunists. Opportunism has triumphed—temporarily—in the European labor movement. Its two main shades are apparent in all the big countries: first, the avowed, cynical, and therefore less dangerous social-imperialism of Messrs. Plekhanov, Scheidemann, Legien, Albert Thomas and Sembat, Vandervelde, Hyndman, Henderson, et al.; second, the concealed, Kautskyite opportunism: Kautsky-Haase and the social-Democratic Labor Group in Germany^[4]; Longuet, Pressemane, Mayeras, et al., in France; Ramsay MacDonald and the other leaders of the Independent Labor Party in England; Martov, Chkheidze, et al., in Russia; Treves and the other so-called Left reformists in Italy.

Avowed opportunism is openly and directly opposed to revolution and to incipient revolutionary movements and outbursts. It is in direct alliance with the governments, varied as the forms of this alliance may be—from accepting ministerial posts to participation in the war industries committees (in Russia).^[5] The masked opportunists, the Kautskyites, are much more harmful and dangerous to the labor movement, because they hide their advocacy of alliance with the former under a cloak of plausible, pseudo-“Marxist” catchwords and pacifist slogans. The fight against both these forms of prevailing

opportunism must be conducted in all fields of proletarian politics: parliament, the trade unions, strikes, the armed forces, etc. The main distinguishing feature of both these forms of prevailing opportunism is the concrete question of the connection between the present war and revolution, and the other concrete questions of revolution, and the other concrete questions of revolution, are hushed up, concealed, or treated with an eye to police prohibitions. And this despite the fact that before the war the connection between this impending war and the proletarian revolution was emphasized innumerable times, both unofficially and officially in the Basle Manifesto.^[6] The main defect of the disarmament demand is its evasion of all the concrete questions of revolution. Or do the advocates of disarmament stand for an altogether new kind of revolution, unarmed revolution?

To proceed. We are by no means opposed to the fight for reforms. And we do not wish to ignore the sad possibility—if the worst comes to the worst—of mankind going through a second imperialist war, if revolution does not come out of the present war, in spite of our efforts. We favor a programme of reforms directed also against the opportunists. They would be only too glad if we left the struggle for reforms entirely to them and sought escape from sad reality in a nebulous “disarmament” fantasy. “Disarmament” means simply running away from unpleasant reality, not fighting it.

In such a programme, we would say something like this: “To accept the defense of the fatherland slogan in the 1914–16 imperialist war is to corrupt the labor movement with the aid of a bourgeois lie.” Such a concrete reply to a concrete question would be more correct theoretically, much more useful to the proletariat and more unbearable to the opportunists, than the disarmament demand and repudiation of “all and any” defense of the fatherland. And we would add: “The bourgeoisie of all the imperialist Great Powers—England, France, Germany, Austria,

Russia, Japan, the United States—has become so reactionary and so intent on world domination, that any war waged by the bourgeoisie of those countries is bound to be reactionary. The proletariat must not only oppose all such wars, but must also wish for the defeat of its ‘own’ government in such wars and utilise its defeat for revolutionary insurrection, if an insurrection to prevent the war proves unsuccessful.”

On the question of a militia, we should say: We are not in favor of a bourgeois militia; we are in favor only of a proletarian militia. Therefore, “not a penny, not a man”, not only for a standing army, but even for a bourgeois militia, even in countries like the United States, or Switzerland, Norway, etc. The more so that in the freest republican countries (e.g., Switzerland) we see that the militia is being increasingly Prussianized, particularly in 1907 and 1911, and prostituted by being used against strikers. We can demand popular election of officers, abolition of all military law, equal rights for foreign and native-born workers (a point particularly important for those imperialist states which, like Switzerland, are more and more blatantly exploiting larger numbers of foreign workers, while denying them all rights). Further, we can demand the right of every hundred, say, inhabitants of a given country to form voluntary military-training associations, with free election of instructors paid by the state, etc. Only under these conditions could the proletariat acquire military training for itself and not for its slaveowners; and the need for such training is imperatively dictated by the interests of the proletariat. The Russian revolution showed that every success of the revolutionary movement, even a partial success like the seizure of a certain city, a certain factory town, or winning over a certain section of the army, inevitably compels the victorious proletariat to carry out just such a programme.

Lastly, it stands to reason that opportunism can never be defeated by mere programmes; it can only be defeated by deeds. The greatest, and fatal, error

of the bankrupt Second International was that its words did not correspond to its deeds, that it cultivated the habit of hypocritical and unscrupulous revolutionary phrase-mongering (note the present attitude of Kautsky and Co. towards the Basle Manifesto). Disarmament as a social idea, i.e., an idea that springs from, and can affect, a certain social environment, and is not the invention of some crackpot, springs, evidently, from the peculiar “tranquil” conditions prevailing, by way of exception, in certain small states, which have for a fairly long time stood aside from the world’s path of war and bloodshed, and hope to remain in that way. To be convinced of this, we have only to consider the arguments advanced, for instance, by the Norwegian advocates of disarmament. “We are a small country,” they say. “Our army is small; there is nothing we can do against the Great Powers [and, consequently, nothing we can do to resist forcible involvement in an imperialist alliance with one or the other Great Power group].... We want to be left in peace in our backwoods and continue our backwoods politics, demand disarmament, compulsory arbitration, permanent neutrality, etc.” (“permanent” after the Belgian fashion, no doubt?).

The petty striving of petty states to hold aloof, the petty-bourgeois desire to keep as far away as possible from the great battles of world history, to take advantage of one’s relatively monopolistic position in order to remain in hidebound passivity—this is the objective social environment which may ensure the disarmament idea a certain degree of success and a certain degree of popularity in some small states. That striving is, of course, reactionary and is based entirely on illusions, for, in one way or another, imperialism draws the small states into the vortex of world economy and world politics.

In Switzerland, for instance, the imperialist environment objectively prescribes two courses to the labor movement: the opportunists, in alliance with the bourgeoisie, are seeking to turn the country into a

republican-democratic monopolistic federation that would thrive on profits from imperialist bourgeois tourists, and to make this “tranquil” monopolistic position as profitable and as tranquil as possible.

The genuine Swiss Social-Democrats are striving to use Switzerland’s relative freedom and her “international” position to help the victory of the close alliance of the revolutionary elements in the European workers’ parties. Switzerland, than God, does not have “a separate language of her own”, but uses three world languages, the three languages spoken in the adjacent belligerent countries.

If twenty thousand Swiss party members were to pay a weekly levy of two centimes as a sort of “extra war tax”, we would have 20,000 francs per annum, a sum more than sufficient periodically to publish in three languages and distribute among the workers and soldiers of the belligerent countries—in spite of the bans imposed by the general staffs—all the truthful evidence about the incipient revolt of the workers, their fraternizing in the trenches, their hope that the weapons will be used for revolutionary struggle against the imperialist bourgeoisie of their “own” countries, etc.

That is not new. It is being done by the best papers, like *La Sentinelle*, *Volksrecht*, and the *Berner Tagwacht*,^[7] although, unfortunately, on an inadequate scale. Only through such activity can the splendid decision of the Aarau Party Congress^[8] become something more than merely a splendid decision.

The question that interests us now is: Does the disarmament demand correspond to this revolutionary trend among the Swiss Social-Democrats? It obviously does not. Objectively, disarmament is an extremely national, a specifically national programme of small states. It is certainly not the international programme of international revolutionary Social-Democracy.

Notes

[1] The reference is to Robert Grimm's these on the war question published in the *Grütli* Nos. 162 and 164, July 1916.

[2] *Neue Leben (New Life)*—A monthly journal of the Swiss Social-Democratic Party published in Berne from January 1915 to December 1917. It expressed the views of the Zimmerwald Right and early in 1917 took up a social-chauvinist position.

[3] Lenin is referring to the international socialist conferences at Zimmerwald and Kienthal.

The first Zimmerwald Conference met on September 5–8 1915 and was attended by 38 delegates from 11 European countries. Lenin headed the R.S.D.L.P. Central Committee delegation.

The Conference adopted the Manifesto “To the European Proletariat”, in which, at the insistence of Lenin and the Left Social-Democrats, several basic propositions of revolutionary Marxism were included. It also adopted a joint declaration by the German and French delegations, a message of sympathy with war victims and fighters persecuted for their political activities, and elected the International Socialist Committee (I.S.C.).

The Zimmerwald Left group was formed at this Conference. It included representatives of the R.S.D.L.P. Central Committee headed by Lenin, the Regional Executives of the Social-Democratic Party of the Kingdom of Poland and Lithuania, the Central Committee of the Lettish Social Democratic Party, the Swedish Left (Karl Zeth Hoglund), the Norwegian Left (Ture Nerman), the Swiss Left (Fritz Platten), and the “International Socialists of Germany” group (Julius Borchardt). The Zimmerwald Left waged an active struggle against the Centrist majority at the Conference. But it was only the Bolsheviks among the Left who advocated a fully consistent policy.

The second International Conference was held at Kienthal, a village near Berne, between April 24 and 30 1916. It was attended by 43 delegates from 10 countries. The RSDLP Central Committee was represented by Lenin and two other delegates.

The Conference discussed the following questions:

- 1) the struggle to end the war; =
- 2) attitude of the proletariat on the peace issue; =
- 3) agitation and propaganda; =
- 4) parliamentary activity; =
- 5) mass struggle; =
- 6) convocation of the International Socialist Bureau.

Led by Lenin, the Zimmerwald Left was much stronger at Kienthal than at the earlier Zimmerwald Conference. At Kienthal, it united 12 delegates and some of its proposals obtained as many as 20 votes, or nearly half the total. This was indicative of how the internationalism in the world labor movement had changed in favor of internationalism. The Conference adopted a Manifesto “To the Peoples Suffering Ruination and Death” and a resolution criticizing pacifism and the International Socialist Bureau. Lenin regarded the Conference decisions as a further step in uniting the internationalist forces against the imperialist war.

The Zimmerwald and Kienthal conferences helped to unite the Left elements in the West-European Social-Democratic movement on the principles of Marxism-Leninism. Subsequently these Left elements took an active part in founding communist parties in their countries and in organizing the Third, Communist International.

[4] The Social-Democratic Labor Group—An organization of German Centrists founded in march 1916 by Reichstag members who had

broken with the Social-Democratic Reichstag group. It had the support of the majority of the Berlin organization and became the backbone of the Independent Social-Democratic Party of Germany, founded in April 1917. The new party sought to justify avowed social-chauvinists and advocated preservation of unity with them.

[5] The war industries committees were established in Russia in May 1915 by the imperialist bourgeoisie to help the tsarist government in the prosecution of the war. The Central War Industry Committee was headed by one of Russia's biggest capitalists, Guchkov, leader of the Octobrists. In an attempt to bring the workers under their influence and foster chauvinist sentiments, the bourgeoisie decided to organize “workers' groups” in these committees, thereby creating the impression that a “class peace” had been achieved in Russia between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. The Bolsheviks declared a boycott of the committees and successfully carried it out with the support of the majority of workers.

As a result of Bolshevik propaganda, elections to the “workers' groups” were held only in 70 out of a total of 239 regional and local committees, and workers' representatives were elected only in 36 of them.

[6] The Basle Manifesto—A manifesto on the war issue. Was adopted at the extraordinary International Socialist Congress held in Basle on November 24–25 1912.

[7] *La Sentinelle*—A Newspaper, organ of the Swiss Social-Democratic organization of Neuchatel Canton (Switzerland), published at La Chaux-de-Fonds from 1890 to 1906 and resumed in 1910. During the First World War it followed an internationalist policy.

Volksrecht (People's Right)—A daily paper, organ of the Swiss Social-Democratic Party founded in Zurich in 1898. During the First World War it published articles by Left Zimmerwaldists.

Berner Tagwacht (Berne Guardian)—A Social-Democratic newspaper founded in Berne in 1893. It published articles by Karl Liebknecht, Franz Mehring and other Social-Democrats in the early days of the First World War. In 1917, it came out in open support of the social-chauvinists.

[8] The Aarau Congress of the Swiss Social-Democratic Party met on November 20–21 1915. The central issue was the party's attitude towards the Zimmerwald internationalist groups, and the struggle developed between the three following trends: = 1) anti-Zimmerwaldists; = 2) supporters of the Zimmerwald Right; and = 3) supporters of the Zimmerwald Left. Robert Grimm tabled a resolution urging the party to affiliate with the Zimmerwald group and endorse the political programme of the Zimmerwald Right. The Left forces, in an amendment moved by the Lausanne branch, called for mass revolutionary struggle against the war, declaring that only a victorious proletarian revolution could put an end to the imperialist war. Under Grimm's pressure, the amendment was withdrawn, but it was again proposed by M. M. Kharitonov, a Bolshevik with the right to vote delegated by one of the party's branches. Out of tactical considerations, Grimm and his supporters were obliged to approve the amendment and it was carried by 258 votes to 141.

The development of the theory of the socio-economic formation by V.I. Lenin^[1]

Victor Alexeyevich Vaziulin

The development of Lenin's theory of the socio-economic formation was carried out in new historical conditions on the basis of the foundations laid by K. Marx and F. Engels.

As an element of the theoretical heritage of K. Marx and F. Engels, the theory of socio-economic formation had its own, relatively independent logic of development. However, the nature, direction and choice of ways of further development, which were hidden in the internal logic of the views of K. Marx and F. Engels, were decisively determined by the needs of the new historical period. The novelty and greatness of Lenin's contribution to the theory of socio-economic formation cannot be properly understood if we do not establish both its difference and connection with the views of K. Marx and F. Engels.

At the end of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century came the era of imperialism and proletarian revolutions. Russia and other countries of Eastern Europe, and after them—the countries of the East with hundreds of millions of people, are drawn into the global revolutionary liberation movement. The centre of the world revolutionary movement shifted to Russia; the Great October Socialist Revolution launched a new era of global development—an era the main content of which is the transition from capitalism to socialism on a global scale.

Under these conditions, the close unity of Marxist theory and revolutionary practice became paramount.

Lenin was faced with the task of understanding and developing Marxism in new historical conditions, when the capitalist socio-economic formation reached its stage of decay and death. It was necessary

to study the laws of the imperialist era, the social system of Russia and other countries involved in the global revolutionary process. There was a need for a more specific study of the “mechanism” of social revolution and the construction of socialism, the unity and multiplicity of ways and forms of transition to socialism in different countries.

To express the above in a methodological perspective, we can say that K. Marx and F. Engels, in accordance with the fundamental need of their era, focused mainly on the study of mature capitalism as historically emerged and historically transient. Lenin, in turn, generalising the wealth of new concrete factual material, the practice of the world revolutionary struggle against capitalism in new historical conditions, the practice of the transition from capitalism to socialism, developed the doctrine of the transition from pre-capitalist formations to capitalism, from the lowest stages of capitalism to the highest, on the stage of the dying (capitalist) socio-economic formation, on the “mechanism” of the transition from the capitalist to the higher, communist formation^[2], on the stages of the emergence and formation of a new, communist formation, on the unity and multiplicity of ways and forms of transition to the communist formation.

In the course of this work and in the struggle against the enemies of Marxism, Lenin also generalised the work of K. Marx and F. Engels.

V.I. Lenin, responding to the needs of the new historical period, concentrated his efforts on the study of “overripe”, dying capitalism, on the transition from one formation to another and on the stages of emergence and formation of both the capitalist and the new, communist formation.

Lenin's revolutionary practical and theoretical activity began in Russia, but from the very beginning it had international significance, as Russia was a link in the capitalist system. The theoretical study of the specificities of the revolutionary movement in this or that country from the standpoint of creative Marxism, from the standpoint of dialectical materialism, is always at the same time the development of Marxism as a whole, because the particular and the universal do not exist in isolation from each other, but in inner connection, inner unity. The Russian conditions were particular conditions, but at the same time from the end of the 19th century to the beginning of the 20th century Russia became the centre of the world revolutionary workers' movement, and in this sense the particular conditions of the revolution in Russia became directly universal conditions of the global revolutionary development.

The 1890s in Russia were marked by the rise of the labour movement. Marxist ideas began to spread to the working class. However, the Russian liberation movement was dominated by Narodnikism^[3]. The Narodniks of the 1890s reflected the interests of the petty bourgeoisie. The predominance of Narodnikism in the Russian liberation movement was a serious ideological obstacle to the successful development of the revolutionary struggle of the working class.

The method of the Narodniks of the 1890s, which was in line with their social class position, was characteristic of the ideology of the petty bourgeoisie. The ideologists of the petty bourgeoisie started from the conviction that it was possible to arbitrarily preserve the (in their opinion) good sides of society and eliminate the bad. The will and desire of certain individuals were considered decisive in history. The existence of objective laws in the development of society was denied. All petty-bourgeois ideologists, since they expressed the reactionary side of the duplicity of the petty-bourgeoisie, adhered to the subjective-idealist method in sociology.

In his struggle with them, Lenin developed the

doctrine of social and economic formations on a number of fundamentally important questions.

Speaking of this, we should not lose sight of the fact that Lenin relied on the theoretical heritage of K. Marx and F. Engels. In the struggle against Narodnikism, while criticising the subjective-idealist method in sociology, the denial of objective laws necessary for the historical process, Lenin defended the Marxist understanding of the development of society as a natural-historical process. He gives, for the first time in Marxism, a detailed definition of what constitutes a socio-economic formation.

Before the idea of the natural-historical process of the development of socio-economic formations was put forward and substantiated, sociology was, strictly speaking, at a pre-scientific level. Sociologists could not understand the complex network of social phenomena, could not uncover their law-governed connections, their ideas about society were chaotic, largely arbitrary. Lenin wrote: "So long as they confined themselves to ideological social relations (i.e., such as, before taking shape, pass through man's consciousness) they could not observe recurrence and regularity in the social phenomena of the various countries, and their science was at best only a description of these phenomena, a collection of raw material."^[4]

He also noted, "sociologists undertook the direct investigation and study of political and legal forms, stumbled on the fact that these forms emerge from certain of mankind's ideas in the period in question—and there they stopped".^[5] The situation was presented as one in which human beings, acting as conscious beings, pursue their goals and build their social relations consciously. However, numerous observations testify to the fact that people adapt unconsciously to the existing totality of social relations and that their actions often lead to unexpected results.

The idea of the natural-historical development of social and economic formations, according to Lenin,

made it possible to elevate sociology to the rank of a science. Marxist sociology raised the question of “the origin of man’s social ideas”^[6] from material social relations. “The analysis of material social relations (i.e., of those that take shape without passing through man’s consciousness: when exchanging products men enter into production relations without even realising that there is a social relation of production here)—the analysis of material social relations at once made it possible to observe recurrence and regularity and to generalise the systems of the various countries in the single fundamental concept: social formation.”^[7]

If previously there had been no rigorous scientific criterion for distinguishing between important and unimportant, essential and non-essential social phenomena, “Materialism provided an absolutely objective criterion by singling out “production relations” as the structure of society, and by making it possible to apply to these relations that general scientific criterion of recurrence whose applicability to sociology the subjectivists denied.”^[8] The relations of production were understood as fundamental, determining all other social relations, all other areas of social life.

