

Platform

June 2025 No.25

The World Anti-imperialist Platform

A stylized illustration of a woman with dark hair, wearing a light-colored long-sleeved shirt, holding a large, dark red flag aloft with her right arm. The background is a solid red color. The entire illustration is framed by a thin white border.





Contents

May 10, 2025

80th Anniversary of the Victory in World War 2—Paris International Colloquium

World War and the Anti-Imperialist, Anti-Fascist Struggle

“It is extremely important to strengthen our solidarity and unity of action against new bloody wars, for a happy future for humanity” 3
Dmitry Novikov | Communist Party of the Russian Federation

“To stop fascism, anti-imperialist forces must consolidate as much as possible around the struggle for socialism.” 6
Union of Communists of Ukraine (continuing to fight on the territory of Ukraine)

The third hybrid world war and the necessary fight against militarization and fascism 8
Bruno Drweski | Union for Communist Reconstruction (URC, France)

Lebanon and Palestine, a century-old resistance to imperialism and colonialism 12
Lebanese Communist Party

“Long live the victory over Nazi Germany and fascism. Long live peace between peoples!” 15
Communist Party of Belgium

World War 3 and the tasks of the world anti-imperialist struggle 18
Joti Brar | Communist Party of Great Britain (Marxist-Leninist)

Imperialism, Fascism, and the Struggle in WWII and WWIII 21
Dimitrios Patelis | Revolutionary Unification (Greece)

Article

The Dialectics of the Historical Process and the Methodology of Its Research	23
Victor Alexeyevich Vaziulin	
Sixtieth anniversary of the victory against fascism: a festival of progressive humanity	31
Harpal Brar Communist Party of Great Britain (Marxist-Leninist)	
“Reflection on revolutionary and counterrevolutionary processes in the 20th and 21st centuries”—Case studies Yugoslavia	62
Aleksandar Đenic New Communist Party of Yugoslavia (Serbia)	
The imperialist epoch is the epoch of socialist revolution and the decay of bourgeois society	79
Party of Committees to Support Resistance—for Communism (CARC Party, Italy)	
How the left failed Syria	87
Joti Brar Communist Party of Great Britain (Marxist-Leninist)	
On the Relationship Between Imperialism and Fascism in the 21st Century	93
Dimitrios Patelis Revolutionary Unification (Greece)	
Deepening in Division and Decline, the Defeat of the Imperialist Camp is Inevitable	97
Stephen Cho Coordinator of the Korean International Forum	
What Does Imperialism Aim for and How Does It Intend to Achieve It	101
Stephen Cho Coordinator of the Korean International Forum	

“It is extremely important to strengthen our solidarity and unity of action against new bloody wars, for a happy future for humanity”

Dmitry Novikov | Communist Party of the Russian Federation

Dear comrades!

On behalf of the Communist Party of the Russian Federation, its Central Committee, and Chairman of the CPRF Central Committee G.A. Zyuganov, I welcome all of you, participants in the Paris international meeting in honour of the 80th anniversary of the victory over fascism in World War II—a meeting organised by our comrades in the World Anti-Imperialist Platform.

Eighty years ago, the Red Army completed its heroic march across Europe, liberating the world from the brown plague. The red banner of Lenin, the banner of the Great October Socialist Revolution, the banner of the Soviet Union, was hoisted over the Reichstag.

Fascism became the most vicious and despicable offspring of imperialism. The peoples of the world have no right to forget the hell of military battles, death camps and Gestapo torture chambers, the torture and execution of people. Karl Marx and his comrades persistently and vividly exposed the anti-human essence of capitalism. But even this brilliant thinker could not have imagined what a monstrous conveyor belt of death would be created in the Nazi concentration camps.

The cannibalistic practices of fascism served the purpose of maintaining the class rule of big capital. The imperialists of the West took great care to nurture the regimes of Mussolini, Hitler, Franco and their accomplices. Big capital, not only in Italy and Germany, but also in the United States, Britain and a number of other countries, played a special role in the establishment of fascist regimes. The imperialists were not bothered by the fact that entire peoples were declared ‘inferior’ and that preparations were being made for their extermination through mass murder, terror, starvation and sterilisation. The main victor

over the ruthless machine of the Third Reich was the Soviet people. They won thanks to socialism, thanks to the genius of Lenin, thanks to the iron will of the Bolshevik Party. Soviet power created a highly developed economy. The Lenin-Stalin modernisation transformed the USSR into a powerful industrial power. Industrial production grew by an average of 17% per year.

The international family of Soviet peoples was freed from the scourges of a class-divided society. Russians and Ukrainians, Belarusians and Georgians, Uzbeks and Armenians, Azerbaijanis and Kazakhs, Tatars and Kyrgyz, Jews and Tajiks, Bashkirs and Buryats, Ossetians and Lezgins, Yakuts and Avars—all the nations and nationalities of the USSR—stood as a wall against Hitler’s hordes.

In the battle against Nazism, the main line of struggle ran through the minds and hearts of the people. The Communist Party’s special merit was to unite our people on the basis of Soviet patriotism, on the basis of the bright ideals of justice, on the basis of love for their socialist Motherland. During the war years, Soviet patriotism manifested itself as a sacred hatred of the invaders.

Our fathers and grandfathers, young and old alike, were ready to fight the enemy until complete victory.

Many peoples of the world demonstrated their best qualities in the struggle against fascism. We pay tribute to the contribution made by the peoples of the United States, Great Britain, Canada and all participants in the anti-Hitler coalition to the common struggle. We honour the heroes of the Resistance movement who fought against the occupiers and collaborators in France, Italy, Yugoslavia, Greece and Poland.

We bow our heads in respect to the fighters of the anti-fascist underground. We proudly cherish the

names of the anti-fascist heroes in our hearts. This great line includes Ernst Thälmann, Georgi Dimitrov, Maurice Thorez, Palmiro Togliatti, Dolores Ibarrola, Alvaro Cunill, Klement Gottwald, Josip Broz Tito, Bolesław Bierut, Enver Hoxha and other leaders of the communist and workers' parties of Europe. The names of the communists who led their peoples' struggle against Japanese militarism are covered with unfading glory. A special place in this row belongs to Mao Zedong, Ho Chi Minh, Kim Il Sung, and Horloogiyn Choybalsan. All of them remain symbols of proletarian solidarity and an unyielding will to victory.

Our Soviet people paid an incredible price for the right to live on Earth and destroy fascism. Twenty-seven million lives were lost in this battle. The Bolshevik Party, led by Joseph Stalin, was a fighting party. Every second communist in the Soviet Union laid down his life in the struggle against the invaders.

Dear comrades! Just recently, on 22 April, the 155th anniversary of the birth of V.I. Lenin, the Communist Party of the Russian Federation opened the Second International Anti-Fascist Forum in Moscow. Speaking at the forum, CPRF Central Committee Chairman Gennady Zyuganov expressed his confidence that people of good will on planet Earth will never forget the heroism of the Soviet people who saved the world from the chains of slavery. Red Army soldiers came to Sofia and Prague, Bucharest and Warsaw, Belgrade and Vienna, to the plains of northern China and the mountain slopes of Korea, not as invaders and destroyers, but as liberators, internationalists and defenders of the working people.

The victorious spring of 1945 opened a new chapter in the history of mankind. The defeat of fascism had an enormous impact on the renewal of the entire planet. People's democratic revolutions in a number of countries led to the formation of the Socialist Commonwealth. A powerful wave of national liberation movements crushed the colonial system.

For 80 years now, anti-communists of all stripes have been unable to erase the meaning and significance

of the great struggle against fascism from people's minds. Unable to defeat the memory of the people, they have waged a war on monuments. In Eastern European countries, monuments to Soviet soldiers are being despicably destroyed. Attempts are being made to distort, distort and rewrite the history of the Second World War.

Yes, dear comrades, the forces of reaction are continuing their dirty work. The pretenders to world domination have not disappeared either. When Donald Trump declares, 'Make America Great Again,' the shadow of Harry Truman looms behind him, who proclaimed that the United States of America 'must take leadership of the entire world.' Mr. Trump's claims to Canada and Greenland, his interference in the affairs of Mexico and Panama, Washington's sanctions against China, Cuba and other countries are typical of the imperialists.

What is happening today means that the lessons of the Second World War are extremely relevant. Humanity is facing acute threats. The imperialists want to turn back the tide of history. For them, the destruction of China, Vietnam, North Korea, Cuba and Laos would mean the destruction of socialism, which is so desired by the reactionaries. The defeat of Russia and its allies would allow neocolonialists to shape the world as they see fit. That is why big capital—the most unscrupulous and bloodthirsty provocateur—continues to fan the flames of war and conflict.

The imperialists are systematically fuelling confrontation in the Middle East.