Thus, Lenin includes in the concept of “socio-economic formation” the reflection of the repetitive elements, what is common in the social orders of different countries. And it is not only a question of the similarity of the social systems of different countries, but of the general, which is revealed by the study of the most essential. By this we do not mean external repetition, but what is essentially common to the social systems of different countries. The essentially common exists only in internal unity with the particular and the singular, but at the same time the essentially common (the general, the universal), the particular and the individual are not reduced to each other, they exist and can be recognised in their internal unity with each other and in their distinction from each other. The identification of the essentially common in social phenomena, in the social systems

of different countries, had a great methodological significance, because it allowed us to move from the external consideration of history to a truly scientific study of society—to the study of the essence, from the description—to the explanation of social life. It was only on the basis of the assignment of the essentially general (universal) that a truly scientific study of the particular, the individual in the social systems of different countries, in the social life, became possible. “It was this generalisation alone that made it possible to proceed from the description of social phenomena (and their evaluation from the standpoint of an ideal) to their strictly scientific analysis, which isolates, let us say by way of example, that which distinguishes one capitalist country from another and investigates that which is common to all of them.”^[9]

V.I. Lenin stresses that the identification of such a common feature in the social systems of different countries was made possible thanks to the application of materialism to the understanding of society.

The concept of socio-economic formation includes not only the reflection of the common relations of production between different countries. The basic idea of Marx about the natural-historical process of development of socio-economic formations, writes V.I. Lenin, assumes not only “the reduction of social relations to production relations and of the latter to the level of the productive forces”.^[10] Consequently, the concept of “socio-economic formation” includes “the reflection of the appropriate level of productive forces”.

V.I. Lenin refers to a certain system of relations of production only as the skeleton, or the content of the socio-economic formation.^[11]

Lenin notes: “The whole point, however, is that Marx did not content himself with this skeleton, that he did not confine himself to “economic theory” in the ordinary sense of the term, that, while explaining the structure and development of the given formation of society exclusively through production relations, he nevertheless everywhere

and incessantly scrutinised the superstructure corresponding to these production relations and clothed the skeleton in flesh and blood. The reason “The Capital” has enjoyed such tremendous success is that this book by a “German economist” showed the whole capitalist social formation to the reader as a living thing—with its everyday aspects, with the actual social manifestation of the class antagonism inherent in production relations, with the bourgeois political superstructure that protects the rule of the capitalist class, with the bourgeois ideas of liberty, equality and so forth, with the bourgeois family relationships.”^[12]

Consequently, Lenin’s concept of the “socio-economic formation” includes all other social relations which correspond to a certain totality, a system of relations of production which grow on the basis of this system and are explained exclusively by these relations of production.

However, this does not exhaust Lenin’s characterisation of the concept of the “socio-economic formation”. The concept of the “socio-economic formation” is established not only in the materialist understanding of society, but also in the process of the dialectical-materialist understanding of social life. From the position of the dialectical-materialist method, the socio-economic formation appears as a special, developing social organism. “What Marx and Engels called the dialectical method—as against the metaphysical—is nothing else than the scientific method in sociology, which consists in regarding society as a living organism in a state of constant development (and not as something mechanically concatenated and therefore permitting all sorts of arbitrary combinations of separate social elements), an organism the study of which requires an objective analysis of the production relations that constitute the given social formation and an investigation of its laws of functioning and development.”^[13]

Understanding the social and economic formation as a specific, historically defined social organism

means that all its necessary sides, elements, etc. are internally connected, interacting. And the decisive role in the totality of these interrelations is played—it inevitably follows from all the above—by the interaction of a historically defined system of relations of production and productive forces that have reached a certain level.

Each socio-economic formation, as a particular, historically defined social organisation, has its own particular (historical) laws. The main task of studying the socio-economic formation from the point of view of the dialectical method is to study the law of the development of this social organism, its transition to another social formation. “Marx treats the social movement as a process of natural history, governed by laws not only independent of human will, consciousness and intentions, but, rather, on the contrary, determining the will, consciousness and intentions of men.”^[14]

At first sight, it may seem that the idea of the natural-historical process of the development of socio-economic formations contradicts the existence of the conscious activity of human beings, their activity as conscious social beings. The Narodniks and many other opponents of Marxism tried to use this view against Marxism. Lenin, in the struggle against the enemies of Marxism, who presented Marxism as a doctrine that denies the role of the individual in history, concretised and developed the Marxist understanding of the correlation between the natural-historical development of socio-economic formations and the role of the individual in history.

V.I. Lenin stresses that Marx systematically and in detail studied only one socio-economic formation—the capitalist one. The idea of the natural-historical development of socio-economic formations before the creation of “Capital” was a scientific hypothesis, and the creation of “Capital” meant its transformation into a scientific theory.

However, the value of Marx’s method of explaining social organisms is by no means limited to capitalism

alone. Verified by a systematic and detailed study of one socio-economic formation, capitalism, it becomes a scientific method for the study of other socio-economic formations. “If the application of materialism to the analysis and explanation of one social formation yielded such brilliant results, it is quite natural that materialism in history already ceases to be a mere hypothesis and becomes a scientifically tested theory; it is quite natural that the necessity for such a method extends to other social formations, even though they have not been subjected to special factual investigation and detailed analysis [...] so materialism in history has never claimed to explain everything, but merely to indicate the “only scientific,” to use Marx’s expression (*Capital*), method of explaining history.”^[15]

Thus, according to Lenin, the idea of the natural-historical development of socio-economic formations should not replace the objective study of non-capitalist formations and the further objective study of the capitalist formation, but should serve this objective study as a method.

The analysis of the development of capitalism in Russia was both an analysis of the specificities of the development of Russian capitalism and a contribution to the Marxist political economy of capitalism in general. It was also a further development of the theory of the socio-economic formation.

V.I. Lenin mainly studies the post-reform development of Russia^[16], the era of transition from feudalism to capitalism, when capitalism begins to prevail in Russia. For the first time in Marxism, Lenin analyses in detail the transition from feudalism to capitalism and the law-governed transition from one stage of capitalism to another.

The analysis of the structure of the socio-economic system of Russia allowed Lenin to clarify the balance of class forces, the conditions of the working-class struggle, to identify the possibilities, the necessity and the ways of creating a party of a new type, to outline the strategy and tactics, the conditions and

prospects of a victorious proletarian revolution. Lenin’s structural study of the socio-economic system of Russia serves as the theoretical basis for the strategy and tactics of the revolutionary struggle of the working class in the bourgeois-democratic and in the socialist revolution.

This study gave Lenin the opportunity to develop for the first time a precise, clear and correct programme for the party of the working class. Unlike G.V. Plekhanov, who sought to impose the general theory of the political economy of capitalism on the Russian reality, Lenin took into account the specificity of the Russian socio-economic system, the refraction of the general theory of Marxism through the specificity of the Russian situation.

V.I. Lenin did not consider the specificity of the socio-economic system of Russia as something that is absolutely unique, as something that exists only in Russia and cannot exist in any other country.

Lenin used the Marxist method, he studied the specificity of Russia from the point of view of the laws of social development, from the point of view of the universal (relations of production, class struggle). And such research, by its very nature, has a universal significance, a significance that goes far beyond the mere insight into the particular scientific object.

From the very beginning, Lenin’s revolutionary activity had an international dimension and was essentially internationalist, although the immediate focus was on the tasks arising from the conditions in Russia. The First World War changed the priorities. If earlier V.I. Lenin had above all pointed out the need to take into account the specificities of the development of capitalism in Russia, then in his speech of 29 April (12 May) 1917 in defence of the revolution at the present moment, he begins with the following words: “In the resolution on the current situation it would be wrong to speak only of Russian conditions. The war has bound us together so inseparably that it would be a great mistake on our part to ignore the sum total of international relations.”^[17]

The First World War was the result, the manifestation, the form of escalation of the contradictions of the capitalist system as a whole. It was in this period that Lenin pioneered the study of imperialism as the highest stage of capitalism, as the eve of the socialist revolution, as the prospect of the victory of the socialist revolution in several countries or even in a single country.

In his studies on imperialism, V.I. Lenin continued the Marxist study of the development of capitalism. Lenin's study of imperialism can be correctly understood only as a continuation of the studies of K. Marx and F. Engels in new historical conditions.

V.I. Lenin was the first in the history of Marxism to analyse the stage of decay and death of the capitalist socio-economic formation. The previously identified stages were stages of its progressive development, while imperialism is a stage of the regressive development of the capitalist socio-economic formation. The identification of imperialism as a specific stage of the development of capitalism brought to the fore a broader, more generalised classification of the stages. The regressive stage, the stage of death and decay of the capitalist formation is different from the progressive stage of the capitalist formation. In turn, the progressive development of the capitalist formation has a number of stages.

K. Marx and F. Engels studied the progressive development of capitalist formation in a dialectical way: progress is made in unity with regression. In this way, the productive forces used by capitalism have had destructive tendencies since the emergence of capitalism. However, in a general sense, progress prevails here. The maturity of the capitalist formation means the beginning of the transition from the predominance of progressive development to the predominance of regressive development.

V.I. Lenin also analyses the regressive development of the (capitalist) formation in a dialectical way, in the unity of opposite tendencies of development: regression occurs in unity with progress, but at the

stage of decay and death regression prevails.

Dying capitalism is different from forming capitalism not only in the further development of the social character of the productive forces, but above all in the transformation of certain fundamental characteristics of capitalism as a whole, into their opposite. "Imperialism emerged as the development and direct continuation of the fundamental characteristics of capitalism in general. But capitalism only became capitalist imperialism at a definite and very high stage of its development, when certain of its fundamental characteristics began to change into their opposites, when the features of the epoch of transition from capitalism to a higher social and economic system had taken shape and revealed themselves in all spheres. Economically, the main thing in this process is the displacement of capitalist free competition by capitalist monopoly."^[18] "...although commodity production still "reigns" and continues to be regarded as the basis of economic life, it has in reality been undermined..."^[19]

It is precisely because some of the basic characteristics of capitalism as a whole turn into their opposite that Lenin writes about imperialism, defining it as a stage of capitalism, as a specific socio-economic structure in comparison with capitalism in general. This is why Lenin calls imperialism a stage of transition to socialism: "...imperialism is moribund capitalism, capitalism in transition to socialism: monopoly, which grows out of capitalism, is already dying capitalism, the beginning of its transition to socialism."^[20]

V.I. Lenin reveals not only the economic specificities of imperialism, but also its political specificities, showing that "...the specific political features of imperialism are reaction everywhere and increased national oppression due to the oppression of the financial oligarchy and the elimination of free competition..."^[21]

V.I. Lenin enriched the understanding of the "mechanism" of the revolutionary transformation

of the capitalist socio-economic formation into a communist one, the understanding of the laws governing this transition and their conscious use by revolutionary forces. Lenin studies not only the state, the politics of this period, but also the relations of production, the relationship between politics and the economy, the ideology of the clashing social forces.

For the first time in the history of Marxism, the whole process of the revolutionary transition from the capitalist socio-economic formation to the communist one was so concretely analysed from the point of view of the practical and conscious implementation of this transition.

V.I. Lenin formulates the laws of transition from capitalism to socialism more concretely than K. Marx and F. Engels, he clarifies the Marxist study of socialism.

V.I. Lenin develops the Marxist doctrine of the transitional period from capitalism to socialism, the stage of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Lenin wrote: “In Russia, the dictatorship of the proletariat must inevitably differ in certain particulars from what it would be in the advanced countries, owing to the very great backwardness and petty-bourgeois character of our country. But the basic forces—and the basic forms of social economy— are the same in Russia as in any capitalist country, so that the peculiarities can apply only to what is of lesser importance.

The basic forms of social economy are capitalism, petty commodity production, and communism. The basic forces are the bourgeoisie, the petty bourgeoisie (the peasantry in particular) and the proletariat.

The economic system of Russia in the era of the dictatorship of the proletariat represents the struggle of labour, united on communist principles on the scale of a vast state and making its first steps—the struggle against petty commodity production and against the capitalism which still persists and against that which is newly arising on the basis of petty commodity production.”^[22]

In his lecture on “The State”, Lenin considers the theory of socio-economic formation in its most general form. Here he characterises the historical development of society and the state, the division of the development of society into formations, and, in connection with the purpose of the lecture, defines the significance (including the methodological significance) of this approach: “This fundamental fact—the transition of society from primitive forms of slavery to serfdom and finally to capitalism—you must always bear in mind, for only by remembering this fundamental fact, only by examining all political doctrines placed in this fundamental scheme, will you be able properly to appraise these doctrines and understand what they refer to; for each of these great periods in the history of mankind, slave-owning, feudal and capitalist, embraces scores and hundreds of centuries and presents such a mass of political forms, such a variety of political doctrines, opinions and revolutions, that this extreme diversity and immense variety (especially in connection with the political, philosophical and other doctrines of bourgeois scholars and politicians) can be understood only by firmly holding, as to a guiding thread, to this division of society into classes, this change in the forms of class rule, and from this standpoint examining all social questions—economic, political, spiritual, religious, etc.”^[23]

The actual solution of the methodological problems of the theory of socio-economic formations is impossible without the process of further development of this doctrine. Moreover, the further development of the theory of formations requires the study of the facts provided by modern concrete sciences in unity with the study of the laws governing the emergence and development of the theory of formations in the works of the classics of Marxism-Leninism. Lenin’s ideas have become a solid foundation for the further development of the theory of socio-economic formations.

The importance of the contributions of the

CPSU and other fraternal parties to this theory is determined by the tasks of the practical struggle for the transition to socialism and communism, because the contemporary era, which began with the Great October Socialist Revolution, is “the era of revolutionary renewal of the world, the era of transition to socialism and communism”.[24]

The CPSU and other fraternal parties, on the basis of Lenin’s ideas, have specified their views on the content of the modern era, developed Marxist-Leninist views on the stage of death, the decay of the old society - distinguished and studied new stages of the general crisis of capitalism, developed further questions on the transition to socialism, on overcoming capitalism, on building the foundations of socialism, on the general laws and national characteristics of the transition to socialism; they have created the concept of a developed socialist society.[25]

The XXVI Congress of the CPSU outlined the scientifically substantiated prospects for the development of mature socialism in the economic, socio-political and intellectual spheres of society. The position formulated in the report of the Central Committee of the CPSU that “the formation of a classless social structure will take place mainly and primarily within the historical framework of mature socialism”[26] is of great importance.

Thus, the development of the theory of socio-economic formations by the CPSU and other fraternal parties is carried out in several main directions: the study of the process of death, the decay of capitalism, the transition of developing countries to socialism, the overcoming of capitalism, the study of the stages of development of socialism, the emergence of communist formation, the general and the particular in the process of transition to socialism and communism.

Notes

[1] This article is the second chapter of “Part A: The Formation of the Theory of Socio-Economic Formation in Historical Materialism”, of the

collective volume: “The Theory of Socio-Economic Formation” [Теория общественно-экономической формации] “Nauka” publishers, Moscow, 1983. Translation (from Greek) Spyros D. Patelis. The Russian original was also considered for the translation.

[2] As we can see from his works, especially from “The Logic of History. Issues of Theory and Methodology” (1st Russian edition Moscow 1988, Greek edition translated by D. Patelis, 2013), V.A. Vaziulin did not adopt the view, widespread in the USSR at the time, that communism was simply one more socio-economic formation, the fifth in a series. He believed that communism was not a mere negation of capitalism as a formation, and therefore could not be considered as just another formation alongside the others. From then on, he approached communism as the “authentically human history” as opposed to the “pre-history” (according to Marx) of pre-class and class society, as the actual development of society on its own basis, as the mature, unified humanity that represents a dialectical development/sublation of the entire course of history up to and including capitalism: of the preconditions, the primary emergence and formation of humanity. Thus, he defined communism as a radically different type of development, a different type of civilisation. In our opinion, the adoption of the term “communist formation” here is connected: 1. with the fact that this chapter focuses on the analysis of the socio-economic formation in historical materialism and not specifically on communism; 2. it is primarily focused on the work of V.I. Lenin, where the study of the revolutionary process, due to the revolutionary tasks of the time, is mainly focused on the transition from capitalism to socialism-communism, on the negation of capitalism through revolution and socialism; and 3. it is connected with the expediency (possibly with the intervention of the editors of the volume) of aligning this chapter with the main stream view of the other authors, but—most importantly—with the official ideological position of the time, according to which socialism itself, namely “advanced socialism” was also a distinct formation, alongside communism. - Translator’s note.

[3] Narodnikism (Russian “народничество”, from the word narod “народ”, meaning people) was a certain ideology and movement of the intellectuals “raznotshichi” (intellectuals who did not belong to the established class of aristocracy) that prevailed during the bourgeois-democratic stage of the liberation movement in Russia and objectively expressed the anti-feudal interests of the peasantry. Its programme was a combination of radical bourgeois-democratic demands with some ideas of utopian socialism, directed simultaneously against the vestiges of serfdom and against the bourgeois development of the country. Two tendencies coexisted in Narodnikism: revolutionary and liberal, which bourgeois development of the country. Two tendencies coexisted in Narodnikism: revolutionary and liberal, which agreed on the basic theoretical principles but disagreed on the methods of their practical application in social struggle. Central to the Narodniks’ view of society was the idea of the necessity and feasibility of developing Russia by bypassing capitalism, the idea of transition to socialism by using and transforming the collectivist traditions (collectivism) of pre-capitalist institutions, especially the peasant community. It was a heterogeneous movement with various references to different philosophical currents, which coalesced around the slogan “Land and Freedom”, by which they meant a matrix of radical bourgeois-democratic transformations, the idea of forming a centralised political organisation, a party, and the aspiration to transform the political revolution into a “social”, i.e. socialist, one. Despite the convergence with Marxism and the adoption

by some Narodniks of some Marxist positions in support of their own ideas, from the 1890s this current moved mainly as a reaction to Marxism and the Russian workers' movement, in direct confrontation with Marxism. It developed into a predominantly petty-bourgeois current, ideologically and politically unstable, with eclectic references and tendencies: from bourgeois-liberal reformist to anarchist, promoting subjectivism and individual terrorism. V.I. Lenin and other revolutionary Marxists systematically criticised this trend, exposing its petty-bourgeois inconsistency, the utopian character of its concepts, etc., while at the same time highlighting the contradiction between the utopian shell of petty-bourgeois socialism of Narodnikism and its democratic anti-feudal "core". Similar types of ideologies and currents can be observed in versions of populism, "Third Worldism", etc. in countries with late development of capitalism, such as China, India, countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America. - Translator's note.

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

[5] As above

[6] As above

[7] As above

[8] As above

[9] As above

[10] As above

[11] As above

[12] As above

[13] As above

[14] As above

[15] As above

[16] This refers to the agrarian reform in the Russian Empire (3 March - 19 February in the Julian calendar - of 1861, with a declaration signed by Tsar Alexander II) concerning the abolition of serfdom. It was a belated and non-radical reform imposed from above, which initiated a certain abolition of feudalism and the development of capitalist relations on the basis of a compromise between the interests of the rising bourgeoisie and those of the feudal aristocracy, the landowners. The reform did not solve the problem of land ownership, while it created new contradictions by providing for small plots and forcing the peasants to rent land or become land workers. In addition, the tsarist state paid the landlords in advance for the land transferred to the peasants, and the latter were obliged to repay this compensation as a debt to the treasury for 49 years. Capitalist development in Russia, late, incomplete and distorted by the remnants of feudalism and tsarist autocracy, was full of such antitheses. Intertwined with the fundamental contradiction of capitalism and the global antitheses of monopoly capitalism, the imperialist wars (the Russo-Japanese War and the First Imperialist World War) contributed in their intensity to the outbreak of revolutionary situations in Russia in 1905 and 1917. The agrarian question was radically resolved by the Great October Socialist Revolution. - Translator's note.

[17] V.I. Lenin, The Seventh (April) All-Russia Conference of the R.S.D.L.P.(B.) 29 April (12 May) 1917

[18] V.I. Lenin, Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism, 1917

[19] As above

[20] V.I. Lenin, Imperialism and the Split in Socialism, 1916

[21] V.I. Lenin, Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism 1917

[22] V.I. Lenin Economics and Politics in The Era of The Dictatorship of The Proletariat, 1919

[23] V.I. Lenin, The State: A Lecture Delivered at the Sverdlov University, July 11, 1919

[24] Brezhnev L.I., On Lenin's path: Speeches and articles. Moscow, 1978, vol. 6, p. 577. [References to texts of the General Secretary of the CPSU and other official texts were an indispensable condition for the publication of any theoretical text of ideological importance, especially by central publishing houses such as "Nauka".

[25] In this text, the term "developed socialism" is mentioned, which was introduced and disseminated in the official ideology of the CPSU and the USSR. V.A. Vaziulin strongly disagreed with this on theoretical and methodological grounds. - Translator's note.

[26] Materials of the 26th Congress of the CPSU. Moscow, 1981, p. 53.

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

Chilean Communist Party (Proletarian Action)

Index

Part 1: Critical approach to the positions of the CPG

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

Part 2: Criticism of the ideological foundations of the CPG

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

Part 3: Imperialism vs. imperialism?

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

- Foreign penetration of the Russian economy
- "Gigantic amounts" of capital export from Russia
- The "big" Russian banking
- Warmongering Russia?
- Imbalance
- All the same... or not?
- Broad background to the current conflict in Ukraine
- The context of the war
- A brief parenthesis
- Production structure of Russia, China and other countries

Conclusions

- Nihil novum sub sole
- Another reality
- Other behaviour
- Syria

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

Conclusions

Nihil novum sub sole

Due to a method of analysis that can be anything but materialist dialectics and a not so remarkable ability to distinguish between methodology and conclusions, the CPG ends up equating the world war that is brewing at present with the First World War. Because Lenin deduced in his time that the First World War consisted of the clash between the imperialist powers, in accordance with the biblical proverb nihil novum sub sole ("there is nothing new

under the sun”), the CPG thinks that today it must be the same as in Lenin’s time, as if the river of time did not flow, as if there had been neither the Second World War, nor the processes of decolonisation, nor the expansion of socialist societies and the subsequent liquidation of part of them.

A confrontation between imperialist countries and countries that resist subjugation does not fit in with their dogma. But this is precisely the situation that has been developing in the last decades: the imperialist bloc (USA and EU) against Yugoslavia. The imperialist bloc against Afghanistan. The imperialist bloc against Iraq. The imperialist bloc against Libya. The imperialist bloc against Syria. The imperialist bloc against Russia. The imperialist bloc against Yemen. And probably, in the not so distant future, the imperialist bloc against the DPRK.

The CPG’s mystique is one thing, and reality is quite another. In this reality, not in the hallucination of the CPG’s “imperialist pyramid”, the vast majority of countries are not imperialist, including Russia, as we have shown in this paper.

Extrapolating Lenin’s conclusions from one particular historical epoch to a post-World War II era leads to dangerous conclusions that equate victims and victimizers. According to the CPG, two imperialist blocs would be confronting each other today: NATO on the one hand, and Russia and China on the other. And since both blocs would be imperialist, no one would dare to side with one of them and whoever did so would be against Lenin and, worse, against the ultimate contemporary derivation of his theory: the “magical imperialist pyramid”.

If the CPG were to continue with the same consequence with which it slanders Russia and China and other countries with its idea of the “imperialist pyramid”, the situation would be: all against all. However, his imperialist pyramid allows everything. It allows him to be consistent with it and not to be consistent with it. It allows him to adjust everything he mentally extracts from reality as he pleases. As it

suits it, it can raise or lower an imaginary bar along it and place it wherever it pleases.

Because, in essence, the CPG is not about countries like Afghanistan, Syria or Sudan. The CPG has another aim with its “magical imperialist pyramid”: to have a so-called “theoretical” tool to accuse Russia, China, Iran and other strong countries that resist imperialism of being imperialist, and to give this absurdity the appearance of “science”. The “imperialist pyramid” is directed against these countries. With this, they do a great service to the real imperialist powers of the world.

Another reality

During the First World War there was no clear winner among the imperialists at war, and even one imperialist country, Russia, was taken out of the orbit of the imperialist countries. Given the admittedly undefined situation left by the First World War, a more devastating war broke out: the Second World War, whose function was to define what the first one could not and, of course, to confront a new danger: the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. The USSR was the victor of the Second World War. However, the real winner (i.e. the country that profited most from the end of the war) was the USA. With it and the phase immediately after it, the USA emerged as the new hegemonic country of the imperialist bloc and the other countries, imperialist or not, were subjugated to it. The European imperialist countries were doubly weakened: by the costs they had incurred during the war and by the consolidation of the socialist camp, of which several Eastern European countries were part.

Subsequently, the USSR was liquidated. This resulted in a new reality, diametrically different from that of the First World War. The most striking difference is that imperialism today, together with the USA, has a definite centre. Around this centre, there is a periphery of imperialist countries and, around these, another periphery made up of countries which are not imperialist, but which benefit from their

membership of the imperialist bloc, as we saw in the last graphs, and thus participate in the plunder of the rest of the world.

This unnatural relationship between the imperialist countries (unnatural because it turns the imperialist countries into allies and not enemies) has led to a particular fact: that these countries constitute a collective imperialist bloc under the command of the USA, whose military organisation that collectively imposes imperialist interests on the rest of the world is NATO.

This unity among the imperialist countries, this way of acting collectively and not confrontationally, only became possible because an imperialist country became hegemonic, and it is so because there was a clear and unique winner of the Second World War. The collective of imperialist countries is neither egalitarian nor homogeneous, but imposes a subjugation particularly on those countries that were defeated during the Second World War.

Regardless of this, it is this bloc, the bloc of all united imperialists, which is in confrontation with the rest of human societies and constitutes the true and only enemy of humanity.

It is therefore absurd to consider, as the CPG does, that the war that is beginning to unfold is a carbon copy of the First World War, when the realities are so different. Time does not pass in vain.

In this new era of imperialism, the world war that is rapidly unfolding is not a repetition of World War I, but a continuation of World War II, whose aim is to complete the task of European fascism: to destroy what is left of the socialist camp (in alphabetical order: China, Cuba, the DPRK, Laos and Vietnam), as well as any form of resistance to the expansion of imperialist capital throughout the world. The expansionist drive of imperialist capital faces two formidable obstacles: Russia and China. For this reason, it is essential that all communists, socialists and democrats support Russia and China in their opposition to imperialism. And this is why the idea

spread by the CPG is so harmful, dangerous and reprehensible.

Other behaviour

We have already seen that times have changed from the First World War to the present (we consider the present as the phase from the time the USSR was liquidated to the present day). But the present has also changed.

The stage of political, economic and military interventions of imperialism directed exclusively against largely defenceless countries has come to an end, and a new one has opened in which the USA and the NATO it leads are challenging countries with large nuclear arsenals and powerful armed forces. We will now look at the different attitudes of imperialist and non-imperialist countries, especially Russia (because Russia is the focus of our work). We will see how much the political behaviour of the two countries differs:

NATO regularly carries out military exercises in which “defensive attacks” against Russia, “pre-emptive attacks” against the DPRK and “defence” tests against China are rehearsed. It seems that NATO member states are urging a war against these countries. In January 2024, NATO Admiral Rob Bauer called on the people of Europe to prepare for a “war against Russia within the next 20 years”.

Roderick Kiesewetter of the CDU/Germany said that the war should be taken to Russia.^[1]

We remember well, that the US and the EU staged a coup in Ukraine in 2014 against the then democratically elected President Yanukovich after he refused to accept the terms of the EU agreement because it would have opened the Ukrainian agricultural market largely to heavily subsidised EU agricultural producers.^[2] Former President Yanukovich said that “I, as president and as a patriot of my country, cannot accept such conditions”.^[3]

The behaviour of NATO states where their economic interests cannot fully assert themselves, where the

free exploitation of other countries' raw materials by their monopoly companies is not fully guaranteed, where limits are imposed on the export of capital or the return on capital (e.g. in China), is well known: overthrow an unwanted head of state. To want to defend your own agricultural producers would be insane and tyrannical, but to call for war against Russia after Germany was responsible for the deaths of between 27 and 32 million Soviet citizens in World War II would be the purest expression of sanity.

The folly, of course, is not that the peoples of the world want to defend themselves against the exploitative policies of the imperialist countries. The madness is to believe that all the peoples of the world must accept it without resistance and that, if they do not, they are forced to do so with sanctions, coups and even wars. This is what happened in Ukraine with Yanukovich.

Since the outbreak of the war in the Ukraine in the Donbass Region in 2014, Russia sought to find ways for peace, such as the well-known Minsk agreements. In December 2021, Russia presented NATO states with a treaty proposal for a security agreement. Among other points, Russia proposed that Ukraine should not join NATO and, in order to avoid incidents, proposed that neither NATO nor Russia could conduct military manoeuvres in a strip defined by all treaty parties on the border between Russia and NATO member states (including states that only have a military alliance with NATO).^[4] It was a last-ditch attempt to make Russia's security interests clear to NATO states through diplomatic channels before the start of the Special Military Operation in Ukraine.^[5]

But Russia has continued to try to reach agreements with the "West", also after the start of the Special Military Operation. Negotiations were held again in March 2022, this time in Istanbul.^[6] Both sides signed a document that stipulated very unfavourable conditions for Russia. For example, the Donbass was to remain Ukrainian, as previously stipulated in the Minsk Agreements. According to the Washington

Post, Crimea would only be handed over to Russia "on a leasehold basis". Russia was to withdraw its troops. In return, Ukraine was to reduce the size of its army and not join NATO. And Russia signed the agreement and withdrew its troops. But, according to David Arachamia (a Zelensky official), Boris Johnson (then UK Prime Minister) went to Kiev and presented Ukraine with a choice: if Ukraine complied with the agreement, there would be no more Western aid. But if it continued to fight, it would receive all imaginable funds. Today we know well what Zelensky decided.^[7]

In the face of NATO's relentless escalation of warmongering, the overwhelmingly re-elected Russian President Vladimir Putin warned on 29 February 2024 this year that Russian weapons could also reach European territory.^[8]

A few days earlier, on 26 February of this year, Putin said that the deployment of NATO ground troops in Ukraine "would be the last step before World War III".^[9] On the night of 17 March 2024, he warned that a direct military conflict between Russia and NATO forces in Ukraine would mean that the world would be one step away from a third thermonuclear world war.

But no, a thermonuclear war seems to be worth it for NATO states when it comes to saving their battered and moribund economies from collapse. Thus two days later, on 19 March 2024, the head of Russia's foreign intelligence service, Sergei Naryshkin, reported that France was already preparing to send a contingent of some 2,000 troops to Ukraine.^[10]

Also on 19 March, US Secretary of Defence Lloyd Austin participated in a meeting of the Contact Group on Ukraine at Ramstein Air Base in Germany, where he reiterated US policy that NATO would soon be at war with Russia if Ukraine were defeated. How ironic, because it would have been earlier if Russia had not prevented NATO's advance into that very country... Extending NATO's architecture to Ukraine would have directly nullified the nuclear parity between Russia and the United States to Russia's

detriment.

A day earlier, German and Polish defence ministers Boris Pistorius and Władysław Kosiniak-Kamysz met outside Warsaw and announced that the two countries would jointly deploy a rapid reaction force to the EU's eastern border (initially with 2,500 troops per country).

On 1 March 2024, an audio recording was made public revealing that high-ranking Bundeswehr officers were planning an attack on the Kerch bridge in Crimea with some 20 Taurus cruise missiles.^[11] On 6 May 2024, German Chancellor Olaf Scholz, due to "Russia's increasingly aggressive behaviour and the increasingly tense situation", decided to travel to Latvia and Lithuania^[12] and talk with Lithuanian President Gitanas Nausėda about the approximately 4,800 Bundeswehr troops Germany wants to station on NATO's eastern flank.^{[13] [14]} On 24 May 2024, NATO Secretary General Jens Stoltenberg urged NATO member states to allow Ukraine to use Western weapons against Russian territory.^[15]

On 28 May 2024, German Chancellor Olaf Scholz joined Stoltenberg's calls and said he would agree to Ukraine using German-supplied weapons "within the framework of international law" against Russia, including on Russian territory.

Russian President Vladimir Putin warned that "this constant escalation could have serious consequences".^[16]

In Germany, the CDU^[17] is likely to be the next government and, although it may seem hard to believe, on the basis of the signals it is giving, it is likely to outdo the current government in warmongering. For example, it has spoken out in favour of the gradual reintroduction of compulsory military service in Germany to "give a clear signal to Russia", arguing that Germany would not currently be in a position to defend itself against foreign aggression. This is Kafkaesque, because Germany is a US-occupied country, and has been since 1945, when it was not the US, the UK or France, but the

Soviet Union that liberated the country from fascism. It sounds schizophrenic, but it is real: Germany "must" militarise, not to drive the current occupiers out of the country, but to wage war against those who liberated it from fascism...

On 5 June last year, the German defence minister said: "we must be prepared for war [against Russia, it is understood] until 2029".^[18]

The reaction of France, the US, the UK, Germany and NATO as a whole to Russia's repeated calls for reason seems incredible.^[19]

NATO sacrifices Ukrainian lives for its own interests. It is also trying to do so with the Baltic peoples and Georgia. A large part of the population of the latter country strongly resists being bled dry again for foreign interests. But the NATO countries will continue to plunge more and more peoples on the face of the earth into blood and death. It should not be forgotten for a moment that the governments of NATO countries are desperate, and rightly so, because their economic system is collapsing. All this seemingly irrational warmongering is ultimately an act of survival.

In this fact lies the great importance of Russia's fight against NATO on Ukrainian territory. Russia is directly confronting imperialism there. Whether it does so by choice or because history has dragged it into it is of no political significance. Russia is confronting imperialism, that is the only fact that counts.

And in this confrontation it is the imperialist countries that are taking the lead in the war against Russia. At every step, Russia has only reacted to imperialist manoeuvres, not because it wants to or because it is morally better, but because it does not have the capacity to act otherwise. Russia also does not interfere directly in the domestic politics of other countries, which again underlines its non-imperialist character and its relative weakness vis-à-vis the imperialists.

In short, its political actions in the world reflect the

non-imperialist character of its state, which in turn is the political reflection of its economic structure, a structure much like that of any other non-imperialist country.

Syria

Where most clearly and unfortunately dramatically it became clear that neither Russia, nor China, nor Iran, are imperialists, was in Syria.

In the blink of an eye Syria ceased to exist. The coup in Syria against the al-Assad government has been a terrible blow to the resistance in that region and, equally serious, Russia lost a key strategic point in the world. Syria is located at the geographical centre of the world. We watch with great concern as Russia loses all the magnificent legacy of international political influence inherited from the USSR.

The argument that the US could no longer assert itself militarily anywhere proved to be a huge fallacy in Syria. The coup in Syria was a joint defeat of Russia, Iran and the rest of the regional resistance bloc. In the face of these facts, the CPG has not said a word, of course, due to the powerful hallucinogenic effect of its “magical imperialist pyramid”, which, as we have seen throughout the work, clouds the mind to such an extent that one can no longer distinguish the essential from the secondary.

In our opinion, the Astana Agreement is at the root of the terrible events in Syria, as it allowed the Turkish occupation army to settle on Syrian territory with the alleged intention of controlling the terrorists, supported, ironically, by Turkey. In other words, Turkey guarding its allied forces in Syria? Sooner or later this was bound to backfire.

The Astana Agreement was a failure very similar to the Minsk Agreements, which only allowed the imperialist forces and their regional lackeys to regain strength, while continuing to weaken Syria with sanctions and rampant terrorism, to the point of bleeding it dry, starvation and cold.

The Astana Agreement, and particularly its tragic

outcome in Syria, could not be a better illustration of Russia’s non-imperialist character. Russia and Iran did not sign it because they were fools or because they betrayed the Syrian people, but because they did not have the strength to support Syria’s struggle for territorial unity. Russia is still pursuing a policy that is, in our view, too soft. Time and again it has abandoned its core objectives in exchange for circumstantial calm. This is imposed by reality, not by will. Russia always acts in response to imperialist actions because it lacks sufficient political strength, in other words, because the political strength of the imperialists is greater. Russia cannot carry out its desired policy consistently to the end because of its relative weakness with the imperialists. But then reality hits it with triple force against it. We hope that the events in Syria will serve as a definitive lesson to him and that he will stop accepting a circumstantial calm, because the imperialists cannot be believed for a single word and, however terrible it may be, they cannot be given any rest, because they never rest. They will break every agreement, every word, because their policy is based on lies.

The danger coming from NATO seems to us to be immense. NATO is preparing an army that could be two to five times bigger than the Russian army. NATO is able to do this because of its expansionism. In practice, it is changing from a North Atlantic organisation into a global organisation. The imperialists control large parts of the world market, the sources of raw materials, trade routes and, to a large extent, the national policies of many countries. They declare every corner of the earth as part of their sphere of interest, for that is how their imperialist character manifests itself.

Imperialists appear powerful because they are powerful. What has happened in Syria should be a wake-up call for the anti-imperialist forces, as it demonstrates several things:

- That the imperialists seem to have largely achieved all their objectives to date.

- That the imperialists seem to be always steps ahead, that they seem to have the ability to plan for the future in the long term and to wait long years for their plans to come to fruition.

- That, after Syria, Lebanon, Iraq (where an attempt will be made to re-stabilise the country in order to wipe out the Shiite forces in that country for good), Yemen and, above all, Iran will probably follow.

- That, from all that has been said, it is clear that the anti-imperialist bloc is to a large extent weaker than the imperialist bloc.

Yes, we are concerned. We wish Russia a monumental victory in the Donbas. And we hope that it will prepare properly for it and, above all, for the war that NATO is preparing against it, because what we see so far is only the beginning of the great confrontation that NATO is pushing for.

Russia has started a fight against internal corruption. This is very positive, but we believe it is moving too slowly. In our opinion, Russia should strengthen the state, boost domestic production and industry, drastically reduce the influence of the oligarchy, transfer all enterprises in the country's strategic sectors to the state, accelerate the rehabilitation of the USSR, Stalin and Lenin, etc., in short, reorient its policy towards the structure of the USSR. With its current economic, political and social structure, we see it as difficult for Russia to survive NATO.

A powerful Russia is in the interests of all the freedom-seeking peoples of the world! Likewise, a very powerful China and Iran: The only existing military alliance today is NATO. We believe that it is time for countries like China, Russia, the DPRK, Iran, Venezuela, Cuba and Nicaragua to move forward in building a military alliance of their own, including the development of nuclear power.

It is in the interests of all the free peoples of the world, of the peoples fighting for their freedom and, in general, of the great majorities, that Russia, China, the DPRK and Iran should be very strong, because they are the countries that can do the most damage to

the imperialists. Its defeat would be an even greater defeat than the liquidation of the USSR for all the forces in the world fighting for national sovereignty, against fascism and imperialism.

But, as we have seen throughout this work, it seems quite clear that these countries cannot confront imperialism and its concrete expression, fascism, alone. They need as many political forces as possible throughout the world to fight against these two political expressions. And these political forces need these powerful states, regardless of their governments, the bourgeois character of their states and the prevailing mode of production in those countries, as long as their active role is anti-imperialist and anti-fascist, because there is no force in the present capable of confronting contemporary imperialism on its own.

However, the CPG seems determined to distance communists from these countries with the absurd and disastrous idea of the "imperialist pyramid". This is even more damaging because these countries have managed to develop economic and even peaceful political cooperation through the BRICS, which goes beyond the prevailing political systems in them; that is, regardless of whether the countries are socialist or capitalist (non-imperialist) in nature.

At present, communist forces must work to orient the national struggle towards socialism, understanding something that the CPG is not capable of comprehending: that the struggle for a socialist society goes hand in hand with national democratic sectors and in alliance with those countries that confront imperialism and fascism.