The atrocities against the peaceful Arab population and the barbaric bombing of Palestinian refugee camps are reminiscent of the darkest pages of history. Washington's aggressive foreign policy is increasingly threatening a military confrontation between the United States and China.

Banderaism has become a sadistic form of neo-Nazism. A clique of monsters in Kiev is trying to indoctrinate Ukrainian youth with ideas of 'conquering Muscovy,' "abolishing" Russian culture, and physically exterminating 'Russians.'

Following the example of Hitler's pogromists, Bandera's rabble has set about demolishing monuments to Alexander Pushkin, Fyodor Dostoevsky, Maxim Gorky, Ivan Pavlov and anti-fascist heroes. A campaign of terror has been unleashed against the peaceful population of Donbass. All opposition organisations, starting with the Communist Party of Ukraine, were banned.

Imperialism, the father of fascism, remains the main threat to humanity. Capitalism is stubbornly dragging the planet into the hell of nuclear war. In the 21st century, humanity once again faces a fateful choice: socialism or barbarism. According to the UN, of the eight billion people on the planet, one and a half billion live in extreme poverty, without even access to clean water. Only a decisive turn towards humanism, social justice, and therefore socialism, can remedy the situation.

Our most important task is to stop neo-Nazism and cover with shame the names of those whose ideological fathers were condemned in Nuremberg in the autumn of 1945. The misfortunes brought to the working people by the global crisis of capitalism are a stark reminder of the saving socialist alternative.

The prospects for this choice are confirmed by the successes and steadfastness of China, Vietnam, Cuba, North Korea, Laos, Venezuela and Nicaragua. Joseph Stalin was right when he said that in order to destroy the very possibility of world wars, imperialism must be destroyed.

The bloody trail of capitalism's crimes stretches across the last hundred years—from the First World War to the bloody crimes in Yugoslavia, Iraq, Afghanistan, Libya, Palestine, Syria, to the tragedy that unfolded in our beloved brotherly Ukraine.

Dear comrades! Today, millions of people around the world are participating in the struggle against imperialism and neo-fascism. But the scale of this struggle is still insufficient. It is extremely important to strengthen our solidarity and unity of action against new bloody wars, for a happy future for humanity.

Communists have a special score to settle with

fascism. We are inspired by the bright ideals of anti-fascist fighters. It is we who have great experience in the struggle and victory over the Nazi evil.

The justice of our cause drives us forward!

We are inspired today by the 80th anniversary of the victory over fascism.

Let us strengthen our ranks!

Forward, to the victory of socialism!

“To stop fascism, anti-imperialist forces must consolidate as much as possible around the struggle for socialism.”

Union of Communists of Ukraine (continuing to fight on the territory of Ukraine)

Hello, dear comrades!

The Union of Communists of Ukraine, operating on the territory of Ukraine, greets you at this rally dedicated to the 80th anniversary of the Victory over fascist Germany and its allies. We celebrate the Victory of the Soviet people in the Great Patriotic War because the Soviet Union made a decisive contribution to the Victory, and because it had the support of the working classes in all bourgeois states throughout the world. This allowed the USSR to create an anti-Hitler coalition with the participation of bourgeois allies and ensured broad anti-fascist resistance in many countries, mainly led by communists. This is our common Victory. Happy holiday, dear comrades!

We celebrate Victory Day on May 9th—the first Day of the onset of PEACE, while in European countries, for some reason, the Day of the end of the war is celebrated on May 8th. On May 9, 1945, peace came to Europe—an event occurred that changed the course of human history. At the cost of incredible and heroic efforts on the front and in the rear, the peoples of all 15 republics of the Soviet Union, including Ukraine, under the leadership of the unified Communist Party of the USSR headed by Comrade Stalin, achieved victory over the monstrous offspring of imperialism—fascism.

In this war, it was not simply the Soviet Union against Germany and its allies; two systems, two ways of organizing society, fought—socialism and capitalism, in its bestial guise of fascism. In this war, it was precisely socialism that won a crushing victory over fascism and its Anti-Comintern Pact. All anti-fascists must remember this—only socialism can defeat fascism.

We call this war the Great Patriotic War because for all of us it is a personal history and tragedy: practically every Soviet family had members who fought or died. More than 26 million lives—such

was the price of this war for the Soviet Union. This sacrifice must not be forgotten, nor must the feat of the Soviet people. The red flag with the hammer and sickle was raised over the defeated Reichstag. The Banner of Victory—this is the flag of the USSR, the world’s first state of working people!

It is all the more bitter for us to see how, in our native Ukraine, for all 34 years of so-called “independence,” fascism has been cultivated directly by European and American curators, with the consent of local authorities and the ruling class of newly-minted capitalists.

It has come to the point where thugs in military uniforms, hired and equipped with EU and US money, with chevrons depicting modified (and sometimes real) fascist swastikas, freely roam the streets of Ukrainian cities; they themselves admit to being fascists—ideological heirs of Hitler’s associates. These militants commit lawlessness and violence against their own population. Men are massively rounded up on the streets, conducting forced mobilization. Journalists who dare to raise their voice against fascists in Ukraine are simply killed, like Olesya Buzina and Gonzalo Lira.

We are forced to observe the mass stupefaction of people, the inculcation of nationalist values and ideas of national superiority. Degraded compatriots, for the sake of false national ideas, are capable of reporting their closest relatives to the political police, severing ties with parents living in Russia or Donbas, and even independently dealing with neighbors and relatives if they suspect them of insufficient “patriotism.”

A fascist regime was imposed on Ukraine; there is no doubt about this. But this fascism is Ukrainian only in its place of manifestation, in its language, and in its personnel; in its origins and funding, it is Western—American and European. It was Western capital that nurtured and incited the Kyiv Nazis.

The fact that there are discords among them today does not change the essence; it was the same in the 20th century when the fascist beast bit its master. By analogy with the term “proxy war,” we can say that “proxy-fascism” is operating in Ukraine.

NATO has set up a proving ground on the territory of Ukraine—diverse weaponry is provided, including chemical weapons. With the help of the proxy—fascist regime, Ukraine has been turned into a weapon against the Russian Federation. The most cherished dreams of Russia’s enemies (such as Hitler, Dulles, or Brzezinski) are being realized by the Ukrainian authorities—a war of brothers against brothers is underway, Slavs are destroying each other. And the imperialists, rubbing their hands, throw in money, diverse weaponry, and ammunition so that as many people as possible from the former unified great country of the USSR perish—they are interested in our rich lands with mineral resources, and the people simply need to be destroyed.

Unfortunately, communist movements in many countries have also been subjected to anti-Russian propaganda. Thus, in Europe and the USA, a number of parties positioning themselves as communist and workers’ parties have adopted the anti-Russian rhetoric of the governments of their host countries, and have condemned the Russian Federation for alleged “unjustified aggression,” or equated it with other aggressive imperialist countries.

Alas, the same fate befell our organization: in early 2022, part of the leadership of the UCU (Union of Communists of Ukraine) left for the EU and effectively adopted the viewpoint of European governments regarding the Russian Federation. And declared that there is no fascism in Ukraine... Former comrades took the position that the war is imperialistic for all sides, but they themselves went to NATO countries, and from there safely fight against the alleged “unjustified invasion of Ukraine by Russia.” Have they forgotten how they themselves, since 2014, opposed the fascist punitive operations of Kyiv against the residents of Donbas, which by 2022 had claimed the lives of 15,000 people, including women and children? Do they not remember the

dozens of people burned alive in Odessa? About the dances on the demolished monuments to Lenin and Soviet soldiers? Do they share the dreams of EU functionaries about inflicting a military defeat and dismembering Russia? How can this be understood, other than as apostasy and betrayal of the cause of the working class?

For us, who remain in Ukraine, the theme of the struggle against imperialism is particularly relevant: we are witnessing with our own eyes all the horrors of the most terrible offspring of imperialism—fascism, and in its most repulsive form of hypertrophied nationalism—Nazism. To stop fascism, anti-imperialist forces must consolidate as much as possible around the struggle for socialism, and communists must form the backbone of the anti-imperialist movement. We are in the same class ranks with the communists of Russia, acting in full ideological and organizational unity with the RCWP (Russian Communist Workers’ Party). We understand that today’s bourgeois Russia is not the USSR. The guilt of Russia’s bourgeois class in creating the situation that resulted in a war between fraternal peoples is undeniable. Starting with the counter-revolutionary coup of 1991, the liquidation of Soviet power and socialism, and continuing with attempts to blame the Bolsheviks and V.I. Lenin personally for the carnage. But we cannot allow the Nazis and their Western masters to inflict defeat on Russia.

We consider it the task of all decent people to fight living fascism without any delay or truce, here and now, by all possible means, involving all possible allies.

Do not stop the fight for socialism!

Our cause is just!

We will win!

Victory will be ours!