By denying this fact, in this historical context, the CPG not only distances communists from the anti-imperialist and anti-fascist struggle, but demobilises them! Communist forces, on the contrary, should be at the forefront of support for Russia, China, Iran, the DPRK, Cuba, Venezuela, Nicaragua, Vietnam, Laos and all the other countries and movements that,

each in their own way, are confronting imperialism and fascism.

Because:

Only with the great majorities fighting together can imperialism be defeated once and for all!

Notes

[1] Kieseletter's words were:

"The evil in all this is Putin and his criminal war of aggression. That's why Russia must be shown that it can't go on like this. Russia must recognise its neighbours' right to exist. The war must be taken back to Russia. Russian military installations and headquarters must be destroyed. We must do everything possible so that Ukraine can destroy not only Russia's oil refineries, but also ministries, command posts and combat centres. It is time for the Russian people to realise that they have a dictator who is sacrificing Russia's future".

[2] This would have meant that Ukrainian agricultural producers would no longer have been competitive.

[3] Yanukovich's words were:

"I, as president and as a patriot of my country, cannot accept such conditions. That is why, in search of a way out of the current economic situation in Ukraine, we agreed with Russia to reduce the price of gas from 430 to 268.5 dollars, to grant a state loan of 15 billion and development loans of up to 5 billion at acceptable interest rates. We have agreed to draw up a road map to restore the \$15-17 billion in trade between our countries that has been lost in the last 1.5 to 2 years. We have signed an agreement under which we will look at joint programmes for a number of industries to increase production of finished products and create new jobs."

While Yanukovich flirted with the EU and NATO, he was considered a "flawless democrat". When he put Ukraine's national interests before those of the EU and NATO, he was overnight declared a "dictator" (in the bourgeois sense of the word), opposed in the streets by a "freedom-loving" people.

[4] Russia also proposed that short- and medium-range land-based missiles should not be deployed in areas from which targets on the territory of other States Parties could be attacked. In general, nuclear weapons should not be deployed outside one's own country. Finally, Russia proposed a return to the NATO-Russia Founding Act, which prohibited the permanent stationing of NATO troops in Eastern Europe.

[5] NATO's written response of January 2022 has not yet been made public, but according to statements by US Secretary of State Blinken and NATO Secretary General Stoltenberg, no concessions were made to Russia. This is in line with NATO's behaviour since its founding (1949).

[6] It is not true what the bourgeois media reported that Russia had torpedoed the negotiations.

[7] It is not a question of defending "democracy and "freedom", even in the bourgeois sense of the word. A quote:

"We cannot allow Russia to win this war. Otherwise, American and European interests will be severely damaged. This is not about supporting Ukraine just out of generosity and because we love the

Ukrainian people. It is about our own interests and those of the United States as a global actor."

These were the words of Joseph Borrell.

[8] Putin's words were:

"They must understand that we also have weapons [...] that can attack and eliminate targets on their territory. [...] All this is real and can provoke conflict and lead to the use of nuclear weapons. Don't they understand? These are people who suffered hard times. But now they have forgotten what war means."

[9] Putin responded to a journalist's question about French President Emmanuel Macron's comments on 26 February that the deployment of NATO ground troops in Ukraine could not be ruled out, that everyone knows that this would be the last step before World War III Putin's words were:

"Everybody knows that this will be the last step before World War III. [I have said it over and over again and I will say it again. We are in favour of peace talks, but not just because the enemy is running out of ammunition".

[10] Sergei Naryshkin said:

"Initially it will consist of about 2,000 soldiers. [...] This will make them a legitimate priority target for the Russian armed forces. This means that they will suffer the fate of all Frenchmen who have ever invaded the Russian world with a sword".

[11] The authenticity of the recording was immediately confirmed by the German government. The bourgeois media and the German government were not shocked by the content of the conversation between high-ranking Bundeswehr officers, but by the fact that it had been leaked. As military strategist Scott Ritter pointed out, this was an act of aggression by Germany against Russia, and Russia could rightly have interpreted it as an open declaration of war by Germany against its country.

[12] In the Lithuanian military training area of Pabrade, he visited the 10th Armoured Division of the Bundeswehr, which is participating in NATO military exercises there.

[13] This will "only" cost around 9 billion euros.

[14] At about the same time that Oslo announced its recognition of Palestine, the Norwegian authorities passed a law banning Russian tourists from entering the country. Associated Press reported on 23 May:

"Norway said on Thursday it would further tighten its entry restrictions on people from Russia and warned that those with tourist visas issued by Norway before controls were tightened in 2022, or issued by another European country, would not be able to enter the Scandinavian country from next week."

A day before Spain's official recognition of the State of Palestine came into force, Zelensky was personally received by the King in Spain. Subsequently, million-dollar security agreements were signed between the Sánchez government and Zelensky.

[15] Stoltenberg's words were:

"The time has come to consider whether it would not be right to lift some of the restrictions that have been imposed. If [Ukraine] cannot attack military targets on Russian territory, then [the restrictions] tie the Ukrainians' hand and make it very difficult for them to defend themselves. It is clear that Ukraine has the right to defend itself [...]"

Legitimate self-defence includes the right to attack legitimate military targets inside Russia as well.”

[16] Putin’s words were:

“Today, the NATO Secretary General talks about the possibility of attacking Russian territory with long-range precision weapons. He should know that long-range precision weapons cannot be used without reconnaissance satellites. The final selection of the target and the so-called flight task can only be carried out by highly qualified specialists on the basis of technical expertise. This flight task is not prepared by Ukrainian soldiers, but by representatives of NATO member states. They should be aware of what they are getting into. First they provoked us in Donbass, led us by the nose for eight years, deceived us into believing that they would solve the problem peacefully and forced us to resolve the situation by armed means. Then they deceived us during the negotiations. They thought they would defeat Russia on the battlefield and inflict a strategic defeat on Russia. We warned them: do not invade our territory, do not bombard Belgorod and other neighbouring areas, otherwise we will be forced to create a security zone.

This continued escalation could have serious consequences.”

[17] The CDU will probably have to form a coalition government with other parties that are not yet foreseeable (perhaps the AfD and SPD).

[18] Der Spiegel reports that:

“Because of the threat posed by Russia, Defence Minister Boris Pistorius wants to strengthen the Bundeswehr’s operational readiness. ‘We must be prepared for war in 2029,’ the SPD politician said on Wednesday during the government question session in the Bundestag. ‘We must not believe that Putin will stop at Ukraine’s borders if he were to go that far,’ Pistorius said. Russia is not only a threat to Ukraine, but also to Georgia, Moldova and ultimately NATO. ‘We must exert a deterrent effect to prevent things going to an extreme.’”

[19] Instead of holding peace talks, they are escalating the war. First they sent weapons to Ukraine, then medium-range missiles, then Leopard and Abrams tanks, a short time ago they began discussing sending long-range Taurus cruise missiles that can penetrate deep into Russian territory and deploying NATO troops to fight Russian soldiers, and today they have authorised Ukraine to use weapons supplied by NATO countries on Russian territory as well.

War Continues in Rojava

Communist Labour Party of Turkey/Leninist

After the religious fascist gangs captured Damascus with the support of Turkey-Zionist Israel-US-UK-Qatar quintet (not to mention other imperialist states), is there any revolutionary force left in Syria?

We know that some revolutionary-communist parties will answer this question in the negative. We also know that a negative view of the Kurdish revolutionary forces prevails, especially because of the presence of the US and the apparent relations with this imperialist power.

However, we claim that the real essence of the apparent relations is very opposite of the image. The presence of the US in Rojava is not to help the Kurdish revolutionary forces, but to facilitate Turkey's step-by-step occupation and annexation of Rojava; together with Turkey, to create antagonism between the revolution in Northern Kurdistan and the Rojava revolution, to introduce Barzanist forces into the Rojava revolution to derail it and so on.

We argue that a concrete, scientific, provable analysis of concrete facts will confirm this thought and claim.

First, let us expose two big lies of the US that turn everything upside down. The first of these is the claim that the US (and other "coalition forces") are fighting against ISIS and are in Syria to prevent the resurgence of this gang. This is a lie that US officials keep repeating at every opportunity. Most recently, US Secretary of State Blinken repeated this lie at a press conference in Paris, France.

The second big lie is that they are "trying to prevent a possible Turkish offensive against Rojava". This statement was made at the same press conference.

There is no need to dwell at length on the first one. This is because it is now a well-established fact that the ISIS gang was created entirely by the

US. Not only that, the US is actually harboring the murderous horde it claims to be trying to "prevent its resurgence" at its base in Tenef (al-Tanf) on the Syrian-Iraqi border, training, arming, equipping it there and sending it to fight in the Syrian deserts. Moreover, the fact that Colani, who was once the "Syrian emir" of ISIS, has been appointed as the head of the so-called interim administration in Damascus sheds enough light on the situation.

It is also a fact that the same ISIS is the worst enemy of the Kurdish people. It was against this gang that the battle for Kobane was fought in 2014. In the following years, the revolutionary forces of Rojava waged a great and bloody war against this murderous horde. The United States, which seems to be a "friend and ally" of the Rojava revolutionary forces, has rescued this gang every time it has been in a difficult situation by taking them away with helicopters. Here is a Sputniknews report from July 2017 on this claim:

"Last month, the United States evacuated more than 20 ISIS commanders from the Syrian city of Deir ez-Zor, where the ISIS siege was broken the previous day.

A US Air Force plane evacuated more than 20 ISIS commanders from Deir ez-Zor in the north of the country," a military-diplomatic source told Sputnik.

The source added that Washington aims to benefit from the experience of ISIS commanders supported by US special services in different fields."

There are countless examples like this, but there is no need to go on. This much is enough. In other words, while the US claims that it is fighting against ISIS together with the Rojava armed forces, it has protected this gang it created in a fully protected military base (Tenef/EITanf). When the US needs it, it pulls this gang out of its lair and drives it to the

battlefield.

The second lie is at least as big as the first. If the US really wanted to prevent Turkey from invading Rojava, it would not have to go to all this trouble. A stern letter to Erdoğan would have been more than enough to solve this “problem”. We base this claim on concrete facts. In 2019, Turkey invaded a part of Rojava, then US President Trump stopped the Turkish army and Erdogan with a letter. Only with a letter and with insulting expressions! Here is an excerpt from that letter:

“Dear Mr. President:

Let’s work out a good deal! You don’t want to be responsible for slaughtering thousands of people, and I don’t want to be responsible for destroying the Turkish economy—and I will. I’ve already given you a little sample with respect to Pastor Brunson.

(...)

History will look upon you favorably if you get this done the right and humane way. It will look upon you forever as the devil if good things don’t happen. Don’t be a tough guy. Don’t be a fool!

I will call you later.”

Trump’s letter and Turkey’s (some prefer to say Erdoğan’s) decision to halt the military operation like a knife cut tells us one thing: Today, if the US wanted to prevent a possible Turkish attack on Rojava, she could do it in one fell swoop without much effort. The case of Pastor Brunson or the release of Deniz Yücel, a journalist with a German identity, with a word from Merkel is another example to prove this claim.

How can we get out of all this mess? Lenin’s theory of imperialism is the only beacon that will show us the way out of this mess. Imperialism subjugates dependent countries. This is one of the most important principles of the Leninist theory of imperialism. Turkey-US relations; more specifically, we can say that Trump’s letter to Erdogan and its consequences are the most concrete form of the Leninist theory of imperialism.

So who is the US helping in Rojava? Kurdish forces or

Turkey? If you ask anyone who looks at the problem superficially, they will say with great confidence that the US (and other imperialists) are helping the Kurdish forces; moreover, they are protecting them. We argue, based on events and facts, that the US is protecting and defending Turkey, that it is helping Turkey’s invasion of Rojava, that it is siding with Turkey in the suppression of the Kurdish nation’s struggle for freedom. This claim is a continuation of Lenin’s thesis on imperialism, that imperialism brings slavery, not freedom, to oppressed peoples. Imperialism has always been and continues to be against the freedom struggles of oppressed peoples. Rojava and Kurdistan are not separate from this. Turkey received the greatest support from the US, Germany, Britain and other imperialists in its war to suppress the Kurdistan revolution.

There are countless proofs of this. We can only point to two of them. The first example comes from US State Department spokesperson Matthew Miller. In October 2023, Mathew Miller said the following:

“We stand with Turkey and the Turkish people in their fight against the PKK and will continue to do so.”

Another example comes from James Jeffrey, the Trump administration’s Special Envoy for Syria. A DW reporter asks this man who has mastered deceiving and lying to the people of Rojava: “Does the US support the PKK? Does it pave the way for the PKK to establish a state in Syria with its support for the SDF?” The man, who was the plenipotentiary representative of US policy during his years in office, gets angry at the question and tells the reporter: ‘Wait a minute, stop here’. And then he continues as follows:

“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, to 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.”

The reason is simple and easily understood: Turkey is a NATO country. And not just any member. It is a NATO member that has been a battering ram in NATO’s war against communism since the Korean War. It is a NATO member that is fiercely loyal to its agreements with the US, has a strong army, is stirring up the Caucasus on behalf of the US and NATO, is guarding Zionist Israel in the Middle East (West Asia), is acting as a springboard against the Soviet Union in the past and against Russia and Iran today... that is why “the US supports all initiatives between Turkey and Iraq aimed at defeating the PKK.”

The opposite cannot be claimed. Those who claim this either forget that, for example, the leader of the Kurdish Freedom Movement was captured by the US-Israel and handed over to Turkey, or they are under the influence of the propaganda of Turkey’s social-chauvinist parties and organizations such as the TKP. But we don’t have to go that far to prove this claim. Let’s start from the end and look at how the US played a facilitating role in Turkey’s invasion of Rojava-Kurdish territory in the days when Syria fell.

This report explains the real reason for the recent withdrawal of the SDF, Rojava’s armed forces, from Manbij: “Syrian Kurds withdraw from Manbij after US ultimatum” (Al Monitor)

There is no reason to doubt the validity of the report, as it has appeared with the same content on other news websites besides Al Monitor. Subsequent developments also confirm this report. The Kurdish armed forces, which withdrew from Tel Rifaat, Aleppo and its surroundings without engaging in a proper confrontation with the gangs, finally started to fight the gangs fielded by Turkey at the Tishrin Dam and Karakozak Bridge, showing that they have the fighting power to repel both the gangs and the Turkish forces that de facto support them. The war now continues with the superiority of Rojava armed forces around Karakozak Bridge-Tishrin Dam.

At this point, the question should be asked: Why

didn’t the SDF armed forces show this fighting capacity when they withdrew from Tal Rifaat, Aleppo and the surrounding areas? The answer lies in the reason for the withdrawal from Manbij: US “suggestions”! As seen concretely in Manbij, those who decided to withdraw with the constant US suggestions seem to have decided to fight starting from the Tishrin Dam-Karakozak bridge location upon the reaction of the Rojava people and fighters “withdraw constantly, and withdraw... to what extend? what is the next?” Moreover, the war against the gangs and the Turkish forces supporting them now seems to have spread to Serakaniye.

Events show us that the people of Rojava are conscious and determined about their right to freedom. Although there are those who compromise with the US and other imperialists, those who fall for their promises, those who are deceived, those who give in to their blackmail and threats, those who fall into situations such as cooperating with them, the peoples’ passion for freedom and determination to struggle prevent the struggle from deviating from the revolutionary line. The peoples of Rojava keep the fire of revolution alive against fascism and imperialism, including the religious fascist gangs that captured Damascus in Syria and Rojava, with the war against the Turkish state and the religious fascist gangs that it feeds and drives to the battlefield.

The main weapon of imperialism, especially US imperialism, against the peoples is lies, deception, blackmail and deceit. The US seems to be supporting the Rojava forces, but in fact it is allowing Turkey to invade Rojava by giving it all kinds of intelligence, military techniques, etc. We saw this during the occupation of Afrin, Serekaniye, Manbij, etc. The confession is here:

“Is there a single piece of evidence that we have given any weapons to the YPG, to the SDF, to enable them to take action against Turkey? Look at what the Turkish army did to the YPG in Afrin and then in northeast Syria, what they were able to do. We didn’t

give them heavy weapons other than machine guns, we didn't give them guided anti-tank missiles of the kind 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 northeastern Syria and we have been very careful about that."

The reality on the ground and the words of the fighters on the ground confirm this explanation. The peoples and revolutionary forces of Rojava are currently fighting against the Turkish state and the religious fascist gangs not with high-tech heavy weapons, but with simple, ordinary conventional weapons. Yet they are repelling the gangs. Because the peoples' war for the right to freedom is a progressive, revolutionary war that creates consciousness in the peoples. The war of the gangs and the fascist state, on the other hand, is a reactionary war that does not create consciousness; it is a war that has no other goal for the gangs other than looting and plunder.

As a result, Syria, which has been captured by imperialism for the time being through religious fascist gangs, is being further clamped by Zionist Israel from the south and the fascist Turkish state from the north. US imperialism is trying to completely control Syria by relying on these two reactionary forces. In this respect, Turkey is not acting in spite of the US, but with approval.

In the midst of this terrible circle of brutal reactionary siege, the Rojava revolution, especially the women's liberation movement, is struggling to survive. Despite frequent catastrophic moves by pro-US faction within it, the revolutionary wing continues to be a beacon of hope with its decision to fight against the fascist Turkish occupation. The war raised by the Rojavan revolutionaries on the Tishrin-Karakozak-Minbic line, together with the resistance against the "interim administration" of the religious fascist gangs in other regions, is the war of the Syrian peoples for freedom against imperialism and the

regional reaction. It is a revolutionary war.

As we have said before, nothing is over, the war is just beginning.

Opportunism is not fought by attacking anti-imperialists

Miguel Ángel | Unión Proletaria (Spain)

Millions of workers and oppressed people throughout the world are delighted by the economic, social, political, military and cultural progress of China and Russia. After many years of capitulation to the imperialists, there is finally a powerful force to confront them. This moral revival of the masses is a valuable incentive for their active participation in the political struggle and, therefore, for the proletariat to gain hegemony and the leadership of the anti-imperialist struggle.

Unfortunately, the leaders of the Communist Party of Greece (KKE) are doing the opposite:

with their theory of the “imperialist pyramid”, they are sowing confusion and discouragement among the masses by exaggerating the shortcomings of the forces that are now confronting imperialism. They even accuse China and Russia of waging a struggle that would not be anti-imperialist, but inter-imperialist, in the style of the First World War, to replace the United States as the main dominating and exploiting force. It is logical that the capitalists denigrate the revolutionaries so that the masses distrust them and prefer the devil they know to the devil they don't know. But the damage is incomparably greater when it is done by a historically strong communist party like the KKE, which has also gained a certain prestige in the workers' movement for its opposition to class conciliation, opportunism and reformism.

In the face of the growing anti-imperialist movement across the planet, the leaders of the KKE behave like sectarians, according to Marx's definition: “For the sect, the meaning of its existence and its problem of honour are not what it has in common with the class movement, but the peculiar talisman that distinguishes it from it.”^[1]

It is true that the spontaneous mass movement has

shortcomings because it reacts against the superficial phenomena of reality and ignores the essence of reality, which can only be discovered through science, to which the majority of the exploited have no access. For this reason, the struggle of the communists against the spontaneous subordination of the workers to bourgeois ideology is indispensable for the proletarian class to be able to free itself from capitalist exploitation. But far from favouring this liberation, the propaganda of the KKE leaders against Russia and China discourages the workers from participating in a joint struggle against the Western imperialists who are the main pillar of international capitalism.