The third hybrid world war and the necessary fight against militarization and fascism

Bruno Drweski | Union for Communist Reconstruction (URC, France)

In a world where the idea that war has once again become “normal” is being imposed with some success on public opinion, peace advocates must fight to re-establish the view that only power relations favorable to anti-capitalist political and social movements can prevent war and set humanity on the bright path of peace and social progress. This leads us to ask why the most reactionary, repressive, bellicose, and genocidal tendencies have been able to gain a foothold in a growing number of countries over the past 40 years, even though the results of their policies are clearly disastrous. Why did the collapse of the Yugoslav states, followed by dangers of so-called “color revolutions”? Why did the descent of Libya into endless clan and tribal wars and social regression not alert the opinions of neighboring Arab countries to the dangers of the so-called “Arab Spring” and its promoters? And so why do significant and sometimes undoubtedly majority sections of public opinion in Western Europe and elsewhere in the world dare not see that capitalism, having reached the stage of senile imperialism, is leading all of humanity towards a world war of extermination, and that no country, no people, no nation is safe from this predictable catastrophe? How, then, can we make people aware of this imminent danger and prevent them from believing that they will be able to “slip through the cracks” of the tornado already visible on the horizon?

The reasons for the appeasement of the “glorious thirty” years from 1945 to 1975

The existence of atomic weapons and the “balance of terror,” the experience of World War II in Europe and Asia, and the existence of the socialist camp until 1989 all contributed greatly to curbing the

warmongering tendencies of the imperialist states after 1945. As Western societies were removed from the wars that imperialism was waging in the Third World throughout this period, the imperialism in crisis today is finding it difficult to “rearm” psychologically, which explains why the objective situation of imperialist “world war” that has been going on for some 40 years has still not reached the consciousness of the peoples of Europe and North America and why, as a result, they do not perceive the imminent danger threatening them. This situation has also affected other countries in other regions of the world, and all these factors combined, atomic weapons and the pacification of minds, may explain why we are not yet in a situation comparable to that of 1914 or 1939. Even if the objective conditions of capitalism in crisis are very reminiscent, and even more tense, of the situations that prevailed on the eve of the two previous world wars.

Even if, since the end of the socialist camp, the imperialists have succeeded in largely eliminating the pacifist vocabulary tending to impose policies of disarmament, denuclearization, detente, and diplomatic negotiations to resolve conflicts, they have not yet succeeded in imposing on public opinion the martial atmosphere that prevailed on the eve of the two previous world wars. This is despite the fact that we are currently facing more than forty conflicts around the world in which the imperialist powers are directly or indirectly involved, not to mention the “frozen conflicts” or the policies of blockades and sanctions, which are different ways of waging war.

What we have just written clearly shows, given the scale of the phenomenon, that we are facing a third world war, but that while this war is “hot” and even

openly genocidal in some places (Palestine, eastern DR Congo, etc.), it remains at least “low intensity” elsewhere. It does not even appear to be a war in large sections of the population of countries where mortality rates are high due to policies of blockading basic commodities, including medicines. However, this situation of mixed economic and military wars is creating major imbalances in most of the world’s societies, which have to bear the threats, pressures and conditions imposed on the market countries to be dominated or conquered. This inevitably provokes resistance and explains the systematic expansion of “local” war zones. We are therefore dealing with two contradictory processes: blindness to the threats of war and the will to resist them. It is therefore up to the forces of peace and progress to regain the upper hand in the propaganda war that is raging across the planet.

The state of the forces pushing for the generalization of war

It is clear, for example, that Russia was pushed into a military response in 2022 because of threats, discriminatory policies, and military aggression aimed either at Russia or more directly at the Russian-speaking populations of Ukraine. It is equally clear that the suffocation of Gaza since Zionist troops formally left the territory in 2005 could only lead to a revolt by the imprisoned, impoverished, humiliated, ignored, and still sporadically bombed population, which logically resulted in the uprising of October 7, 2023. This type of situation, which pushes countries and populations to resist the dominant order in crisis, is repeating itself in a more or less radical form in a growing number of regions around the world. Either we see the proliferation of rebellions by states and peoples, as is the case in the Sahel, Latin America, the Philippines and elsewhere, or the imperialist forces succeed in breaking up independent states by provoking civil wars, as we have seen in Iraq, Libya, Syria, Somalia, Sudan, etc. All these wars and hotbeds

of tension are emerging within the framework of a single global situation created by imperialist policies themselves. No serious and impartial observer can deny that, while the intensity of conflicts and tensions varies around the world, the cause of these phenomena is, on the contrary, unique: the struggle of the imperialists to prevent the tendency of their profit rates to fall. The war in Ukraine, the genocide in Gaza and the West Bank, terrorism in the Sahel, the struggle to appropriate coltan in the Congo, tensions in the China Sea, in the Taiwan Strait and between the two Koreas, etc. have one and the same cause: the desire of the imperialist powers to eliminate the emerging powers currently grouped around the BRICS, to conquer their markets, to conquer the regions that produce energy and rare earths, and to control the trade flows of these resources that supply the BRICS countries or other countries that are more or less sovereign and more or less non-aligned.

It is therefore important today to make the whole of humanity aware that poverty in countries deliberately kept in underdevelopment by imperialism and the precarious living conditions in developed countries whose productive capacities are on their last legs have one and the same cause: imperialism, which has reached a stage where it can no longer guarantee anywhere on the planet the distribution of the crumbs it could previously extort here and distribute there. Hence the end of social-liberal reformism in favor of openly militaristic and fascist policies. Therefore, without the overthrow of imperialism and thus of capitalism, it is illusory to imagine that the countries on the periphery of the developed world will have any chance of escaping underdevelopment, and it is illusory to imagine that the populations of developed countries who have become accustomed to a certain number of rights and social protections that are now being dismantled will be able to recover them without a struggle to overthrow the capitalist system, which has become sterile in terms of innovation and progress for all.

This situation explains why we are seeing the rise of a warlike vocabulary in the mainstream “democratic” and pro-capitalist media, accompanied by the reemergence, including in these same media, of uninhibited fascist or para-fascist discourse on the part of politicians who are in principle “liberal.” Neoliberalism has effectively killed old-style liberalism, not to mention social democracy, and paved the way for new forms of fascism. One need only observe the rise of various forms of repression (censorship, arrests, prosecutions, expulsions, bans on media, parties, associations, interruptions or manipulation of electoral processes, etc.) in countries that were formerly liberal democracies to realize that the process of fascistization is no longer confined to countries dominated by imperialism but is now being “repatriated” to the imperialist metropolises. In 1973, during the Vietnam War, journalists in a liberal newspaper such as *Le Monde* could still openly ask and ask themselves the question of “external fascism,” that is, the fact that the dominant liberal democracies, which guaranteed their citizens a certain number of democratic freedoms, could export openly fascist methods of government to their colonies or neo-colonies, as was the case in Vietnam at the time. Today, it is clear that the methods that prevailed in Saigon, Santiago de Chile, Seoul, and Gaza in 1973, or at the same time in Madrid, Rabat, and Pretoria, now reign unabashedly in Tel Aviv, Odessa, London, Berlin, Bucharest, Paris, and elsewhere. This proves only one thing, namely that imperialism is no longer able to maintain an attractive appearance on the surface, because its sordid nature is now visible on both sides. This is proof of the degree of weakness it has reached, which in turn provokes its boundless aggression. And this is where the anti-imperialist forces in all their diversity must converge and unite.

The challenge we face

The challenge we face is to make societies that have become accustomed to peace, and all of them

to a model of consumption capable of making even the most destitute dream “on credit,” even the most destitute, that this era is definitively over and that even if they wish to preserve their social “gains” without wanting to see the tragedies unfolding before their eyes, they no longer have any chance of escaping. For it is precariousness, war, and poverty that await them all at the end of the road. This is why the imperialist upper classes are spreading mistrust and fear by pitting workers against each other, precarious workers against permanent workers, religion against religion, ethnic group against ethnic group, tribe against tribe, region against region, country against country, etc., because they know that they can no longer promise anything positive or credible to the masses, not even crumbs. Hence the return of fascist, warlike, and racist slogans that now dominate the mainstream media, but also a host of social media outlets that also convey the dominant ideas, in a “hard” or “soft” form, depending on the target audience.

Comrades! We must therefore be aware that our enemy, at least since the psychoanalyst Bernays, has developed a deep understanding of human psychology and methods of mental manipulation that tend to marginalize rational thinking in favor of magical thinking. We know that Bernays served as the basis for both Goebbels’ speeches and those of US advertisers, and he has therefore been used to promote the foundations of individualistic manipulation of the masses, who often no longer even dare to call themselves masses. So what seems obvious to us, the heirs of Marx and Lenin, the total war of all against all for the benefit of the globalized “happy few” oligarchs, and what I have briefly described above, is only convincing to those who have retained their capacity for rational, scientific thinking. The powers that be are banking on fear, atomization, and emotions that block reflection, and they’re doing it pretty well, we have to admit. This is why, alongside the struggles for social rights

and against war that mobilize the most conscious section of society, we must carry out sociological and psychological analysis capable of unlocking the minds of the atomized masses, which have been distorted by the mass media, by a large part of the “social” media, and by the proliferation of false needs created by the system. The purpose of these false needs, apart from making profits, is to stupefy and fragment the population and awaken feelings of fear and hatred towards an invented external or internal “enemy.” We must therefore go to the people, listen to the people as they are, and know how to speak to the people according to their real state of mind. For the number of those who perceive that they are being lied to but do not believe that any future is possible other than trying to slip through the cracks is too large for us to ignore. If the Zionists have succeeded in transforming a mass of Jews into a genocidal herd, it is not because they are Jews, but because they have been able to manipulate the memory of the genocide of their cousins, create a mass consumerist society in a regional sea of misery, and instill hatred and fear of an invented enemy. This example and many others show us that we must adjust our propaganda by studying the methods of mental manipulation used by our enemies so that we can ultimately render them ineffective. To do this, we must all show courage, tenacity, and boldness.

Lebanon and Palestine, a century-old resistance to imperialism and colonialism

Lebanese Communist Party

Dear comrades,

On this 80th anniversary of the great victory over Nazism, we pay tribute to the millions of martyrs who fell to crush this fascist barbarism. We bow to the heroism of the Soviet people, whose colossal sacrifice was decisive in the defeat of the Third Reich, and to the communist and anti-fascist fighters throughout Europe who resisted to the end. We will always remember these sacrifices and be forever grateful to them, for they gave us all our freedom.

But today, Nazism is taking on new forms: 1- NATO, an aggressive imperialist alliance, is extending its sway, threatening and bombing sovereign nations and imposing its law by force. 2- Zionism, a tool of colonial domination in Palestine, is perpetuating oppression and ethnic cleansing in Palestine, financed by the Western powers and certain Arab regimes.

Dear comrades,

What is happening today in the Middle East is merely the continuation of a colonial and imperialist process that began over a century ago. The fall of the Ottoman Empire marked the beginning of Western domination, in which the colonial powers betrayed the peoples of the region by promising them independence in exchange for their support against the Ottomans. Once victory had been won, these same powers divided up the region between themselves.

Worse still, in 1917, the British state promised to create an artificial Zionist state in Palestine, to the detriment of its indigenous people, to perpetuate their colonial stranglehold on this strategic region

rich in raw materials. Since then, Palestine has been occupied, its people massacred, expelled, and imprisoned. What is happening today in Gaza and the West Bank is not a war, but a genocide, an ethnic cleansing financed by Western imperialism. It's a settlement colonialism.

1. The occupation of Palestine

As early as 1948, during the Nakba ("catastrophe" in Arabic), hundreds of thousands of Palestinians were massacred and expelled from their land. Since then, the Zionist entity has pursued a policy of extermination against the Palestinian people:

- Accelerated colonization and permanent oppression in the West Bank.
- Suffocating blockade on Gaza since 2006.
- Repeated massacres (1987-1993, 2000-2005, 2008-2009, 2012, 2014, 2021, 2023...).

Since October 7, 2023, the Zionist entity has intensified this terror:

- Bombings of civilians all over Gaza in residential buildings, tents, hospitals, schools, UN sites.
- A famine imposed on Gaza by blocking humanitarian aid.
- Massacres, massive destruction of homes and expulsion of hundreds of Palestinian families from the West Bank.

The latest reports estimate that almost 20% of Gazans have been killed, injured or disappeared, with 40% of victims being children. With 90% of its infrastructure destroyed, Gaza has become an open-air concentration camp, where survivors wander under the bombs, without water, food or medicine.

The Zionist entity uses mass imprisonment as a

weapon of domination:

- More than 11,000 Palestinian political prisoners (today in 2025), including 500 children, 79 women, and 4,000 administrative detainees, without trial or charge.
- They are systematically tortured, raped, mutilated, deprived of medical care and humiliated. Dozens of prisoners have died under torture.

2. Zionist aggression against Lebanon, Yemen, Syria and Iran

The colonial project of the Zionist entity and the imperialist powers goes far beyond Palestine.

- Since its creation, this Zionist entity has repeatedly attacked Lebanon (in 1968, 1973, 1978, 1982, 1993, 1996, 2006, and most recently since October 2023). Since 1968, it has occupied 7 villages in Lebanon. In 1982, it invaded Lebanon as far as Beirut, laid siege to the capital for 80 days and committed the despicable massacres of Sabra and Chatila, where 3,500 Palestinians and Lebanese were slaughtered. Under pressure from the Lebanese resistance, the Zionist entity withdrew from 80% of the land occupied in 1986 and completely withdrew from southern Lebanon in 2000, remaining in the 7 villages occupied in 1968. In 2006, the Zionist entity unleashed a 33-day war on Lebanon, killing at least 1,191 civilians, wounding 4,400 and displacing 900,000. At the end of this war, the Zionist army was forced to withdraw under the blows of the Lebanese resistance. But this did not please the imperialist powers and their armed wing in the region at all, and they prepared to take revenge.
- Since October 2023, the Zionist entity has been attacking Lebanon every day with bombings and air raids, and occupying new villages in Lebanon. According to official figures from the Lebanese Ministry of Public Health, more than 4,047 people have been martyred (including 320 children and 800 women) and 16,638 wounded (5,412 serious cases with permanent disabilities). 127 villages partially

or totally destroyed. 48 health establishments directly targeted.

The Zionist entity is not content with Palestine and Lebanon: it is also threatening and attacking Yemen, Syria and Iran. Tensions are rising in the region, and everyone is becoming even more militarized. The prime minister of the Zionist entity claims to be facing an existential threat. On April 21, 2025, he declared that the war he was waging was a war of rebirth that would change the face of the Middle East. Clearly, the Zionist entity will do anything to achieve its goal, even if it means a 3rd world war.

3. Western funding of the Zionist entity and NATO

In addition, the USA, the EU and other satellite countries provide unwavering military and diplomatic support to the Zionist entity, not wanting to lose their tool of domination in the region.

On the other hand, Euro-American imperialism continues to expand NATO eastwards without limit, imposing a unipolar American world by force. The Atlantic alliance gives itself the right to establish itself anywhere in the world without any other country having a say. It threatens Russia, China, Iran and any other country that doesn't fall in line with its authority and domination. It has destroyed and destabilized many countries in the Middle East and around the world, including Cuba, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Iraq, Libya, Syria, Sudan, Somalia, Ukraine, Mali, Congo and many others.

4. Resistance as the only hope of liberation

In the face of continuing imperialist violence, our duty is clear: peoples' resistance must continue. Our party, the Lebanese Communist Party, launched and actively participated in the resistance against the Zionist occupation of Lebanon and Palestine from the very beginning until 2000, alongside other political forces.

One of the first martyred comrades fell in 1936

against the colonization of Palestine by the Zionist Haganah militia. Other Lebanese forces then took up the baton of resistance. But today, more than ever, we unwaveringly support the resilience and resistance of the Lebanese people against Zionist aggression.

We bow to the heroic resistance of the Palestinian people against ethnic cleansing, despite the modest means at their disposal. We salute their immense sacrifices and their rootedness in their land.

Despite the support of imperialist governments for the Zionist entity, popular opposition was strong, as we have all seen:

- Historic mobilizations (millions of demonstrators marched around the world against the genocide in Palestine).
- Massive boycotts of complicit companies (McDonald's, Carrefour, Amazon, Starbucks, KFC, Siemens, Coca Cola...).
- Student strikes and university occupations.

We also express our solidarity with all peoples in struggle, from Yemen to Latin America, from Africa to Asia, against imperialism and colonialism, for their right to self-determination and independence. We salute the revolt of African and South American countries against imperialism and colonialism.

Conclusion

Finally, we appeal to all the free people of the world, to all those who refuse injustice, to all the revolutionary and anti-imperialist forces of the world - let's unite! Let's converge, let's organize, let's strengthen popular resistance. In the face of capitalist and imperialist barbarity, there is only one response: struggle to victory. As history has shown, no empire is eternal.

Through unity and determination, we will win.

Long live the people's resistance!

Long live the anti-imperialist struggle!

Until victory, always!

“Long live the victory over Nazi Germany and fascism. Long live peace between peoples!”

Communist Party of Belgium

Dear comrades and friends,

The victory over fascism is a great moment that the COMMUNIST PARTY OF BELGIUM wishes to celebrate with you, at your side. We warmly thank you for inviting us once again to be among you and to speak.