We will try to unravel the tangle of arguments with which they justify their position, first answering the most practical ones, linked to the war in Ukraine, and then the more theoretical ones, on imperialism and how to combat it.

Countering Russian propaganda by taking on NATO propaganda

A recent article,^[2] the head of the KKE's International Relations Section, Eliseos Vagenas, promises to refute the “justifications of both sides” in the war in Ukraine, but he only criticises the arguments of those of us who support Russia. He begins by narrowing the focus to Ukraine, with its natural and industrial wealth and its geostrategic position as a “bone of discord” over which the two “imperialist” sides fight. With this sleight of hand, he obscures what is right before the eyes of any half-informed observer: the harassment actions of the United States and its European allies against Russia and China through proxy wars, “colour revolutions”, NATO expansions in Eastern Europe and East Asia, sanctions, trade

conflicts, etc.

Anyone who compares his sources of information can easily see how the NATO powers have been harassing Russia until it regained sufficient strength to defend itself. The Greek leader, on the other hand, sees things the other way round and, what a coincidence! He sees them exactly the same as Western governments: Russia had been on good terms with the West until its bourgeoisie felt “that it had consolidated its power, that it should claim space for its own monopolies and in turn create its own capitalist unions on the territory of the former USSR, which was prevented by NATO enlargement.” Russia would thus be the imperialist aggressor, while NATO would only be defending itself against Russia’s claim to “dispute the supremacy of its own monopolies.” If Russia’s arguments were honest, Vagenas continues, it should not have taken up arms because, by doing so, it has provoked an enlargement of NATO that has swallowed up Sweden and Finland, as well as an increased militarization of Ukraine. It seems that he does not mind taking inspiration from the reformist social democrat Plekhanov and, what is even worse, from the reactionary militarist Stoltenberg!

It recognises the fascistisation of Ukraine, but warns against the attempt of the Russian bourgeoisie to “take advantage of the Antifascist Victory and the antifascist and pro-Soviet sentiments of the Russian people”. The KKE leadership tends to see only the negative side of those who fight the imperialists. Its dogmatic sectarianism prevents it from appreciating the contradictory nature of objective reality, especially when it contains something progressive that contradicts its rigid prescriptions. However, it is a fact that the Russian bourgeoisie cannot ignore the antifascist and pro-Soviet sentiments of the Russian people in a situation where the Western imperialists are desperately trying to subjugate the entire nation. Consequently, we are faced with an objectively necessary and positive alliance, so far led by the bourgeoisie, but which strengthens the

working class as the antagonism with the main international representatives of the bourgeois class—the imperialists—develops.

Vagenas absurdly tries to blame Putin for the rise of fascism in Ukraine for trading with this country, as if the USSR had not traded with German imperialism before and during the Third Reich. Even more absurd is his accusing the majority of communists of lacking “all revolutionary logic” by concluding an anti-fascist alliance with the Russian bourgeois regime, despite the fact that the bourgeois regime is the “matrix” of fascism. Here, as in many other cases, the leadership of the KKE exhibits its metaphysical “logic” which we will analyze later and which, for the moment, prompts us to ask: did the USSR perhaps lack “all revolutionary logic” by allying itself with the American and British bourgeois regimes against the Nazi-fascist powers, despite the fact that they were also a “matrix” of fascism?

The author of the article then accuses the Russian bourgeoisie of using Russians and Russophones in the republics that became independent from Moscow as pawns in its geopolitical plans, overlooking the fact that, first, it was the new non-Russian bourgeoisies led by Western imperialism that adopted hostile measures both towards the Russian Federation and towards the culturally Russian part of the population of Ukraine, Latvia, etc.

Moreover, it parrots NATO propaganda, which blames Russia for annexing territories under the pretext of protecting the Russian national minority: in reality, the Russian community is not a minority, but a majority, in eastern and southern Ukraine; it was part of this republic peacefully until the nationalists violently seized power in kyiv (Euromaidan), against the Constitution and the majority decision of the electorate, but with the sponsorship of the West, to force the anti-Russian Ukrainization of the whole country; The population of these territories—proudly proletarian—was not annexed by the Russian army, but before the latter intervened, it defended itself

where it could (in Crimea, Sevastopol and in the Donetsk and Lugansk regions, because in Odessa, Kharkov and other places it was massacred by fascist paramilitaries) from the aggression of the new authorities, it was the victim of fraud by the Western governments that signed the Minsk Agreements, it demanded an autonomy that was denied it, it then proclaimed its independence and, only when it was about to be crushed by an army that had become a battering ram for NATO, it asked for military aid from the Russian Federation and its accession to it.

After making some fair criticisms of Russian bourgeois nationalism (fair because, as Lenin warned, even the nationalism of an oppressed nation tends to be exclusionary and reactionary), Vagenas rejects the view of most communists who consider Russia to be part of an anti-imperialist axis. The argument he makes is that Russia, being a capitalist country dominated by monopolies and integrated into the global capitalist market, is an imperialist country and therefore cannot be anti-imperialist.

The “imperialist pyramid”, an anti-dialectical simplification

When we question the schoolboy logic that presides over his theory of the “imperialist pyramid” and that leads him to equate the United States and Burkina Faso as imperialist countries, the leader of the KKE is only able to recognize that “each capitalist country within the world imperialist system plays a different role and occupies a different position on the basis of its power, its economic, political and military strength.” But simply recognizing that there are “differences” between countries is insufficient to understand the world today and to be able to transform it. It is not just a question of differences, but of opposition, of antagonism between oppressor countries and oppressed countries.

Lenin discovered that the basis of contemporary imperialism is monopoly capitalism, but anyone who claims to be a Marxist-Leninist must not be content

with this essential cause abstracted from the diversity of imperialist phenomena in which it is expressed. In fact, Lenin also went so far as to say that “the division of nations into oppressors and oppressed... constitutes the essence of imperialism... which the social-chauvinists and Kautsky deceitfully avoid.”^[3] What then is the essence of imperialism? How can we explain the contradiction that Lenin falls into here?

Contrary to the leaders of the KKE who deduce everything from an abstract definition, Marx advocated the method of “rising from the abstract to the concrete” as “the process by which thought assimilates the concrete, reproduces it spiritually as concrete.” Moreover, he did not confuse the concrete with a single particular aspect, even if it were essential!, but defined it as “the synthesis of multiple determinations, therefore, the unity of the diverse” which appears “in thought as a process of synthesis.”^[4] Accordingly, Lenin held that truth is always concrete and called for a concrete analysis of concrete reality. As much as the domination of monopolies is an essential aspect of imperialism, it does not encompass its concrete essence. To encompass the essence of a thing, one must take into account the various phenomena in which it is expressed: in Lenin’s words, “The essence is manifest, the phenomenon is essential.”^[5]

It is certainly easier to reduce imperialism to monopolies (or capitalism to the market), but this is not enough and is therefore false and contradicts reality and its theoretical reflection as Marxism-Leninism: this abstract reductionism harms the proletarian revolution and benefits the bourgeois counterrevolution.

The KKE leaders’ theory of the “imperialist pyramid” abolishes at one stroke the anti-imperialist solidarity of the proletariat with the socialist states and oppressed nations on the grounds that the bourgeoisie has grown stronger or is the ruling class in them. With this theory, they feed the irrational

fear and panic of the weaker revolutionaries that alliances with certain sections of the bourgeoisie against others will end up breaking up the workers' movement, as has often happened in recent decades. Instead of trying to understand concretely why this has happened and what concrete alliances are progressive and necessary, they promote the sectarian and anti-unitarian attitude of entrenching themselves in a false class independence that is really an isolation of the proletariat from the people and an isolation of the communists from the masses, for the greater glory of imperialism.

They claim to be communists, but they ignore the Communist Manifesto when it explains how the proletariat prepares itself as a revolutionary class not by abstaining from, but by participating in, bourgeois struggles: "The clashes in the old society in various ways favour the development of the proletariat. The bourgeoisie lives in a permanent struggle: first against the aristocracy, then against those sections of the bourgeoisie whose interests are in conflict with the progress of industry, and finally always against the bourgeoisie of all other countries. In all these struggles it is forced to appeal to the proletariat, to call on its help and thus draw it into the political movement. In this way the bourgeoisie provides the proletarians with the elements of their own education, that is, weapons against itself."

Since they have forgotten the Manifesto which should have inspired them, and before continuing with the analysis of their concrete errors, we will remind them of the category of communists to which they tend to degrade themselves: the critical-utopian communists "pretend to replace social action by their personal speculative action, the historical conditions which will determine proletarian emancipation by fantastic conditions which they themselves forge, the gradual organisation of the proletariat as a class by an organisation of society invented according to their whim. For them, the universal course of history to come is determined by the propaganda and practical

execution of their social plans."^[6]

Russia and China are not imperialist countries

The KKE leadership places China and Russia at the top of the "imperialist pyramid" with a poor argument that can be summed up as saying that they are powerful countries in which there are monopolies.

Of course, the economy of both has a commodity basis, which does not necessarily mean capitalist, and even less imperialist, as any Marxist should know. To date, no society has yet reached the level of development described by Marx in his Critique of the Gotha Programme: none has been able to do without commodity relations of production, not even the Soviet Union in Stalin's time, where consumer goods continued to be considered commodities.

All socialist revolutions have pursued and continue to pursue the goal of liberating humanity from the alienation that the commodity entails, as analyzed by Marx in the first section of the first book of Capital. But will is not enough, since a quantitative and qualitative development (socialization) of the productive forces (including the worker) is also needed to put an end to the scarcity of the means of subsistence necessary for the free development of each individual. Historically, private property, the market and capitalism have been necessary levers for this development, until reaching the current situation in which they are becoming increasing obstacles that the proletarian revolution has the mission of removing. To this end, this revolution seizes political power from the bourgeoisie to undertake a dialectical transition—long, complex, contradictory—from the domination of capitalist relations of production to their complete abolition in communist society.

No process of development can do without partial setbacks, during which the conditions for further advances are completed. Thus, for example, the First International (IWA) had to water down its programme

compared with the Communist Manifesto in order to make possible the united action of the working class, which convinced the militant proletariat of Europe of the suitability of the principles defended by Marx and Engels. The Soviet power under Lenin also had to take a relative step backwards, which was the New Economic Policy, in order to be able to resume the offensive in the construction of socialism. Then, as now, the bourgeoisie interpreted these setbacks as proof of the superiority of capitalist economy over communism, and the “left” prophets claimed that the Bolsheviks had betrayed the proletarian revolution and returned to capitalism.

In Russia in the 1990s, the working class party had become so weak that it was ousted from political power by a new, emerging bourgeoisie. But soon the voracity of the Western imperialists forced the main section of the Russian bourgeoisie to turn away from them and to rely on the proletariat formed under Soviet socialism. Russia is thus a capitalist country led by a weakened bourgeoisie, harassed from outside and dependent on a national detachment of the working class in the process of recovering its historic democratic, patriotic, anti-imperialist and socialist position. The Greek “pyramidists” should at least acknowledge that the freedom of workers to unionize, to join the communist parties with which they still have relations and to accede to their Marxist-Leninist revolutionary theory is greater in Russia than in Ukraine or in any ordinary capitalist country. Therefore, the attitude of the communists towards this country should be less antagonistic and more cautious than towards countries with a solid bourgeois dictatorship.

This is one of the reasons why it is inappropriate to call it imperialist. Another reason is the solidarity it provides to other peoples and governments attacked by the real imperialists: Cuba, Venezuela, Syria, Iran, the DPRK, Mali, Niger, etc. Disregarding the opinion of the peoples who receive it, the “leftists” of the KKE question this aid as insufficient and self-serving,

but their accusation is not at all original. Young Soviet Russia was also reproached for not sacrificing itself for the European revolution, the USSR for not providing direct military support to the Greek communists who were under attack by the Anglo-American interventionists, etc.

Even if we ignore the above, Russia does not fit Lenin’s description of contemporary imperialism, which he did not limit to the domination of capitalist monopolies, even though that was its essential cause. The Eurasian country has not experienced a process of monopolization, but rather, on the contrary, of de-monopolization based on the preceding socialist economy (“socialism is nothing but state capitalist monopoly placed at the service of the entire people and which, therefore, has ceased to be a capitalist monopoly”).^[7] Capitalist accumulation in a country with such immense resources does not yet require the export of more capital than goods. And the capital it exports, as well as the military, nuclear, industrial, space, pharmaceutical, diplomatic, etc. power that Vagenas mentions to “prove” Russia’s imperialist character, are not caused by an internal over-accumulation of capital, but by the need to overcome the imperialist encirclement. It achieves this thanks to its recent socialist past and not as a beneficiary of the “imperialist pyramid” at the expense of other peoples. On the contrary, it is a power that, even under bourgeois leadership, only manages to maintain itself sovereignly by fighting against this “pyramid” in alliance with all those oppressed by it.

The “imperialist pyramid”, the monopoly of a “handful of countries”—as Lenin said—or of the “golden billion”—as Putin says—was established during the Bolshevik leader’s lifetime after hundreds of years of capitalist accumulation, and since then, the composition of each of the two camps into which the world was divided has changed little. As Kautsky demonstrated in relation to Kautsky, nothing can be as compact and monolithic as a pyramid in the antagonistic relationship between the imperialists

and the relationship between them and the oppressed peoples. The unity between the former can only be relative in relation to the latter, while the struggle is absolute. For this reason, the expression “imperialist chain” used by Lenin is more correct to describe the relationship of oppression between countries and how each break in a link puts the whole chain in jeopardy. This is what happened with the socialist and national liberation revolutions of the 20th century, and this is what will happen again with the increasingly united anti-imperialist struggle of the socialist, ex-socialist and sovereignist countries, of the oppressed peoples and of the internationalist proletariat. The imperialist chain is broken, weakened, rebuilt and broken again in a historical process that enables the proletariat to replace capitalism with communism, and not in a fatal ahistorical repetition of the initial stage of imperialism with a mere change of hierarchy between countries.

As for China, Vagenas reproaches it for participating in the G-20 alongside Russia and the other most powerful capitalist states (negotiating does not presuppose identity of objective) and for having “as its objective the profit obtained from the exploitation of the labor force not only of the workers of its own country, but also of many other countries in Europe, Asia, Africa, America, in all the places where its monopolies are developed.” Of course, economic profit comes from work carried out beyond the reproduction of the value of the labor force. But this is not necessarily “exploitation” of workers. For there to be true exploitation, the ultimate objective must be to perpetuate the class relationship by which one class lives at the expense of the work of the other.

However, where is the proof that the perpetuation of the exploitation of man by man is the goal of China, whose regime proclaims itself to be socialist, with the rule of the working class under the leadership of its Communist Party, the prevalence of state and cooperative ownership, central economic planning, etc.? The leaders of the KKE and others object that

these are just fine words to cover up a reality in which “the bourgeois classes, the monopolies, rule”, analogous to the false socialism ruling in our capitalist countries. But the analogy is not sufficient proof. Unlike our “socialists”, the Chinese communists came to power by overthrowing and expropriating the exploiting classes, and are succeeding in improving the situation of the working population of their country and the oppressed peoples with whom they do business, and their economy continues to develop and outstrip that of capitalist countries without economic crises to endanger this positive trend.

It is true that, from 1978, they carried out a risky partial retreat towards the market, capitalism and the penetration of foreign capital, greater than that permitted by the Soviet leaders who succeeded Stalin and than that proposed by Lenin as NEP. The international context in which the Chinese leaders took this course was characterized by the relative consolidation of the imperialist camp, its enmity with the USSR, the continued weakening of the workers’ movement despite its efforts to counteract it and a growing inequality in the development of productive forces between the oppressor countries and the oppressed countries, including China. They then opted to develop their productive forces as quickly as possible at all costs.

Today’s concrete imperialism and the revival of the workers’ movement

The crisis that the proletarian movement has been undergoing since the mid-twentieth century is not only due to the erosion of revolutionary principles in the socialist states and communist parties, but also to a change in the concrete conditions of existence of the working class in the capitalist countries: increasing inequality between workers in the dominant countries and those in the dominated countries, favouring national antagonisms; growth in the level of professional education of workers and, through it, in their ideological indoctrination; intensive

development of production and fragmentation of the industrial fabric; exponential increase in the means of communication controlled by the capitalists; greater resources to bribe the top of the proletarian movement thanks to the more efficient neocolonial exploitation of the oppressed countries; etc.

Since the First World War and the time of Lenin, the concrete reality of the working class and the concrete reality of imperialism have changed. As a result of the Second World War, one imperialist power had emerged, far superior and dominant over all the others, which imposed its particular interests in the joint struggle of all of them against the internationalist proletariat and its new bastions: the socialist countries and the anti-colonial revolutions. This progressive field of contradictory forces in their class composition is the one that today can and needs to unite to defeat the imperialists. And it is precisely the participation of the proletariat in this alliance that will allow it to win its leadership in order to continue the struggle until the victory of socialism. There is no other way than to sustain this alliance, fighting within it for the strategic interests of the proletariat. But any exaggeration of the internal struggle, of criticism of our allies, that weakens unity will only lead to prolonging the horrors of imperialism.

Every progressive person knows for sure that the real base supporting imperialism and capitalist oppression of the masses are the Western powers, primarily the United States of America. Each defeat they experience weakens their economy and, consequently, their ability to oppress the people and to tame the workers' movement. They are the main enemy against which we must direct all the opposing forces. Among these there are also oppressors and some might even end up developing the capacity to replace the current imperialists. But this replacement is not yet possible, it is only one tendency among others and the task of the revolutionary proletariat is precisely to promote the opposing tendency in the only possible way: to fight to strengthen this alliance,

thus demonstrating that it is the best leader for achieving victory.

The KKE leadership believes (or wants us to believe) that it will overthrow capitalism and build the new socialist-communist society by breaking away from what it calls "all imperialist alliances" and clinging to only one of Lenin's slogans against unjust wars like the First World War: not supporting any side. But it forgets that Lenin also spoke of taking sides in just wars like the one being waged against imperialism on various fronts. It also forgets that Lenin, even in that unjust war, called on revolutionaries to promote above all the defeat of their own country's government, an objective that these Greek leaders sabotage by repeating NATO's anti-Russian and anti-Chinese propaganda. As Che Guevara said (and the Mexican supporters of the KKE so wrongly recall): "You cannot trust imperialism even a little bit, not at all."⁸ To really contribute to the political independence of the working class in each country, one must begin by gathering the greatest possible force against its own imperialist government instead of distracting, confusing and disorienting the masses with the supposed defects of those who fight it with more than just words.

Vagenas is partly right when he criticizes as a petty-bourgeois illusion the prospect of a multipolarity of countries living together in peace, justice and harmony, as long as their economies are capitalist (by the way, this idyllic relationship was not even achieved between socialist countries, because they still present "in all their aspects, in the economic, moral and intellectual, the stamp of the old society from whose womb they come."⁹). However, as long as there is no progress towards communism, the slogan of multipolarity is tactically pertinent as a dialectical mediation, as an international democratic demand that breaks down imperialism.^[10] Our author is wrong to completely dismiss this demand and any other democratic demand, thereby erecting a Great Wall of China between democracy and socialism.