This new international meeting of the World Anti-imperialist Platform is being held at a very glorious moment in the history of peaceful and free peoples, that of the VICTORY of May 8, 1945, which saw the defeat of Nazi Germany, the surrender of Hitler, and the red flag flying triumphantly over Berlin, taken by the Red Army at the cost of millions of innocent victims... Nazi Germany, Hitler's surrender and the red flag flying triumphantly over Berlin, taken by the Red Army at the cost of millions of innocent victims...

What is fascism?

The first fascist states were founded in Italy in 1922 and in Germany in 1933.

The concept of fascism has political, economic, and military aspects.

Georgi Dimitrov presented a report to the 7th Congress of the Third International in 1935. He defined fascism as “the open terrorist dictatorship of the most reactionary, most chauvinistic, and most imperialist elements of finance capital.” In his book “Unity Against Fascism,” published in 1935, he called for the creation of a united front of the working class against fascism. This front, under the leadership of the Soviet Union, defeated fascism in 1945.

The State of Israel and the State of Ukraine today meet the economic, political, and military criteria of a fascist state. Financial capital, particularly US financial capital, as the driving force of imperialist monopoly capital, took power in the State of Israel

after British imperialism, weakened by World War II, was replaced in Palestine-Israel by US imperialism. Israel is today the bridgehead for US economic and military penetration in the Middle East.

In 1997, Zbigniew Brzezinski formulated in “The Grand Chessboard” the US strategy in Eastern Europe aimed at dividing the Soviet Union, separating Ukraine from Russia in order to weaken and further divide it. The involvement of former President Joe Biden's son in a business venture in Ukraine is a good illustration of US economic imperialism in that country.

In Israel for decades and in Ukraine since 2014, fascism has abandoned the “democratic” and hidden forms of fascism, such as elections, and has organized a terrorist and genocidal regime, killing tens of thousands of people.

This glorious moment of victory on May 8 is nevertheless overshadowed by many events, a major turning point, new wars dangerous for humanity, a great historical upheaval, and large-scale brainwashing aimed at shaping public opinion:

- The war in Ukraine (which began in the Donbass), but also in Gaza, Syria, Lebanon, and Yemen (four places where Donald Trump will clearly not bring peace, but where US imperialism continues to supply bombs, missiles, and drones and detonate them with its own military forces in Yemen...
- Regarding Ukraine, instead of taking advantage of the change of presidency in the US and Donald Trump's willingness to find peaceful solutions, old Europe—the oldest of all colonial and imperialist powers, which has already caused two world wars in 25 years—is relaunching a monstrous arms race costing hundreds of billions of and is strengthening

its boomerang-like and ineffective sanctions against Russia, with which it claims to be at war, with China as its ultimate target. Old Europe is deluding itself that Russia could be defeated by Zelensky's fascist regime and that Russia could return the conquered territories... Zelensky does not say what he would do with the millions of Russian speakers living in these regions that the Kiev regime has been bombing and massacring for 11 years, under the command and with the silence of America, "Europe" and NATO.

Pushed by his fascist elements, by Biden, by Europe, by the warmongering NATO alliance and by his own Russophobia, Zelensky refuses to see that it is in his interest to abandon this useless war and negotiate the terms of peace directly with Russia if he does not want to see his country ransomed by Trump for its black earth and other riches.

This old "EUROPE," which proclaims itself capitalist, liberal, free enterprise, and competitive, increasingly expansionist and annexationist, is a sham. It does not want peace, it wants to wage wars of conquest. This is one of the reasons why the COMMUNIST PARTY OF BELGIUM wants Belgium to leave NATO and see it dissolved, because NATO has been imperialist since its foundation, aiming for world hegemony, and we want Belgium to leave the imperialist alliance that today forms the European Union. It is with sadness that we see certain "left-wing" parties joining it, voting to help fascist Ukraine, declaring that a European army is necessary since we have abandoned our American masters, whom we revere as our protectors, our "liberators," and that Russia should not be invited to the celebrations of the 80th anniversary of Victory Day, because of its "aggression" and "invasion" of Ukraine.

The so-called "Russian threat" does not date back to the war in Ukraine, but to Churchill's famous "fear speech" delivered in the presence of Harry Truman at Westminster University on March 5, 1946. It is true that at the time, the alleged "threat" was "Soviet

expansion." This threat still exists despite the fact that the Gorbachev counter-revolution brought Russia back into the capitalist camp, causing the departure of several Soviet socialist republics and reducing the territory of the USSR by 5 to 6 million km²...

Some on the left are content to proclaim that "imperialism is the highest stage of capitalism!" This leads them to denounce the three imperialisms that are supposedly "the global West," Russia, and... China. They forget that when capitalism is in deep crisis—which is currently the case—it enters its final phase: strong power, its most racist (including Russophobia), brutal, bestial, and murderous form, fascism, and ultimately war... This is what threatens the whole of "Europe" today.

And for the record, Belgium now also has a Flemish nationalist prime minister whom no one wanted ten years ago because the N-VA was considered extreme right-wing, and therefore anti-democratic and unfit to govern. That changed after the elections of June 9, 2024, when a far-right coalition made up of liberals, Flemish nationalists, Christian Democrats, and so-called Flemish "socialists" also came to power.

And this "democratic" and "free" Europe is seeing this brown plague increasingly coming to power in most of the countries that once made pacts with Hitler: Hungary, Italy, Germany (obviously), Austria, Estonia, Lithuania, Latvia, Finland, Spain... Even the Netherlands, Great Britain, France (which was Pétainist), Sweden (a formerly neutral country, but which still sold 80% of its steel to Uncle Adolf) are infected... As for Ukraine, enough has been said about its past, its present, its carefully cultivated Russophobia...

And in Europe, there are leaders, parties, trade unions, and pacifists who let it happen... Yet these fascists also exist elsewhere and are already putting their skills to good use: this is the case in the Gaza concentration camp, where 2.2 million Palestinians have been locked up for 18 years and are now being massacred by Netanyahu's fascist government: the

horror is permanent... The “Europe” of Von der Leyen, Macron, Starmer and Co. remains silent and does nothing because it is complicit... As it has been doing for 11 years in Donbass... As it is doing in Syria, as it did in the Balkan wars and in Libya, where it even helped install corrupt regimes...

NO, at this moment, on the 80th anniversary of the victory over fascism, we must reaffirm that RUSSIA does not want war, does not want to invade Europe, that London, Paris, Brussels, Rome, etc. can continue to sleep peacefully: RUSSIA has a territory larger than all the EU countries combined, where enormous untapped riches still lie dormant, guaranteeing its self-sufficiency.

RUSSIA, like CHINA, is currently preparing huge development plans, achievements that will astonish the world... These two great countries, within the BRICS+, are also preparing the conditions for new international relations based on peace, development and cooperation, despite their differences in regime, a new world...

On May 8, 2025, we will also celebrate the victory over fascism, made possible by the immense contribution of the USSR (now Russia), the Western allies, the partisans, the resistance fighters, and the underground press activists. Without the USSR, without Stalingrad, Nazi Germany could have won the war, thanks to the enormous resources it was able to deploy with the help of collaborators. This is what today’s revanchists cannot stomach or forgive, neither Stalin’s USSR nor Putin’s Russia. This is where the Russophobia of the Kiev regime and its allies in the Baltic states, Finland, Poland, Germany and elsewhere in the new European empire comes from...

LONG LIVE THE VICTORY OVER Nazi Germany and fascism. Long live peace between peoples! STOP the new arms race, the new bloc politics... PEACE IN UKRAINE! START NEGOTIATIONS NOW!

World War 3 and the tasks of the world anti-imperialist struggle

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

Back in 1906, Josef Stalin wrote: “The dialectical method tells us that we must regard life ... in its motion and ask: Where is life going? We have seen that life presents a picture of constant destruction and creation; consequently, we must examine life in its process of destruction and creation and ask: What is being destroyed and what is being created in life?” (Anarchism or Socialism? My emphasis)

When we look at the world today, we can see signs of the destruction of the US-led imperialist bloc in every field. Economically, the USA and its imperialist allies are essentially bankrupt. Their largest corporations survive on government subsidies and their national budgets run on debt that is paid for by harsh austerity and endless money-printing, which in turn fuels inflation and drives inequality and social unrest.

Socially and culturally, the imperialists have lost all ability to inject their people with confidence or optimism. Film studios, TV stations and computer games manufacturers pump out a toxic mixture of mindless consumerism, escapist fantasy and nihilistic dystopias. Graphic and disturbing violence and pornography are everywhere. The average age that a child in Britain is first exposed to pornographic video images stands now at 11, and is falling every year.

Militarily, the US-led Nato alliance has been roundly beaten by Russia in Ukraine. Three full armies of west-trained personnel and the combined arsenals of the collective west have been thrown into the Donbass and been destroyed. Russia’s armed forces are not only superior in terms of highly-motivated soldiers and firepower, they are also far better at learning from and adapting to the realities of the modern battlefield, mastering the use of drone

warfare to devastating effect.