On the relationship between the struggle for democracy and the struggle for socialism

Lenin had to deal with such dogmatic and metaphysical errors, which appear with every sharp turn in the course of political events, as an irrational reaction to opportunist deviations. During the First World War, it was the so-called “imperialist economism” that is now being diligently copied by the leaders of the KKE. It was formulated by prominent theorists of the Bolshevik Party who played a vacillating role in the Russian revolution and who ended up opposing the construction of socialism in the USSR (Bukharin, Piatakov, Radek, etc.). The philosophical root of this defective thinking was explained by Lenin in his assessment of Bukharin: “His theoretical conceptions can hardly be called entirely Marxist, for there is something scholastic about him (he has never studied and I believe has never fully understood dialectics).”^[11]

Lenin warned the adherents of “imperialist economics” that “they have gotten themselves into a quagmire, that their ‘ideas’ have nothing in common with either Marxism or revolutionary social democracy” and that they are incapable of “solving the problem of how to link the advent of imperialism with the struggle for reforms and democracy.”^[12]

This inability was also evident in the article that former KKE General Secretary Aleka Pappariga wrote in 2013, *On Imperialism and the Imperialist Pyramid*, when she identified “the anti-imperialist struggle with the anti-capitalist struggle.”^[13] It is one thing to link the two struggles, which is correct, and quite another to reject any expression of anti-imperialism that is not anti-capitalist. Imperialism is not only highly developed capitalism, but also its superstructure.^[14] Reactionary that denies bourgeois democracy and that, consequently, turns the popular strata and the oppressed nations into allies of the proletariat in its necessary struggle for democracy.

The Mexican followers of the KKE candidly

admit that they are revising the Marxist-Leninist conclusions about imperialism... for the sake of imperialism!: “For a certain period... some wars could be just, but since the end of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century, as Lenin said, wars were imperialist on both sides. (...) Lenin pointed out the problem of dependent, colonial and semi-colonial countries, however, the development of productive forces and the class struggle (where the USSR and the communists played a decisive role) has changed that world.”^[15]

The “pyramidists” contempt for general, i.e. bourgeois, democratic questions is even more serious now that the imperialists have succeeded in reducing the class consciousness of the workers and it is the oppressed nations and the surviving socialist states that are putting up the greatest resistance to the offensive of imperialism in crisis. Under these conditions, the working class will become a political force again only if its communist vanguard encourages its participation in the democratic struggle—particularly the national liberation struggle—against imperialism and, in the course of this, also educates it in socialism.

But the defenders of the “imperialist pyramid” disagree and prefer the logic of the “imperialist economists” which Lenin summarized thus: “The ‘only’ thing that can be ‘opposed’ to imperialist war is socialism; only socialism is the ‘way out’. ‘Consequently’ to include democratic slogans in our minimum program, i.e. under capitalism, is a deception or an illusion, confusion or postponement, etc., of the slogan of the socialist revolution.”

This type of logic shows that “there is a failure to understand the relationship between capitalism and democracy, between socialism and democracy,” and that “the awakening and growth of the socialist insurrection against imperialism are inextricably linked with the growth of democratic resistance and rebellion.”

The path that Lenin prescribed was: “Through

bourgeois democracy towards the socialist and consequently democratic organization of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie and opportunism. There is no other way. There is no other way out. Marxism, like life itself, knows no other way out... without fearing that this will 'stain' 'the purity' of our economic objectives."^[16]

He explained the relationship between the struggle for democracy and the struggle for socialism as a process that leads to a qualitative leap: "While we rely on the democratic achievements already achieved and denounce their incompleteness under the capitalist regime, we demand the overthrow of capitalism, the expropriation of the bourgeoisie, as an indispensable basis both for ending the misery of the masses and for fully and integrally carrying out all democratic transformations. Some of these transformations will be initiated before the overthrow of the bourgeoisie, others in the course of its overthrow and others after the overthrow. The social revolution is not a single battle, but a period comprising a whole series of battles for economic and democratic transformations at all levels, battles that can only culminate in the expropriation of the bourgeoisie."^[17]

To become the vanguard of these battles, instead of despising and rejecting other participating classes, this is the mission of the socialist proletariat.

Lenin concluded his critique of "imperialist economism" by explaining the cause of its emergence: "It is one thing to ponder the causes and significance of an imperialist war brought on by highly developed capitalism, the social-democratic tactics in relation to such a war, the causes of the crisis within the social-democratic movement, etc.; but it is quite another thing to allow war to oppress one's thought... One such form of oppression and repression of human thought by war is the contemptuous attitude of 'imperialist economism' towards democracy."^[18]

The trauma that has oppressed the rational thinking of the "pyramidists" is, without a doubt, "the counter-revolutionary process of overthrowing Soviet

socialism" by the opportunist leaders of the CPSU, which, according to Vagenas, "was completed" in 1989-1991, "completely" destroying the positions won by the proletariat during decades of revolution (an impressive display of dialectical materialism!). Their unfortunate mechanical denial of opportunism has a historical precedent immediately after the October Revolution, when a few communists interpreted the success of the Bolsheviks in a one-sidedly leftist way.

Partnerships, intermediate stages and commitments

The KKE leaders start from the abstract scheme according to which, once capitalism has reached its highest stage, the bourgeoisie and the proletariat remain as the only antagonists. Hence, only this contradiction and that of the capitalists among themselves remain, while the contradiction between the imperialist countries and the oppressed countries has disappeared. In this way, they consummate Lassalle's revenge on Marx: in contrast to the working class, the other classes form nothing but a reactionary mass.

Therefore, any proposal for an alliance or compromise with any sector of the bourgeoisie or any proposal for a "stage between capitalism and socialism".^[19] This would be reactionary and would amount to treason. The "new" "pyramidal" analysis of imperialism also rejects the position that Engels held in relation to the Blanquist Communards: the communists are communists not because they want to achieve their goal without stopping "at intermediate stages and without compromises, which only serve to delay the day of victory and prolong the period of slavery"; but "because, through all the intermediate stages and all the compromises created not by themselves but by the course of historical development, they clearly see and constantly pursue their final goal."^[20]

In particular, as we announced earlier, the leader of the KKE Eliseos Vagenas deduces from the fact that

“fascism is a product of the system of exploitation, a choice of the bourgeoisie”, the conclusion that it would be “contrary to all revolutionary logic to believe, as some communist parties do, that the bourgeoisie, even of another country, can effectively propose to end fascism, but at the same time support by all means the “matrix” that gives rise to it, that is, the capitalist system. (...) This division of imperialist forces into “bad” (‘fascist’, ‘neo-fascist’) and “good” forces leads to calls for the formation of “anti-fascist fronts” in a classless direction, that is, in alliances without socio-class criteria, even with bourgeois forces and to align themselves with the supposedly “anti-fascist states”. This conception leads the communist movement, the working class to disarm, to renounce its historic mission... the way is opened to collaboration with opportunism, with social democracy and with bourgeois political forces, with sectors of the bourgeoisie. The way is opened to choosing between imperialists.”^[21]

Does this comrade mean to imply that the communists should not have supported the Popular Front, entered its government (which was bourgeois) and defended with arms in hand the Second Spanish bourgeois Republic against international fascism between 1936 and 1939?

Does he not feel moved by the historical fact that it was precisely through the formation of anti-fascist popular and national fronts that socialism spread to a third of humanity and international communism became a mass party?

Vagenas appeals to Lenin to decree that “the correct side of history, when imperialist ‘predators’ clash, is not to choose the side of the weaker ‘predator’ to take the place of the more powerful. The correct side of history is to choose the side of the people against the camp of the capitalists ... and to build the new socialist-communist society by disengaging ourselves from all imperialist alliances.”^[22]

Without flinching from the Trotskyist “matrix” of his logic, the KKE leader is contrasting Lenin with

Stalin because of the anti-fascist alliance that the latter concluded to win the Second World War. In fact, Vagenas’ logic also condemns Lenin, since Lenin also negotiated agreements with one imperialist against another, such as the Brest-Litovsk Peace Treaty, and he always defended a policy of alliances and a mass line based on dialectical materialism, as anyone can see from his writings *Two Tactics of Social Democracy in the Democratic Revolution*, *On “Left” Infantilism and the Petty-Bourgeois Spirit*, *The Infantile Disorder of “Leftism” in Communism*, etc.

The mechanistic and metaphysical logic of the “pyramidists” does not admit the unity of opposites, but only identity or the most rigid antinomy. Its drawback is that it runs into contradiction from the moment it attempts to put it into practice.

Thus, Aleka Papariga herself cannot fail to acknowledge that society is not divided exclusively between a completely separate proletariat and bourgeoisie, but that there are other social strata or classes, and that therefore “an alliance between the working class and the poor popular sectors of the objectively self-employed” is necessary. But she adds that this alliance “must develop in a firmly anti-monopoly, anti-capitalist direction, and be directed towards the acquisition of workers’ power.”

This direction corresponds to the objective interest of the working class, but not to that of those other strata or intermediate classes which, as Comrade Parariga notes, “are fluctuating by their nature (by their position in the capitalist economy), which have an interest in the abolition of monopolies, in the socialisation of concentrated means of production, while at the same time they are imbued with the illusion that they have an interest in small private property. They cannot understand that their long- and medium-term interests can be served only by socialist power.”^[23]

If they cannot understand this, then it is absurd because it is impossible to pretend to achieve an alliance on this basis. Let us see what solution the

leader of the KKE offers to this contradiction: “The illusion that any other compromise can be successful under conditions of monopoly capitalism, that is, in the imperialist phase of capitalism, is harmful, utopian, inefficient.” Therefore, she does not contemplate any way other than the rejection of all compromises and alliances that are really possible, the isolation of the proletariat and its disintegration because its peripheral layers are in contact with those intermediate layers.

Under the pretext of preserving the political independence of the working class in the face of opportunism, the “pyramidists” reject any compromise with other classes and for objectives more immediate than socialism. In this paranoid and suicidal way, Lenin disagreed with the struggle against opportunism:

“To prepare a recipe or a general rule (“no compromises”!) for all cases is absurd. One must have one’s own head in order to know how to orient oneself in each particular case. (...) Naive and totally inexperienced people imagine that it is enough to admit compromises in general, in order to remove all boundaries between opportunism, against which we are and must be fighting an uncompromising struggle, and revolutionary Marxism or Communism. But such people, if they do not yet know that all boundaries, in nature and in society, are variable and to a certain extent conventional, cannot be cured except by prolonged study, education, enlightenment and political and practical experience. (...) To wage war to overthrow the international bourgeoisie, a war a hundred times more difficult, prolonged and complex than the most bitter of current wars between states, and to renounce in advance all manoeuvring, all utilisation (even if only temporary) of the antagonism of interests existing between enemies, all agreements and compromises with possible allies (even if they are provisional, inconsistent, wavering, conditional)—is this not infinitely ridiculous? (...) The whole question is to know how to apply this

tactic in order to raise and not lower the general level of consciousness, revolutionary spirit, fighting capacity and victory of the proletariat.”^[24]

The solution to the contradiction in which Comrade Pappariga has found herself is in the part of her statement that corresponds to the reality of those intermediate layers or classes that “have an interest in the abolition of monopolies, in the socialization of the concentrated means of production.” If at least the “pyramidists” were consistent with their essentialist conception of imperialism, they would appreciate the contradiction between the monopolists and the rest of the capitalists, both within the imperialist countries and on an international scale. Alliances on this basis would not be sufficient to achieve socialism, but they would be absolutely necessary to weaken monopoly capitalism and to politically develop the working class as the leadership of the remaining oppressed masses.

Comrade Pappariga rightly demands that the struggle against capitalism and imperialist war be combined “with the struggle against opportunism... since the root of opportunism is found in the imperialist system itself because the bourgeoisie, when it realizes that it cannot manage its affairs with stability, relies on opportunism as a general vision, as a political party, in order to gain time to regroup the bourgeois political system, to undermine the constant growth of the revolutionary workers’ movement.”

But it is striking that this comrade reduces the fight against opportunism to mere denunciation and overlooks the economic root of opportunism that allows the bourgeoisie to use it against the workers’ movement, which can only be destroyed by the alliance of the proletariat with the liberation movement of the nations oppressed by the imperialists: “monopoly gives superprofits, that is, an excess of profits above the normal, ordinary profits of capitalism throughout the world. The capitalists can spend a part of these superprofits (and even a not small part!) to bribe their workers, creating something

like an alliance (...) of the workers of a given country with their capitalists against other countries. (...) On the one hand, there is the tendency of the bourgeoisie and the opportunists to turn the handful of richest, privileged nations into “eternal” parasites on the body of the rest of humanity, to “rest on their laurels” by exploiting Negroes, Indians, etc., by holding them down by means of modern militarism, equipped with a magnificent technique of extermination. On the other hand, there is the tendency of the masses, who are more oppressed than ever, who bear all the calamities of imperialist wars, to throw off this yoke, to overthrow the bourgeoisie. The history of the workers’ movement will now inevitably develop in the struggle between these two tendencies, for the first tendency is not accidental, but has an economic “foundation.”^[25]

Which of these two tendencies do the leaders of the KKE represent when they deny that the “handful of richer nations” exploit and parasitize the others, when they decree that all countries are imperialist to a greater or lesser extent? Which do they represent when they despise the struggle of nations for sovereignty and independence, including their own and that of other European nations, subjugated or directly occupied by the Yankees and subjected to their interests through the European Union? Without supporting all those who rise up against the states that dominate the planet, the struggle against imperialism and opportunism becomes an empty phrase and a deception. To contrast this national struggle with the proletarian struggle is to conceal how the Paris Commune and all the socialist revolutions that triumphed afterwards were unleashed.

It is good to “critically examine the errors, weaknesses and problematic approaches that influence” the ranks of the international communist movement, as Comrade Vagenas calls for at the end of his article. But we must do so in order to move forward and not backward. The criticism that the proletariat needs does not consist in resurrecting old and crude errors

that have been overcome by the Marxist-Leninist worldview and by revolutionary experience. A criticism such as that engendered by the theory of the “imperialist pyramid” only deserves to be criticized and repudiated in turn. It is an essential condition for liberating the energy, initiative and potential of the working class on the road to socialist revolution. We hope that the comrades of the KKE and other victims of dangerous dogmatic-sectarian errors will undertake a process of understanding and rectification in order to join forces in the common struggle against the imperialists and their opportunist agents.

Notes

[1] Letter from Marx to Schweitzer, from October 13, 1868

[2] https://www.iccr.gr/es/issue_article/Los-pretexos-de-justificacion-de-la-guerra-imperialista-son-una-cortina-de-humo-a-los-ojos-del-pueblo/

[3] The revolutionary proletariat and the right of nations to self-determination, Lenin. <https://www.marxists.org/espanol/lenin/obras/oc/akal/lenin-oc-tomo-23.pdf>, p. 41.

[4] Grundrisse der Kritik der politischen Ökonomie, Marx. https://www.nodo50.org/gpm/Einstein/Grundrisse_Tomo_I.pdf

[5] Philosophical Notebooks, Summary of Hegel’s book “Lectures on the History of Philosophy”, Lenin. <https://historiaycritica.wordpress.com/wp-content/uploads/2012/11/cuadernos-filosoficos1.pdf>, p. 235.

[6] The Communist Manifesto, Marx and Engels: [http://www.marx2mao.com/M2M\(SP\)/M&E\(SP\)/CM47s.html#en39](http://www.marx2mao.com/M2M(SP)/M&E(SP)/CM47s.html#en39)

[7] The catastrophe that threatens us and how to combat it, Lenin. <https://www.marxists.org/espanol/lenin/obras/oe3/lenin-obras-2-3.pdf>, p. 140.

[8] https://www.iccr.gr/es/issue_article/Las-guerras-imperialistas-y-las-tareas-de-los-comunistas/

[9] Critique of the Gotha Programme, Marx. <https://www.marxists.org/english/me/1870s/gotha/critique-of-the-gotha-programme.htm>

[10] See the detailed and accurate analysis of the issue in “Multipolarity” or Internationalist Anti-Imperialism, by Dimitrios Patelis. <https://waporgan.org/?p=2828>

[11] Letter to the Congress, Lenin. <https://www.marxists.org/english/lenin/works/1920s/testament.htm>

[12] The New Tendency of “Imperialist Economism,” Lenin. <https://www.marxists.org/english/lenin/works/1910s/8-1916.htm>

- [13] On Imperialism and the Imperialist Pyramid, Aleka Pappariga. <https://pcpe.es/sobre-el-imperialismo-y-la-piramide-imperialista/>
- [14] See Lenin's discussion with Bukharin at the March 19, 1919 session of the 8th Congress of the RCP(b) on the party program (marxists.org/espanol/lenin/obras/oc/akal/lenin-oc-tomo-31.pdf, pp. 35-36)
- [15] https://www.iccr.gr/es/issue_article/Las-guerras-imperialistas-y-las-tareas-de-los-comunistas/
- [16] Response to P. Kievsky (I. Piatakov), Lenin. <http://redstarpublishers.org/respuestakievski.pdf>
- [17] The Revolutionary Proletariat and the Right of Nations to Self-Determination, Lenin. Id. ut supra, p. 40.
- [18] Response to P. Kievsky (I. Piatakov), Lenin.
- [19] On imperialism and the imperialist pyramid, Aleka Pappariga.
- [20] The infantile disorder of "leftism" in communism, Lenin. [http://www.marx2mao.com/M2M\(SP\)/Lenin\(SP\)/LWC20s.html#s8](http://www.marx2mao.com/M2M(SP)/Lenin(SP)/LWC20s.html#s8)
- [21] https://www.iccr.gr/es/issue_article/Los-pretexos-de-justificacion-de-la-guerra-imperialista-son-una-cortina-de-humo-a-los-ojos-del-pueblo/
- [22] Ibid.
- [23] <https://pcpe.es/sobre-el-imperialismo-y-la-piramide-imperialista/>
- [24] The infantile disorder of "leftism" in communism, Lenin.
- [25] Imperialism and the Split of Socialism, Lenin. <https://www.marxists.org/english/lenin/works/1910s/10-1916.htm>

Can “anti-globalist” conservatism be the ideological basis of the anti-imperialist movement?

Dimitrios Patelis | Revolutionary Unification (Greece)

With the election and inauguration of Donald Trump, a particularly notable international far-right group of supporters of the once again ruling Republican Party, with the US “Tea Party” as its main constituency, has re-emerged. Many Trump supporters see him as a global “anti-systemic leader” who has supposedly “revived the idea of the nation-state”—in contrast to the “national nihilists/globalists”. A leader in whom they not only place their hopes for a world of “peace and multipolarity”, but also urge us to support him “to solidify the prospects of the current antiimperialist movement”!

These are symptoms of a clear deterioration of conscience and deep ideological and political confusion of a significant part of the people who consider themselves “anti-imperialist”.

The long-term propaganda and practice of the most dangerous opportunism/revisionism in the conditions of World War III (WWIII), led by the group that controls the “Communist” Party of Greece, has contributed to this confusion. The hostile attitude of this group towards any form of national liberation anti-imperialist struggle and the denunciation of anti-imperialism as “opportunism”, combined with the dominant post-modern neo-liberal ideologies, according to which nations are nothing but “social-symbolic constructions”, have led to a situation where the confusion and subversion of the movement has reached its peak.

Thus, in some “progressive” circles, any reference to concepts such as the nation, the homeland, national independence and popular sovereignty of imperialist-dependent peoples and countries is denounced as supposedly indicative of “nationalism/fascism”, while imperialist cosmopolitanism of the EU-NATO type is presented as supposedly “authentic internationalism”!

Where there is subversion, where there is a lack of a serious left, communist body capable of rallying the anti-imperialist sentiments rising in WWII into a victorious frontal struggle, the public management of these sentiments is handed over without a fight to be manipulated by the deeply entrenched regime forces of the extreme right and fascism.^[1] In the context of this manipulation, variants of fascism are promoted and perceived as “anti-systemic”, “radical”, “anti-imperialist” and “anti-globalist patriotic forces”, supposedly beyond the “outdated right-left dichotomy”, “above class antitheses and interests”, as the only forces supposedly “fighting for the values of the ancestors, for altars and hearths”!

Contrary to such deceptions, ideological manipulations and confusion that de facto strengthen the US-NATO-EU axis, the World Anti-Imperialist Platform has scientifically and objectively documented the character of WWIII as a conflict between the forces of

- a) the imperialist axis of aggression led by the USA and
- b) socialism and anti-imperialism.

Especially as far as the USA is concerned, it is unthinkable to expect serious changes in the strategy, in the terms of engagement of this imperialist state, the “collective capitalist” (Marx), the most aggressive forces of the financial oligarchy, in WWIII.

However, with the intensive manipulation of the dominant ideological and propaganda mechanisms, a certain type of “public opinion” has been formed, which, while considering class (socio-economic) antitheses as “obsolete”, in the spirit of an extreme subjective idealism, perceives WWIII as a battlefield of certain ideas, values and norms, as an existentially important ideological and political confrontation of “darkness vs. light”, which is reduced to the following

opposition—dipole:

1. Globalists, national nihilists—advocates of “multiculturalism”, the “woke agenda & culture”, rights activism, the endless “construction & reconstruction of gender etc. identities”, the “inclusivity towards of all differences and identities” (as well as DEI corporate frameworks & mandates), and

2. Anti-globalist nationalists, statist, advocates of the nation-state, of “national unity”, of “traditional ancestral values of the fatherland, of religion and of the [patriarchal] family”, of primordial history, of “land and blood”, of “conservative believers in the traditional values of the nation”, and so on.

The result is an audience addicted to unquestioningly swallowing, digesting and propagating any irrational nationalist, conspiracist, cosmopolitan, etc. nonsense, to accepting as “fact” and “explanatory cheat sheet” whatever seems to “light the way” and strengthen “their own” side in this “dark vs light” dichotomy. Here, as in every mainstream debate based on pack mentality, sensationalism through conditioned reflexes replaces rational judgement. The catchphrase, any primitive, easily digestible, vulgar slogan, replaces any claim to scientific substantiation.

In the USA, with its historically established traditions of extreme individualism, competitiveness and political illiteracy, the above ideological-political dichotomy has been channeled and consolidated in the one-party system that is very convenient for the oligarchy of capital, the alternating versions of which are ensured by the ostensible “bipartisanship”. This bipolarity now permeates the entire superstructure, the state as a whole, the deep state and the criminal underworld, the mechanisms of the capitalist media, the entertainment industry, religion, etc.

Today exist there:

1. the Democratic Party (primarily representing the interests of the financial oligarchy, organically linked to the global “bubble” of “virtual capital”), which is the main carrier of the ideologies of the “globalists”; and

2. the Republican Party (which at present mainly

represents the interests of those sections of the oligarchy linked to real estate, the mining sector, the remnants of US manufacturing, the Elon Musk-type state-sponsored high-tech monopolies, etc.), which is the main vehicle of the “anti-globalists”.

This dipole is not just for domestic consumption. On the contrary, especially since the 1980s, it has become a “key export product”, a model for imposing the agenda of ideological-political fermentation and debate on a global scale, a “bed of Procrustes” for reform into regime positions—a mutation of “public narratives”—ideologies of transnational scope.

It is from the USA, etc., that the main lines of takeover, corruption, degeneration and manipulation emanate through massive funding, through overt and covert sponsorship of “academic” institutions and bodies, through a methodical transnational NGO-isation of parties, organisations, trade unions, etc., precisely in the spirit of this dipole.

In fact, in violation of every factual and logical principle, the ideological and political narrative of the Democrats is presented, in the context of the “bipartisan” rhetorical squabble as a model of the “left”, supposedly progressive, or even “Marxist”, which the Republicans go so far as to denounce as a vector of “radical & alien European ideas aimed at undermining the traditional values of the white majority”, and even going so far as to label its politicians as “communists”!

In this spirit, Trump’s resurgence is projected by some as an “anti-systemic revolution” against the “deep state” of the Democrats!

The confusion over these irrational and dangerous ideologies is exacerbated by the fact that they have been blatantly reproduced for decades in the propaganda figures of the mainstream media and the political leadership of the newly formed bourgeoisie of today’s Russia, in the context of the pursuit of a nebulous “multipolarity”.^[2] The uncritical adoption and systematic promotion of this American-style agenda is indicative not only of the inherent counterrevolutionary and comprador character of the newly formed ruling class, but also of the

omnipresence of powerful “fifth column” enclaves of Western interests within the current Russian establishment.

This is particularly true of those shades of ideology that are organically and openly linked not only to versions of mysticism, obscurantism, regression and reaction, but also to versions of fascist practices and ideological constructions. Examples of this are the cases of official reception and systematic over-promotion of far-right figures and politicians (Le Pen, Alternative for Germany [AfD], Northern League, Freedom Party of Austria, etc.) as “pro-Russian” and “anti-American”. In addition, attempts are being made to establish the geopolitical claims of certain centres/poles on the basis of reactionary, conspiracist tendencies of “anti-globalisation”, “conservative values”, ecclesiastical, parachurch and theological structures, pan-Slavism, pan-Turkism, any nationalist “great idea” (irredentism) and so on.

This policy is extremely destructive, not only for the genuinely anti-imperialist movement, but also for bourgeois Russia itself. Its architects are probably unaware of the following: especially in the NATO member countries, the entire extreme right-wing formations function from the outset as an instrument of the secret services and their tentacles in the deep state and non-state structures, imbued with long-standing anti-Soviet/anti-communist propaganda, which is now being turned against Russia, the DPRK, the PRC, etc. The proof lies in the attitude of all parliamentary far-right formations whenever the issue of NATO and US strategic interests in WWII and beyond is raised. The cases of the pro-Mussolini government of Meloni in Italy and of Orban in Hungary, also a friend of Trump, are illustrative.

Typical is the over-promotion of the notorious irrationalist “philosopher” Alexandr Dugin,^[3] propagandist of a hodgepodge of eclectic doctrines of a fascist bent, centred on anti-Sovietism/anti-communism, the resurrection of the reactionary doctrines of the Slavophiles of the 18th and 19th centuries, the “Black Hundreds”, precursors of tsarist monarcho-fascism, a primitive version of Russian

nationalism, Orthodox mysticism and the portrayal of Russia as the bearer of a metaphysical mission of “Eurasianism”.^[4]

The links between these circles and the Nazi terrorist organisation Golden Dawn in Greece and a host of far-right, nationalist and fascist groups from Turkey and many other countries are anything but coincidental.

As part of his “anti-Western” narrative, Dugin—fundamentally incapable of originality—is quick to justify Samuel Huntington’s reactionary ideology of the “Clash of Civilisations”^[5] (also a product of plagiarism)! Dugin could only see the development and expansion of the BRICS as a “vindication” of Huntington’s theories! Since the early 1990s, he has been pushing the idea of a “war against Islam” in the context of the need for the “superior Western civilisation” under the US to achieve global hegemony. In the spirit of this racist Huntingtonian filth about the existence of self-existing, incompatible and hostile/rival cultures by default, Dugin is promoted as the self-appointed ideological spokesman for Russia in WWII.

He portrays WWII as an allegedly inevitable “war of civilisations”! Similar reactionary and obscurantist ideologies are designed to undermine the formation of a potential anti-imperialist movement by concealing the class nature of the conflict, imperialist super-exploitation, neo-colonialism and the instrumentalisation of fascism/racism by imperialism.

Instead of Hitler’s “Aryan race” and Huntington’s “hegemony of Western civilisation under the USA”, the Eurasianist monarcho-fascist Dugin puts forward his own adaptation of the chauvinist scenario about the “superiority and necessity of the supremacy of Slavic and Orthodox civilisation under the Holy and Monarchist Tsarist Russia”!

The absurdity of the monarcho-fascist Dugin culminates in his elation over Trump’s election and his proposal for the “simultaneous establishment of monarchy in Russia and the USA” under the “enlightened leaders” Putin and Trump respectively!

Even more ridiculous were the public celebrations of the “ultra-patriots” Dugin & Malofeyev at Trump’s inauguration, while he was threatening Russia with destruction if it did not accept US terms. At the same time, Trump’s chosen one Elon Musk (an avowed friend and sponsor of both Meloni in Italy and the “pro-Russian” Alternative for Germany) was giving Nazi salutes on a worldwide broadcast! Furthermore, he and the leader of the far-right AfD party called Hitler a “communist” before making an unprecedented attempt to exonerate Nazism during a speech at the congress of the same fascist-leaning party!

Striving for the formation of a pole based on “national Russian exclusivity”, the “Russian idea”, a metaphysical “special mission of the Russian people”, the “Russian world”—even in a highly multi-ethnic state like the present Russian Federation—indicates a nationalist, expansionist and chauvinist position. A position that can only provoke the aversion of peoples to such “alliances”.

There can be no anti-imperialist front, no serious struggle for independence based on bourgeois geopolitical narratives of “multipolarity”, borrowing from the resurrection of obscurantist “Eurasian” mysticism of the 19th century, adding “philosophical depth” from the irrational delusions of the likes of Dugin! Russian expansionist nationalism/chauvinism of a monarcho-fascist bent cannot be proposed as an alternative to anti-Sovietism/anti-communism, which has developed today into the Russophobic and Sinophobic hysteria of the imperialists.

It is in this spirit, the conspiracist rhetoric of the far right of the US “Tea Party” and its followers, is being launched internationally in different flavours, to suit every taste. They propose a package of ideologies that combines “anti-globalisation” with nationalism/racism, religiosity, “anti-illegal immigrant” sentiments, conspiracist “explanations” of the manufacturing and spread of SARS-CoV-2 by “Chinese communists”, with “the fight against microchip injections” (which is “orchestrated by Bill Gates, the World Health Organisation, the Chinese

communists”, etc.), metaphysical technophobic hysteria against 5G telecommunications networks, against “aerial spraying” and other goodies for the genre’s aficionados.

The last thing the proponents of such fantasies are interested in is whether they correspond with reality or are scientifically proven to be feasible. Obviously, this audience is not limited to some fringe cult-like circles.

The capitalist circles that promote such ideologies do so with cynicism in the context of the opportunism and pragmatism that characterise them: as an ex-posteriori ideological wrapping of their preconceived, self-serving practices.

This was demonstrated on a practical level by the way the Russian leadership defended Syria by employing at best wavering and at worse convulsive balancing moves between mutually exclusive interests. The Syrian leadership, the US-NATO-EU “partners”, Iran, the untrustworthy friends Turkey & the Zionist formation (the “friend Tayip Erdogan” & the “friend Benjamin Netanyahu”), etc. in an unprecedented showcase of the fickle interests of the oligarchy (e.g. it is rumoured that 8 out of 10 Russian oligarchs have Israeli passports). Thus, while Russia had an air and naval base there (also a legacy of the USSR, a concrete testimony of support for the anti-colonial Arab anti-imperialism of the Baath Arab Socialist Party), with the most technologically advanced anti-aircraft and missile defence systems, the USA, NATO and Israel have been allowed to attack military and civilian targets in Syria unhindered for ten years, while it is the Russian leadership that forced the invasion of Turkish troops into northern Syria to create a “border security zone”, initially with mixed Russian-Turkish patrols. Finally, the implacable friends have jointly dismantled and occupied Syria, which marks a strategic victory for the imperialist axis in the West Asian theatre of operations, putting Palestine, Lebanon, Iran, Yemen, etc. in existential danger. Hence the rather cold military part of the Russia-Iran summit agreement of 17 January 2025.

Who can be inspired by such ideological and

practical “consistency”?

The above also serves as evidence of the result of the ahistorical and unscientific detachment, over-inflation and absolutisation of the nation-state and globalisation dipole from the overall framework of global relations (primarily the relations of production) and the elevation of this dipole to a “main contradiction of our time”, indeed above class antitheses, above the left versus right, fascism versus antifascism antithesis.

As the vice-president of the Central Committee of the CPRF, D. Novikov rightly and often points out, today many people are quick to replace the scientific approach to society, the socio-economic formation approach of Marxist historical materialism, with the bourgeois “approach of separate cultures”. He points out that today “much is said about the clash of civilisations. But [...] we must not forget about class struggle, the class approach, the methods of analysis of Marx, Engels and Lenin. There is much here that is important and interesting for understanding the modern world and assessing its prospects”.^[6]

Elementary scientific knowledge of Marxist political economy and social theory makes it clear that there are no equivalent, co-equal or equipotent nation-states and/or ideas about them. Nations, states, regional integrations, coalitions, etc. (and the accompanying ideas about them) function as organic elements of highly unequal, exploitative economic (political, military, cultural, etc.) relations on a global scale in which the colossal mechanisms of the multi-national monopoly corporations play a decisive role. The agents of capital, where appropriate, promote slogans in favour of nationalism, chauvinism, racism, etc. (like every Trump, Bolsonaro, Milei, Meloni, Orban, etc.) or in favour of “globalist” cosmopolitanism (like the US Democrats, the herd of Soros’ omnipresent flock, etc.) in order to promote their cynical class interests, as two sides of the same coin, the basically identical self-interests of the oligarchy of capital.

Any difference between these poles lies in the respective emphases and hierarchies of individual capital and the resulting manipulative expediencies,

rather than in the broader and deeper strategic interests of the “collective capitalist”, the state of the imperialist centre in question.

They do this in order to disguise the class mechanism of capital’s exploitation at national, regional and global levels, while at the same time seeking to conceal the increasingly hideously destructive nature of capital’s rule and to prevent any thought of the only alternative prospect for the survival of society: the revolutionary unification of humanity (socialism-communism), for which the necessary and sufficient conditions are maturing to an unprecedented degree at all levels of:

- the creative potential of scientific and technological progress for the benefit of humanity,
- the development of the subject of labour,
- the necessity for planning within production and its effects on nature and society,
- the prevention of ecological and/or wartime destruction, the way out into space, etc.

Here, of course, the national question also has an extremely important role to play, not in isolation, but organically integrated into the strategic objective of the above-mentioned unification, insofar as the struggles of peoples and regions for popular/national sovereignty, against imperialism and neo-colonialism constitute an essential aspect of the global class struggle, an indispensable element of the global revolutionary process. This is primarily the struggle of peoples and countries with an average or below-average level of development, with corresponding positions and roles in the global matrix of the balance of forces, among which the “weak links”—especially in the conditions of WWII—emerge as fertile ground for the eruption of revolutionary situations.

On the contrary, when the “greatness” of a nation-state of the metropolises of the global imperialist system and especially of the hegemonic superpower of the imperialist axis of aggression is put forward, this clearly refers to the most aggressive, inhuman and destructive forces of the global capitalist-imperialist system. It is naive at best to align oneself with the section of the multinational multi-branch monopoly

capital represented by Trump (in the latter's pursuit of "making the USA great again", i.e. reversing the decline of the US pole of this capital, struggling to consolidate and extend its parasitic domination with new massacres) and to harbour illusions about serving national and international "revolutionary objectives" in this way!

The programmatic claims of Trump and the government of the oligarchy he has set up to "make America great again" are clear:

- US hegemony through military and economic power,
- Imposition of annual war spending of 5% of GDP on NATO members,
- economic warfare through the imposition of 100% tariffs on imports from the BRICS countries and 25% from Canada and Mexico,
- reassertion of the dominance of the dollar as the global reserve currency and of US-controlled intergovernmental institutions with claims to global governance,
- repatriation of industrial manufacturing operations of the US monopoly groups to US territory, recovery and establishment of hegemony in advanced technologies (military-industrial complex, artificial intelligence, microelectronics, aerospace, biotechnologies, nanotechnologies, etc.), through the direct merging/reassignment of key government positions and roles to prominent representatives of the capital oligarchy,
- attempt to entrap, temporarily appease or buy off the Russian oligarchy,
- focus on war in East Asia (DPRK, PRC),
- overt expansion with a series of annexations/expropriations aimed at seizing strategic natural resources (from Canada and Greenland, which can ensure an unequalled long-term self-sufficiency in natural resources as well as access to the resources of the North Pole on par with Russia) for the purposes of war, and re-industrialisation,
- control of the strategic maritime arteries (Arctic Belt, Mexico, Panama, etc.), all the oceans and the Mediterranean,

- subjugation—regime change and total control of Latin America,

- strengthening the criminal Zionist formation and further instrumentalisation of the "Kurdish factor" for the joint destruction of the axis of resistance in West and Central Asia (with Iran, its allies and the post-Soviet space as the main target),

- promoting ethnic cleansing in the territories occupied by Israel, with a massive increase in the supply of its war machine while "urging" Jordan and Egypt "to take the Palestinians from Gaza",

- faith in "traditional values" with the institutional abolition of the "woke agenda", etc.

Therefore, when some people confuse the strategic aims of the regime of the above monopoly groups with anti-imperialism, with the interests of the oppressed peoples, the working class and the revolution, it is clear whose interests they are serving and what kind of useful idiots they are fishing for in the murky waters of the systemic crisis of WWII...

How much of a "progressive force" is the fascist-like to outright fascist flock of Trump supporters, or their counterpart of "democratic" war hawks?

Hence, there are people and organisations who see events in the US and the world in the light of an extremely dangerously oversimplified bipolar "globalist"—"anti-globalist", "liberal multiculturalist"—"conservative believer in the age-old values of the nation" and so on, as a "revolution" of the latter against the US "deep state". This confusion is echoed by the Kremlin's official propaganda figures.

This, of course, requires zero reference to the class basis of the poles in question and to the fact that both stand for versions of the fascisation of the declining superpower at the head of the Euro-Atlantic axis in crisis and war. There is no reference to the global mechanism of exploitation / siphoning off of monopoly super-profits by the imperialist powers of the axis led by the USA and the global devastation they prescribe, especially as their decline, wavering and decay under the conditions of the imperialist WWII becomes more and more obvious.

Humanity and the progressive movement are called upon to face the problems, the solution of which is impossible without the science of the Logic of History, without the global political economy of the modern stage of imperialism, without the study of the global mechanism of super-exploitation, regional imperialist integrations, capital flows, etc.

Some, like the opportunist group that controls the “Communist” Party of Greece, reproduce metaphysically mindless schemes of Althusserian origin about supposed “national socio-economic formations”, among which they see “interdependencies”, mechanistic “pyramids”, “unions”, “alliances”, etc. ...

In the absence of revolutionary theory and methodology, the way is open for any kind of irrationalism and for the strengthening of reactionary geopolitical, racist, etc. schemes and doctrines...

The World Anti-Imperialist Platform is working on all levels (theoretical, ideological, practical and organisational) to coordinate the forces of anti-imperialism and socialism into a victorious front capable of crushing the mortal danger of the US-led imperialist axis of aggression.

This struggle requires great vigilance on the ideological level in order to disentangle consciences from extremely dangerous, artificial, confusing and manipulative dipole traps such as “globalisation vs. anti-globalisation”, “extreme postmodern neoliberalism vs. extreme postmodern neoconservative traditionalism of primordial values”, etc.

The creative development/application of revolutionary theory is an imperative task for communists and an indispensable condition for the reconstitution of the global communist movement of the time as the vanguard of the revolutionary anti-imperialist movement and the socialist prospect.