In the middle east, no amount of western munitions or genocidal bombardment has been sufficient to crush or disarm Palestinian, Lebanese or Yemeni resistance. In the Red Sea, Yemen has waged a brilliant and creative air and sea campaign that has successfully defeated Nato’s combined naval and air power, repeatedly forcing US aircraft carriers to retreat from the vicinity, destroying and capturing hi-tec Reaper drones, and even bringing down two F-18 bombers. Israeli ports have been bankrupted, its society is in meltdown and its economy on the verge of collapse.

Russia and Iran have both demonstrated military capabilities that simply cannot be countered by the west. Even with no missile attached, the Oreshnik showed what can now be done with Russia’s most advanced non-nuclear technologies. Iran’s hypersonic capability has likewise proven that air defences are powerless to protect Zionist military bases in the event of all-out war. Even Yemen, despite its distance from Israel, has repeatedly hit targets in Tel Aviv, including Ben Gurion airport. In Yemen, Gaza, Lebanon and Iran, as in the DPRK and Vietnam, the resistance has mastered the art of tunnel warfare and keeps its arsenals well concealed from imperialist bombers.

In response, the USA, Britain and their Nato allies have fallen back on reprisal bombings and terror attacks against civilians and civilian infrastructure as their only means of trying to bludgeon the people into submission.

In the fields of diplomacy and information war, Russia and China have been skilful in bringing the majority of world opinion round to their side, despite the huge propaganda campaigns waged against them

by the imperialists. The development of Chinese and Russian domestic and global media, social media and communications technologies are beginning to undermine the imperialists' domination of the global information space.

The exposure in real time of imperialist governments' complicity in zionist crimes in Gaza has further deepened their social crisis at home. Western countries are turning to authoritarian measures to stop protest and silence dissent, and are thus alienating their own people still further.

The economic and military defeat of Nato in Ukraine has given renewed hope and confidence to liberation forces worldwide. We have seen the successful renewal of the struggle for independence and sovereignty in the Sahel, as well as a resurgence of armed liberation struggle across the Arab world.

Despite the imperialists' inability to win any of the wars they have started, the logic of their position is such that they must keep trying to bring every liberated territory to heel. For their survival as a class, victory over China and Russia is simply indispensable. Their desperation to achieve this goal has not abated but rather been reinforced by their failures in Russia and Gaza, since the economic crisis is made worse by every defeat.

The deepening of US imperialism's war drive in the east is revealed in the construction of new military bases in the Philippines, in the arming and training of proxy forces in Taiwan, in the insane provocations of the south Korean puppet state against the DPRK, and in the ratcheting up of the economic war against China to fever pitch. In Latin America, fascist proxies are being unleashed against popular governments, US bases are proliferating across the continent, and Colombia has joined Japan, South Korea, Australia and New Zealand as a Nato 'partner country'.

While all this goes on, the British and European imperialists are trying to somehow keep the war going in Ukraine, hoping to avoid any public admission of defeat and to keep the door open to rearmament and

new offensives in the future.

All of this shows us that while the imperialist system may be in a state of advanced decay, like a wounded beast it remains exceptionally dangerous. In their quest to save their failing system, there is no crime the imperialists are not prepared to commit; no level of death and destruction they consider to be too high.

The social crisis at home means that the imperialists' preferred method for waging war today is via proxy forces. While this is undoubtedly a sign of weakness, the fall of Syria reminds us that however senile the present system is becoming, its mastery of divide-and-rule tactics, and its extensive ability to fund and direct psychological operations, terror attacks and proxy warfare mean that it remains a formidable enemy.

Syria's fate also illustrates that the key to socialist and anti-imperialist nations' success in the face of imperialism's relentless war drive lies in increasing their cooperation and integration – integrating their military capabilities, building trade partnerships, assisting in one another's economic development and sharing technologies.

Only in this way will each nation separately and the whole bloc together be able to withstand the USA's economic and military blackmail. Socialists living in these countries must do everything in their power to help reinforce the military and economic cohesion of the anti-imperialist camp, while simultaneously strengthening the influence and position of the communist forces within each broad national front.

In this context, the news that DPRK troops have helped their Russian allies to liberate Kursk is extremely welcome. This is an important milestone in the deepening of ties between two frontline states, and it sends a clear message to the imperialists: the DPRK has Russia at its back and combat experience under its belt. It is fully prepared to defend itself, and if the USA succeeds in re-igniting the Korean war, it will surely regret its recklessness.

As the imperialists are cut off from avenues of profit-taking in many parts of the world, from Venezuela to Russia to the Sahel, their system is being weakened and their crisis is getting deeper. These developments are extremely positive for humanity and bring us closer to our goal of liberty, sovereignty and socialism for all.

But this is not leading the exploiting class to retire gracefully; as their position declines, they are becoming more rabid and desperate. Progressive workers in the imperialist heartlands cannot simply sit back and applaud the advances of the anti-imperialist camp. We must understand that our ruling class will never be truly defeated until their entire system has been dismantled – and that for this to happen, it needs to be decisively beaten on both its fronts.

Ultimately, the system's final death blows will be delivered by workers on the home front. Genuinely revolutionary parties must be built in the imperialist countries, and they must establish strong connections with the masses, bringing them a Marxist analysis and popularise a programme of anti-imperialist activities and socialist demands.

There is an especially urgent need to build a genuinely anti-imperialist antiwar movement capable of delivering real solidarity to all those fighting our class enemies on the frontlines, whether in Gaza, Yemen or Donbass.

We need a mass movement of non-cooperation with imperialist war. In organising workers to sabotage and obstruct the war machine, we will also be giving them lessons in the use of their power as a class.

History shows us what this looks like. Back in 1920, when the British working class was mobilised around the communist-led Hands Off Russia movement, a panicked ruling class was forced to pull out of its war against Soviet Russia. This was a moment when the British proletariat came very close to revolutionary uprising. Every imperialist country has seen similar periods of anti-imperialist and revolutionary struggle,

whose successes we must replicate and whose failures we must learn from and avoid.

And we must always be guided by the understanding that to be truly effective, the fight for peace must be developed into a movement to overthrow the capitalist system entirely. In the words of Josef Stalin: “To eliminate the inevitability of war, it is necessary to abolish imperialism.” (Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR, 1951)

Imperialism, Fascism, and the Struggle in WWII and WWIII

Dimitrios Patelis | Revolutionary Unification (Greece)

1. Historical Emergence and Ideology of Fascism

Fascism arose during the general crisis of capitalism post-1917, serving as a tool for the most reactionary factions of monopoly capital to suppress workers' movements and preserve capitalist rule. It is characterized by extreme nationalism, racism, anti-communism, and state terror. Georgi Dimitrov defined it as "the power of finance capital itself," organizing terror against the working class and revolutionary forces. Historically, fascist regimes (e.g., Italy, Germany, Spain) emerged to manage capitalist crises, militarize economies, and pursue imperialist expansion.

Fascist ideology draws from irrational, reactionary sources like colonial racism, Nietzschean thought, and anti-Semitism, promoting myths of racial superiority, militarism, and "class harmony." It manipulates populist demagoguery to co-opt socialist rhetoric while advancing anti-socialist agendas.

2. Fascism in WWII: Imperialist Instrument and Defeat

During the interwar period and WWII, fascism functioned as a state-monopoly tool for imperialist powers (e.g., Nazi Germany, Fascist Italy) to crush socialism and colonize territories. The Anti-Comintern Axis aimed to destroy the USSR and suppress global revolutionary movements. The USSR's Red Army played the decisive role in defeating fascism, bearing 77% of Germany's losses and sacrificing 27 million lives. Imperialist powers like the U.S. and Britain, while part of the anti-fascist coalition, initially tolerated or supported fascism to direct it against communism (e.g., Munich Agreement, delayed Second Front).

Post-WWII, fascism persisted in neo-colonial dictatorships (e.g., South Korea, Greece under the junta) and apartheid regimes (e.g., Baltic states), often backed by U.S.-NATO to suppress anti-imperialist movements.

3. Fascism in WWIII: Transnational Imperialism and Proxy Warfare

Today, fascism is reconfigured under transnational monopoly capitalism, where global corporations and imperialist states (led by the U.S.) subordinate nations through economic and military coercion. Unlike 20th-century state-monopoly fascism, modern fascism is "exported" as a proxy force in hybrid wars:

- **Ukraine:** The 2014 coup installed a neo-Nazi regime, instrumentalized by the U.S.-NATO-EU axis to wage war on Donbass and Russia.
- **Israel:** A racist settler-colonial state acting as a U.S. bulwark in the Middle East.
- **Baltic States:** Neo-Nazi collaborator regimes enforcing apartheid against Russian minorities.

Fascism now merges neoliberalism, social Darwinism, and postmodern irrationalism, serving as a disposable "strike force" for imperialist domination.

4. Strategic Lessons for Anti-Imperialist Struggle

- **WWII:** The anti-fascist front prioritized defeating the Axis, leveraging inter-imperialist contradictions (e.g., USSR's alliance with Western powers). Anti-fascism was the pathway to anti-imperialism.
- **WWIII:** The primary enemy is the unified U.S.-NATO-EU axis, which uses fascism as a weapon. Anti-fascism must be subordinated to a broader anti-imperialist front, uniting socialist forces (e.g., China, Russia, BRICS) and oppressed

nations. Opportunists who reject this (e.g., KKE's "imperialist pyramid" theory) undermine the struggle.

The Russian bourgeoisie, despite its capitalist restoration, is forced into anti-imperialist resistance due to NATO's existential threats. However, its inconsistent ideology (mixing neoliberalism, tsarist nostalgia, and fascist elements like Vlasov glorification) limits its revolutionary potential. Only a proletarian-led movement can ensure consistent anti-fascism.

5. Conclusion: Crush Imperialism to Defeat Fascism

Fascism is inseparable from imperialism; both must be destroyed. The WWII victory proved that united popular resistance can triumph. Today, the World Anti-Imperialist Platform must coordinate global resistance, exposing the U.S.-led axis as the root of fascism. The legacy of 1945 inspires the coming revolutions:

Death to fascism and imperialism!

Defeat the U.S.-NATO-EU axis!

Victory to socialism and anti-imperialism!

Key Sources:

- Dimitrov's analysis of fascism (1935).
- WWII historical data (USSR's sacrifices, imperialist complicity).
- Modern fascist proxies (Ukraine, Israel, Baltic states).
- Transnational monopoly capitalism theory.
- Critiques of opportunism (KKE's errors, Russian bourgeois vacillations).

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

Victor Alexeyevich Vaziulin

Contents

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

The previous contents were published in the last issue.

3. Society as an “organic” whole

“What is society, irrespective of its form? The product of man’s interaction upon man.”^[1] Let us consider K. Marx’s definition of society independently of any particular social form.

As we can see, K. Marx writes first about human beings, then about their interaction, and finally about the product of their interaction.

The emphasis on society as a product of human interaction in the quoted passage is no coincidence. K. Marx is commenting on the idealistic views of the petty-bourgeois ideologist Proudhon on history: “[...] finally, he (Proudhon—V. V.) finds that men, taken as individuals, did not know what they were about, were mistaken as to their own course, i.e. that their social development appears at first sight to be something distinct, separate and independent of their individual development. He is unable to explain these facts, and the hypothesis of universal reason made manifest is ready to hand.”^[2] K. Marx proves that social development is not something completely independent of human beings, but that it is the product of human activity. In this context, the emphasis is on the critique of the idealist conception of history.

And if we emphasise the dialectical understanding of society as opposed to the metaphysical? Then we

should focus on the fact that society is both the result (product) and the process of human interaction.

The interaction of aspects, moments, elements, etc. of processes, things, objects is their true “final cause”^[3] (causa finalis.—V. V.). Their internal interaction, interconnection is their true essence. This general dialectical approach also applies to society.

Society is the unity of the external and internal interaction of human beings. External interaction is the interaction of human beings as a natural, living beings; internal interaction is the interaction of human beings as a social beings.

Man is the unity of the natural and the social. If man is considered only as a natural being, then society turns out to be a mechanical aggregate of isolated individuals. If, on the other hand, man is considered only as a social being and his biological nature is ignored, then society is once again assumed, albeit indirectly, implicitly, to be a mechanical aggregate of isolated individuals.

The first tendency found its most developed classical expression in the philosophy of L. Feuerbach, who began with the isolated individual. As early as 1847, K. Marx had already identified this limitation of L. Feuerbach’s views: “Feuerbach resolves the essence of religion into the essence of man [menschliche Wesen = ‘human nature’]. But the essence of man is no abstraction inherent in each single individual. In reality, it is the ensemble of the social relations. Feuerbach, who does not enter upon a criticism of this real essence is hence obliged: 1. To abstract from the historical process and to define the religious sentiment [Gemüt] regarded by itself, and to presuppose an abstract—isolated—human individual. 2. The essence therefore can by him only be regarded as ‘species’, as an inner ‘dumb’ generality which unites many individuals only in a natural

way.”^[4]

The second tendency in the approach to society found its most profound expression in the philosophy of Hegel. Hegel’s starting point was the universal reason, detached from the particular and the singular. Applied to the question of society and man, this means that Hegel started from society understood in isolation from the human beings who make up society. The human essence within man was torn away from man himself and projected as an absolute—as God.

Both concepts implicitly assumed as their basis a rupture between society and man, between interaction and those who interact, and consequently in both concepts man appeared as an isolated natural being, connected to other human beings only by natural ties. But while in Hegel society, social development, is presented as something detached, fundamentally different from man and transformed into something divine, Feuerbach, who took note of Hegel’s mysticism, Hegel’s detachment of the universal from the particular and the singular (in our case, the detachment of society, social development, from man), essentially abandoned the interpretation of the universal as different from the sum of the singular and directly expressed the idea of man as an isolated individual and of society as a mechanical aggregate [of individuals]^[5].

Both concepts are based, explicitly or implicitly, on a rupture between man and society, between the natural and the social in man as an eternal, insurmountable rift. These positions have their social basis in an antagonistic society where social forces genuinely oppose human beings as autonomous entities—unsubordinated to other human beings and operating as hostile forces against them. The greatest development of this independence and hostility of the social forces towards human beings is achieved in capitalist society. Moreover, while social forces are only hostile to the ruling capitalist class to a certain degree (through threats of crises, bankruptcy, etc.),

they confront the working class as fundamentally and irreconcilably hostile.

Both concepts emerge from the world of private property. Private property forces the owner to treat all other human beings as means and to see himself as something self-sufficient, as the centre, as the end-goal. All other human beings, from the private owner’s point of view, appear as external to him.

A consistent dialectical understanding of society and man, of the natural and the social in man, was only achieved by the founders of Marxism, for they stood on a fundamentally different social position, on the position of the working class, which, by virtue of its real, material position and its role in production and society, is destined to destroy the exploitation of man by man, the rupture of the social forces from man, their hostility to man, the rift between society and man, to abolish private property, to socialise property, to subordinate the social forces to man. Only from this point of view could it become clear that the social forces hostile to man are created by man himself under certain objective conditions, that man’s hostility to man, the idea of man as an isolated being, hostile or indifferent to other human beings, that all this is not eternal. Marxism shows and scientifically substantiates the ways and means of fundamentally transforming such a society.

In view of the above, let us try to answer the question: what is the starting point in the study of society: the individual or society itself?

From the above it follows that one cannot begin from the individual, isolated from society, for then all that is social in man disappears, and he appears only as an animal, as a natural being, connected with other similar beings only by natural ties; the specificity of the social, the essence of man, falls out of sight and becomes inexplicable; but one cannot begin from society, taken in its detachment from the individual, for then society, social development, appears as a divine, supernatural, inexplicable force. If one begins from man isolated from society, and

from society as an external and superhuman force, then the rupture between them does not disappear and the explanation of society remains impossible. The explanation of society can only be sought by understanding it as the interaction of human beings.

It would seem—if one starts from the simple negation of the approaches listed in the previous paragraph—that one should stop at the fact that, since man as man exists only in society, and society is the product of the interaction of human beings and, consequently, does not exist without the human beings who constitute it, i.e., if man and society exist only in their mutual conditionality, then one must simultaneously explain the first by the second and the second by the first. However, the simple negation of the approaches listed in the previous paragraph does not make it possible to resolve the question of man and society completely and correctly.

One cannot separate human beings from their interaction, but neither can one absolutely identify human beings with their interaction. The dialectical solution to the question lies in the fact that human beings and their interaction are simultaneously identical and different.

It is precisely for this reason that it does not matter where one begins: with human beings or with the product of their interaction.

Marxist literature currently gives two typical answers. Some argue that Marxism has always taken the “empirical individual” as its starting point, while others argue that the starting point in Marxism can only be society. We believe that neither of these views can be fully accepted. These different positions are expressed, for example: the first—in the interesting book by F. Tökei, “Towards a Theory of Social Formation” (Moscow, 1975), the second—in the detailed epilogue to his book, written by V. Zh. Kelle.

Thus, F. Tökei essentially expresses the view that the classics of Marxism-Leninism always begin from the “empirical individual” and illustrates this with quotations from the works of K. Marx and F. Engels.

However, he does not always consider the context in which the quotations he cites are used. F. Tökei does not reveal the point of his insistence on beginning with the “empirical, concrete individual”, nor does he analyse the relationship between the individual and society from this position. In essence, therefore, it remains largely unclear how this position differs from Feuerbach’s.