Notes

[1] See also: 1. On the relationship between imperialism and fascism during WWII. D. Patelis. Platform № 9, February 2024, p. 36-43. 2. The destruction of fascism in 1945 as a legacy for the defeat of the present axis of the USA–NATO–EU! D. Patelis. Platform № 12, May 2024, p. 38-46

[2] See also: “Multipolarity” or internationalist anti-imperialism, Dimitrios Patelis, Platform № 4, September 2023, p. 42-57

[3] The over-promotion of Dugin and of controlled media (e.g. Tsargrad.tv) is based on lavish sponsorship—high “patronage” on behalf of monarcho-fascist circles of the Russian oligarchy of capital (of the Konstantin Malofeyev type). These circles also seem to sponsor and direct an international network of circles with similar “values” and ideologies, with luxurious publications of Dugin’s books and other activities. This kind of “generous sponsorship” of course pales in comparison to the torrent of resources flowing from the US-NATO-EU transnational channels of takeover & corruption, but it does have some reach and impact. It is enough for the eligible recipients of such donations to adopt a sufficiently flexible ideological framework of abstract to “de-ideologised” anti-American, anti-Western and pro-Russian attitudes. Necessary conditions are: 1. the emphasis on preventing economic and military support for Ukraine; 2. if not the elimination, at least the mitigation of any overtly critical reference to nationalist and monarcho-fascist versions of extreme right-wing “anti-American—anti-Western” attitudes in Russia and around the world; and 3. the separation of this kind of “anti-imperialism” from a radical socialist orientation, from the communist prospect.

[4] “Eurasianism” (Russian: евразийство) is an ideological-political pro-monarchist doctrine of metaphysical and irrational mystification of the “unrivalled Russian civilisation”, popular among Russian expatriates of the defeated “White Guard” after the October Revolution, most of whom collaborated with fascism-Nazism from the interwar period and participated in the then Axis offensive against the USSR. According to this doctrine, Russia does not belong to the European or Asian category, but to the geopolitical concept of Eurasia, and as such is destined to be entrusted with a global soteriological hegemonic mission of a geostrategic nature, as the core and heart of Eurasia, as the cradle of primordial, eternal values and orthodox religious traditions (with Moscow as the successor of Constantinople, as the ‘Third Rome’), ideally formed into a multiethnic empire—superpowerful, absolutist monarchy under God.

[5] Huntington, Samuel P. The Clash of Civilisations? Foreign Affairs; Summer 1993; 72, 3; The so-called “political scientist” Samuel P. Huntington (1927-2008) was one of the most reactionary representatives of the American academic and ideological-political establishment, far right, xenophobic and racist, a supporter of the “apartheid” policy and of “white supremacy” in South Africa. His ideology of the war of civilisations was also the product of plagiarism and propagandistic adaptation of older forms of reactionary bourgeois metaphysical philosophy, such as that of the Russian Nikolai Yakovlevich Danilevsky (Russian. Nikolai Яковлевич Данилевский (1822-1885), the German Oswald Spengler (1880-1936), the British apologist of imperialism and colonialism Arnold Toynbee (1889-1975) and others.

[6] Заместитель Председателя ЦК КПРФ Дмитрий Новиков о лукавстве западных поборников «сохранения единства России» и об актуальности марксизма-ленинизма (в программе «Время покажет»), 6 февраля 2024.

Comments on the Arrest and Detention of Yoon and “January 19 Riot”

Stephen Cho | Coordinator of the Korean International Forum

January 19, 2025

1. On January 19, 2025, a detention warrant was issued for the “Republic of Korea (ROK)” President Yoon Suk-yeol. Following his failed attempt at a pro-presidential coup d’état on December 3, 2024, where he declared martial law, he was suspended from the presidential office after the National Assembly passed a motion for his impeachment on December 14 for charges of treason, insurrection, and inducement of foreign aggression. On December 31 and January 7, the joint investigation headquarters consisting of the Corruption Investigation Office for High-ranking Officials (CIO), Police, etc., issued arrest warrants on two separate occasions, and after much difficulty, he was captured on January 15. Yoon obstructed the execution of the arrest warrant by mobilizing the Presidential Security Service (PSS), resulting in the largest-ever arrest operation. Yoon, who was detained at the Seoul Detention Center, requested the court to review the legality of the arrest, but the court denied his petition on January 16. On January 17, the CIO filed for a warrant of detention, and on January 19, the court issued the warrant following an investigation to determine its validity. As expected of the former Prosecutor General, Yoon attempted to obstruct all law enforcement actions and invoked various legal remedies, but all of his attempts failed.

2. On January 19, the moment Yoon’s detention warrant was issued, the far-right reactionary crowd supporting him turned into a mob and stormed the Seoul Western District Court that issued the warrant, smashing windows and destroying office furniture. During the riot, a police officer was lynched by the mob and injured, and an MBC (Munhwa Broadcasting Corporation—one of the major television and

radio broadcasters in the “ROK”) reporter was also attacked, with the camera being broken. Such a riot, in which the crowd stormed the courthouse, wielding violence, damaging the building, and injuring people, is the first of its kind in the “ROK” history. The Democratic Party has labeled this as a “second insurrection.”

3. The unprecedented courthouse storming riot—the “January 19 Riot”—was incited by Yoon Suk-yeol, the leader of the insurrection, along with far-right reactionary pastor Jeon Kwang-hoon and far-right reactionary People Power Party (PPP) lawmaker Yoon Sang-hyun, as well as actively supported by far-right YouTubers. Jeon Kwang-hoon is an extreme right-wing pastor who blamed the December crash of Jeju Air, which killed 179 people, on “leftists” and “Satan.” Yoon Sang-hyun was the son-in-law of the military fascist Chun Doo-hwan, who was responsible for the Gwangju Massacre in 1980. Yoon Sang-hyun directly incited the riot by telling far-right youth that they would be released immediately on warning even if they were arrested by the police for storming the courthouse. On January 17, PPP lawmaker Kim Min-jeon organized a press conference at the National Assembly with the “Anti-Communist Youth Corps,” also known as the “Baekgoldan” (White Skull Squad), which caused great controversy. The model for the “Anti-Communist Youth Corps” was the “Northwest Youth Association,” which played a leading role in the 1948 Jeju Massacre. The “National Anti-Communist Youth Corps” was a youth organization that took the forefront in the 1960 election fraud orchestrated by Syngman Rhee. The “Baekgoldan” was a political gangster organization formed by Syngman Rhee in

1952, and later became a police gangster organization responsible for violently killing student and labor protesters after the 1980s.

4. The term “January 19 riot” is referred to as “disturbance” in legal terminology. “Disturbance” falls under the definition of “Incident,” meaning “when there are belligerency or serious disturbances of social order that considerably impede the performance of the administrative and judicial functions of the State”. It is one of the two key conditions for declaring emergency martial law, along with “in time of war.” The Counter-Intelligence Agency cites the October 1979 Uprising (the Busan-Masan Uprising) as an example, where emergency martial was declared due to a “civil disturbance.” It implies that it is not impossible for acting President Choi Sang-mok to declare a second martial law. Although the National Assembly could vote to lift it, it should be noted that, unlike the first martial law attempt in the absence of a “state of war,” the current situation, which involves “disturbance,” makes the conditions for declaring martial law relatively satisfied.

5. Currently, Yoon Suk-yeol is awaiting the ruling of the Constitutional Court. Legal experts commonly expect that the ruling will be made within approximately two months, with a 100% likelihood of an admission. If that happens, Yoon will be dismissed from the presidency, and disciplinary measures will be finalized. Afterward, as punitive measures, a court trial will proceed regarding charges of treason, insurrection, and inducement of foreign aggression. The crime of insurrection is punishable only by death, with the method of execution specifically defined as a firing squad. It is important to note that, due to the severity of the crimes of treason, insurrection, and inducement of foreign aggression, they are exceptions to the president’s immunity from arrest, which is why Yoon was urgently arrested and is currently detained in a detention center.

6. On December 31, 2024, it was revealed by the Democratic Party’s insurrection fact-finding team that Yoon directly led the Office of National Security (ONS) and the Drone Operations Command in executing the drone attack on Pyongyang on three days of October 3, 9, and 10, 2024. The drones’ continuous incursions into Pyongyang, dropping leaflets, clearly crossed the red line established by the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea (DPRK). However, the DPRK did not respond at all, with its “strategic patience.” Had the DPRK taken corresponding military action, a localized war would have broken out immediately. If that had occurred, it would have fallen under the category of “wartime,” meeting the requirements for emergency martial law. The localized war itself could have escalated into the war in the “ROK”, but even if that didn’t happen, the declaration of emergency martial law would have provoked a response from the DPRK, eventually leading to an outbreak of the war in the “ROK”. In other words, the war in the “ROK” could have erupted in October 2024. The side that threatened peace in the Korean Peninsula and East Asia is the “ROK,” while the side that preserved it is the DPRK.

7. The Special Investigation Headquarters of the prosecution revealed, through the indictment of the former Minister of National Defense Kim Yong-hyun, who is a principal offender in the insurrection, that Yoon had issued a shooting order to the martial law forces during the December 3 martial law period, stating “shoot if necessary,” and he also remarked, “We can implement the 2nd and 3rd martial law”. Even after the National Assembly voted to lift the martial law, it was confirmed, through CCTV evidence and other sources, that there was an attempt to arrest the National Assembly Speaker, the key decision-maker in the parliamentary vote, if he went back home, and to declare the second martial law.

8. During the process of Yoon’s arrest and detention,

far-right reactionaries were united under the direction of the US. Specifically, the Presidential Office, the PPP, conservative media, and far-right YouTubers engaged in a series of reckless statements and actions that denied the rule of law and democracy. This escalated to the point where they even occupied the courts and engaged in riotous behavior. In the colonial “ROK,” the only force capable of mobilizing and organizing all these far-right reactionaries at once is the imperialist US, which holds military, political, and economic control.

9. The “ROK” is transitioning from insurrection to civil war. It is still in a state of insurrection. Although the National Assembly and the government lifted the first martial law, the arrest and detention of Yoon have intensified the ongoing conflict between the “pro-Yoon,” fascist, and reactionary forces on one side and the “anti-Yoon,” democratic, and progressive forces on the other. As these conflicts deepen into violent clashes and riots, the declaration of a second martial law becomes more likely under the pretext of this “disturbance.” If this is followed by the military opening fire on the citizens protesting the martial law, it will recreate the 1980 Gwangju Massacre as the “2025 Seoul Massacre.” Just as the citizen militia of Gwangju organized and fought against the martial law troops, Seoul’s citizens will do the same. It will be a civil war. The “January 19 riot” is the signal of the coming civil war.

10. If Yoon is deposed from the presidency two months later by the Constitutional Court’s decision, an early presidential election will be held within two months, where Democratic Party candidate Lee Jae-myung is expected to be elected unless there is a surprise. Suppose the Democratic Party wins the presidency as well as an overwhelming majority of the National Assembly. In that case, the special counsel bills to probe insurrection, and Kim Geon-hee (Yoon’s spouse accused of corruption) will

be passed by the National Assembly without the President exercising his veto power. If that happens, most People Power Party politicians will be detained while investigating the treason, insurrection, and inducement of foreign aggression incidents and “Myung Tae-kyun Gate.” Afterward, the PPP will be fatally wounded as a political force and unable to avoid disbanding.

11. Civil war is the only way out for the insurrection cliques. They will likely be sentenced to heavy punishment for charges such as insurrection crimes, and their very existence as a political force is at risk due to their expected defeat in the early presidential election. The insurrection cliques, whose downfall is already certain, will do whatever it takes to shake things up and turn the situation around in order to survive.

12. The war in the “ROK” is not an option but a necessity for imperialism. For the imperialist powers instigating World War 3, the war in the “ROK” is like a detonator in East Asia, the main battlefield of World War 3. If the war in the “ROK” breaks out, the war in Taiwan will likely erupt at the same time, and if Japan and the Philippines join in, it will become a war in East Asia. If Australia and New Zealand were added, it would turn into the Western Pacific War. The war in the “ROK” is the optimal move for imperialism, which aims to escalate World War 3 in earnest. In other words, the storm of World War 3, triggered by imperialism, is sweeping from Eastern Europe through West Asia and heading toward East Asia. In fact, in February 2022, the war in Ukraine broke out in Eastern Europe; in October 2023, the war in Palestine erupted in West Asia (the Middle East); and in October 2024, the war in the “ROK” almost broke out.

13. Civil war is a way to survive for insurrection cliques, and the war in the “ROK” is the imperialist’s

scheme. When combining civil war in the “ROK” with a localized conflict against the DPRK, it becomes the war in the “ROK.” The “ROK” has the historical experience of starting its civil war in 1948 domestically, going through the localized conflict against the DPRK in 1949, and then witnessing the outbreak of the Korean War in 1950. Today, the “ROK” is precisely following the process of internal confrontations among the masses, riots, a second martial law, and gun firing that will lead to civil war. The process of civil war, localized conflict, and the Korean War that occurred between 1948 and 1950 is being condensed and reenacted today. The “ROK” is closer to civil war and the war in the “ROK” than ever before.

14. While the Korean War in 1950 marked the beginning of the “Cold War,” the war in the “ROK” in 2025 will mark the beginning of the “New Cold War.” The commonality between these two wars is that both then and now, the “ROK” is an “out-and-out anti-communist outpost” of the US, which is “the most reactionary state that regards anti-communism as its invariable state policy.” US imperialism has defined the DPRK, China, Russia, and Iran as the “New Axis of Aggressors” and is pushing for a “New Cold War” system through World War 3.

15. The anti-imperialist camp is advancing on two key strategic theaters, Eastern Europe and East Asia, among the three major theaters of war. The great victors of the December Uprising, the “ROK” people, will crush the plots for civil war and local conflicts through anti-fascist and anti-imperialist uprisings, protecting peace in the region and advancing the new world of people’s democracy. The People’s Democracy Party, the sole subjective force of the “ROK” revolution, will proudly fulfill its historic mission as the locomotive of the uprising.

Korean people will prevent civil war and the war in the “Republic of Korea”, bringing forward a new world of people’s democracy

Stephen Cho | Coordinator of the Korean International Forum

January 28, 2025

The essence of the December 3 martial law in the “Republic of Korea (ROK)” is the self-coup by the pro-US fascist group.

The coup, orchestrated and supported by imperialist America, was carried out alongside war preparations against the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea (DPRK). However, when the DPRK’s “strategic patience” prevented the escalation of a localized war, the coup was declared without meeting the martial law condition of a “wartime” situation. Consequently, it ultimately failed due to mass anti-government protests involving millions, the National Assembly’s resolution to lift martial law, and the impeachment that suspended the president’s authority. Among the newly revealed facts, some are particularly significant as they are closely linked to the unfolding dynamics of World War 3.

On December 31, 2024, the National Assembly’s Special Committee on Insurrection Investigation revealed that President Yoon had directly commanded the Drone Operations Command through the National Security Office and carried out drone attacks on Pyongyang on October 3, 9, and 10. The attacks at that time were not mere military provocations in terms of their purpose, scale, and method; rather, they were at a level aimed at triggering an actual war. In other words, a war in the “ROK” nearly broke out in October 2024. Had the DPRK not taken the highly unusual stance of remaining unresponsive and maintaining its position of “strategic patience,” the war would have erupted at that moment.

Had the war in the “ROK” erupted at that moment, it would have marked the war in the “ROK” of October 2024, following the war in Ukraine of February 2022

and the war in Palestine of October 2023. These three regions—Eastern Europe, West Asia (the Middle East), and East Asia—are volatile flashpoints where regional conflicts could escalate into full-scale wars. This reality demonstrates that imperialist forces have designated these three areas as the primary battlefields of World War 3, systematically expanding the war theater from Eastern Europe to West Asia and finally to East Asia.

The war in the “ROK” is the trigger for the East Asian war. If the war in the “ROK” breaks out, the war in Taiwan will inevitably follow. If Japan and the Philippines join, it escalates into a broader East Asian war, and if Australia and New Zealand added, it extends into a Western Pacific war. Just as Volodymyr Zelensky in Ukraine in Eastern Europe and Benjamin Netanyahu in Israel in West Asia have been known, the world has now come to recognize Yoon Suk-yeol in the “ROK” as a fascist maniac and warmonger in East Asia. Like Zelensky and Netanyahu, Yoon is also backed by imperialist forces.

The US imperialist conducted 132 joint US-“ROK” war exercises against the DPRK over 20-year period from 2003 to 2022. However, this number surged to 123 exercises in just one year in 2023, and in the first ten months of 2024 alone, a ‘new record’ was set with 130 exercises. In other words, since the outbreak of the war in Ukraine in 2022, and especially from 2023—the year when the war in Palestine broke out—until 2024, the US has engaged in an utterly frenzied onslaught of war exercises against the DPRK.

In August 2023, at the Camp David Summit, the leaders of the US, Japan, and the “ROK” effectively formed a “Northeast Asian NATO.” Later, in July

2024, at the NATO Summit in Washington, they essentially declared the “Pacification of NATO.” In March, June, and August 2024, the US and its allies conducted the largest-ever war exercises against the DPRK under the names “Freedom Shield”, “Freedom Edge”, and “Ulchi Freedom Shield.” Then, from June to August, they carried out continuous and overlapping military exercises across the Pacific in the air, sea, and land, effectively implementing the “Pacification of NATO” in reality.

Following this organizational structuring and combat readiness development, a series of major escalations took place: the Kursk invasion against Russia in East Asia in August; concentrated offensive against Hezbollah in West Asia in September; and drone attacks on Pyongyang in East Asia in October. Furthermore, after Trump’s presidential election victory, the pattern of escalation continued: in November, the lifting of restriction on long-range missile strikes against Russia in Eastern Europe; on December 3, a military coup in the “ROK” in East Asia; and on December 8, the collapse of the Assad regime in Syria in West Asia. The three battlefields are closely interconnected, with clear signs that they are being systematically executed as part of an imperialist strategy of World War 3.

The US imperialists’ war preparations against the DPRK and the military coup preparations by Yoon Suk-yeol’s fascist forces in the “ROK” followed an identical process. In reality, Yoon’s fascist clique made the provocation of a local war against the DPRK the primary impetus behind the coup preparations in the “ROK”. To this end, from September to November 2024, they relentlessly escalated provocations, including drone attacks, rocket launches, and artillery shelling. By mid-December 2024, it was further revealed that Yoon’s fascist forces had used the authority of the Minister of National Defense to mobilize the Headquarters Intelligence Detachment (HID), a counterintelligence unit against the DPRK under the Intelligence Command, to carry out false

flag operations, staging fake attacks on air force base in Cheongju and Daegu, as well as on the THAAD base in Seongju.

Yoon Suk-yeol’s fascist cliques organized a press conference in the National Assembly by the “Anti-Communist Youth Corps” and, by putting such extreme right-wing reactionaries ahead, instigated and manipulated the “January 19 Riot” —the first of its kind, where they stormed the court, destroyed its building, and attempted arson. The “January 19 Riot” is a clear sign that the situation in the “ROK” is shifting from insurrection to civil war. The history of the “ROK” shows that in 1948, a civil war broke out within the country due to the pro-US fascist forces, followed by localized conflicts with the DPRK in 1949, and finally, in 1950, the Korean War erupted. The present situation in the “ROK” is fundamentally no different from that time.

After the failure of the December 3 Coup, the fascist and reactionary forces in the “ROK” are facing inevitable harsh penalties, such as the death sentence, or their end as political forces. Civil war is the only way out for the fascist and reactionary forces on the brink of death. Civil war progresses through stages of bloodshed, riots, and gunfire, and we are already at the stage of riots. If the civil war within the “ROK” merges with the localized conflict with the DPRK, it will become the war in the “ROK.” The war in the “ROK” is a scheme of imperialism desperate for World War 3 and war in East Asia.

The overwhelming strength of our great people and nation, who already thwarted the December 3 Coup, will prevent civil war and the war in the “ROK,” preserving peace. It will also hasten the realization of a new world of people’s democracy and national independence through anti-fascist and anti-imperialist uprisings. As proven by its theoretical and practical activities so far, the People’s Democracy Party will valiantly fulfill its historical mission as the locomotive of the anti-fascist and anti-imperialist uprising.

Platform



rm

The World Anti-imperialist Platform