The decisive arguments against this view are well formulated by V. Zh. Kelle:

“K. Marx and F. Engels, as historical materialists, always started with historical reality and did not form a priori constructions. ‘To begin with the real’, according to Marx, means to proceed from the ‘totality of all social relations’ which constitute the ‘essence of man’, to single out in them the main, determining—material relations, to show the conditionality of the latter to the development of the productive forces, and so on. Therefore, outside the analysis of social relations, we cannot say anything concrete either about the ‘empirical individuals’ themselves or about the nature and direction of their activity: The ‘empirical individual’ as such, is the starting point for positivist sociology, which is concerned with describing the ‘behaviour’ of this individual but only skims the surface of the phenomena. The path of Marxist analysis is therefore from society to man. And this is the main principle that the founders of Marxism-Leninism themselves have repeatedly and quite unambiguously stated”^[6].

The essence of the arguments is that since the essence of man is the “totality of all social relations”, outside of society, “concrete individuals” have no social nature and nothing can be said about them as social individuals, while the choice of the “empirical individual” as the starting point of positivist sociology leads to only scratching the surface. Therefore, one should start from society, not from the “concrete individual”.

If we reveal the dialectical-logical basis of this reasoning, it can be expressed as follows: in studying

the interaction of some elements, aspects, which form a system, one should begin with the interaction, with the essence, and from there proceed to the consideration of the elements, aspects, to the surface; this is necessary because the essence, the interaction, is the main, determining factor for understanding the elements, aspects as elements, aspects precisely of this system, this interaction. Thus, it is implicitly (perhaps unconsciously) assumed that Marxism, in its understanding of society, necessarily begins from the essence to the surface, whereas if the starting point is the surface, this inevitably leads to skimming the surface, to the inability to understand, to explain the essence (hence the reference to positivist sociology). The movement from the surface to the essence is thus essentially excluded from Marxism.

In the first chapter we already noted that the movement of knowledge is from the surface to the essence and from the essence to the surface (more precisely, to the phenomenon and to reality). These opposite movements of cognition always occur simultaneously, but at the same time, in certain stages of cognition, the movement from the surface to the essence first dominates, determining the main character of the stage of cognition, and then from the essence to the surface.

The opposing views on the starting point of the study of society, as expressed in contemporary Marxist literature, implicitly contain the dilemma: either the only path of cognition is from the surface to the essence, or the only path of cognition is from the essence to the surface.

The proponents of the second part of the dilemma admit, consciously or unconsciously, that the path of knowledge from the surface to the essence is inseparable from the bourgeois worldview, particularly from the specificity of Feuerbachianism and the specificity of the approach of bourgeois political economy, especially of the 17th century. And they are right in the sense that the path of knowledge from the surface to the essence, isolated from the

opposite path, inevitably leads to positivism, etc., and is typical of bourgeois ideology. But the path of cognition from essence to surface, isolated from the opposite path, leads to idealism and metaphysics. In its most developed form, this latter approach was carried out by Hegel.

The specificity of Marxism also consisted in the fact that K. Marx and F. Engels did not simply reject the views of Hegel and Feuerbach, and did not simply combine Feuerbachianism and Hegelianism in a mechanical way, but reworked the views of Feuerbach and Hegel, revealing the rational moments in them.

In *Capital*, this approach was put into practice in relation to the task of researching the development of the capitalist economy.

The logic at work in the representation of the capitalist economy in *Capital* is, in its universal moments, applicable to the representation of society.

Indeed, if we compare the definition of society given by Marx in his letter to P.V. Annenkov (the quote was given at the beginning of this chapter) with the definition of capitalist wealth in *Capital*, we will see that there is more than an outward logical similarity between them.

“The wealth of those societies in which the capitalist mode of production prevails, presents itself as “an immense accumulation of commodities,” (in the German text: ‘Warensammlung,’ i.e., in the exact translation, “collection of commodities.”—V. V.), its unit being a single commodity. Our investigation must therefore begin with the analysis of a commodity.”^[7] The collection, the accumulation of commodities, is the interaction of commodities as it appears on the surface, at first sight. K. Marx goes on to show that the commodity, as the elementary form of capitalist wealth, does not exist as a commodity in isolation from other commodities; it becomes a commodity only in interaction with other commodities, and commodity relations, having become dominant and universal in society, are capitalist relations.

Thus, the elementary form of capitalist wealth

is the individual commodity; in society as such, taken independently of any form, the element is the individual person; capitalist wealth is formed by the interaction of commodities (which on the surface appear merely as a simple collection, an accumulation of commodities), human society [is formed]^[8] by the interaction of human beings.

In both cases there is an interaction of elements; in the first case of commodities, in the second of human beings.

It follows that the logic of Capital, insofar as it is the logic of representing the interaction of elements, aspects, is fully applicable to the consideration of society as such.

Before K. Marx, the representation of capitalist wealth was faced with the same question as the representation of society. Where to begin? With the commodity or with capital? The commodity as an element of capitalist wealth is always a capitalist commodity: isolated from capital, the commodity is no longer a commodity of capitalist society, it is no longer an element of capitalist wealth. But at the same time, capital is a collection of commodities. There is a circle: there is no capital without commodities, but there are no commodities as elements of capitalist wealth without capital; in capitalist society, capital and commodity mutually condition each other. To understand what a capitalist commodity is, one must first understand what capital is, but to understand what capital is, one must first understand what a capitalist commodity is.

We encounter a similar situation when we consider society as such. To understand human beings as human beings, and not as animals, one must understand society, social relations. But to understand society, social relations, one must understand human beings, the product of the interaction of which is society.

This difficulty arises whenever it is necessary to represent the interaction of aspects, elements. For an element, insofar as it is an element precisely of

this interaction, is determined in its specificity by this interaction. It is therefore necessary, first, to understand this interaction itself. But on the other hand, interaction is the interaction of elements, and one cannot understand interaction without first understanding the parts that are interacting.

A contradictory situation arises: a necessary condition for understanding the one, is the prior understanding of the other, and the understanding of the other is possible only with the prior understanding of the first.

Any given interaction has a certain stability at a given time and can therefore be considered from the point of view of its functionality. At the same time, every interaction is a historical process; it changes over time.

It is expedient to consider first how the interaction of elements (elements can be goods, human beings, etc.) is represented as a functional interaction, i.e. in the purely logical aspect, and then to shift to the consideration of interaction as a historical process. A full justification of the legitimacy of this precisely, and no other representation of interaction, can only be given by representing interaction in the unity of its functional and historical development.

In the most general terms, what is the course of K. Marx's thought in considering interaction as functional interaction? K. Marx begins his consideration of capital in Capital with the commodity, not with capital. He moves from commodity to capital, from the elements to their interaction.

On the other hand, if one accepts the view that in the analysis of society, Marxism moves from society to man, to the individual, and not the other way round, then one would expect K. Marx to have begun his consideration of capitalist wealth in Capital with capital and proceeded from capital to the commodity. After all, to explain the commodity as an element of capitalist wealth, is first and foremost to explain capital.

As the text of Capital progresses, it becomes

increasingly clear that the commodity is the correct starting point for considering capital, both logically and historically.

K. Marx begins his characterisation of capital with the commodity and moves on to capital, or more precisely to the representation of the production of surplus value. This is the main path of K. Marx's thought in the first volume of *Capital*. In the second volume of *Capital*, K. Marx returns, as it were, from capital to the commodity, but if in the first path he emphasised in the commodity that it was a capitalist commodity, in the second path it is established that it is a capitalist commodity, that capital manifests itself in the commodity. In the third volume of *Capital*, K. Marx reveals the forms of unity of the essence of capital (the production of surplus value) and the manifestation of capital (the circulation of capital).

Let us try to characterise, in the most general terms, the logic of the representation of society as such.

The starting point of the representation of society as such, should be man, but man in his immediate givenness. The connection between man and society will initially appear only as immediately given in the individual human being.

How is man given when we consider him directly?

First, man appears as a living being, forced to maintain his life and therefore forced to satisfy his needs for food, clothing, shelter and the continuation of his species.

Of course, all these needs are by no means entirely identical with the needs of animals; they already contain human specificity. But as long as man is only taken at face value, and it is not explained how that which is specifically human in man emerges, develops and is "produced", what is inherent in man precisely as a man, and what is inherent in him as a mere living being, cannot be distinguished from each other and do not become the subject of special consideration.

"Men can be distinguished from animals by consciousness, by religion or anything else you like.

They themselves begin to distinguish themselves from animals as soon as they begin to produce their means of subsistence, a step which is conditioned by their physical organisation. By producing their means of subsistence men are indirectly producing their actual material life." wrote K. Marx and F. Engels in *The German Ideology*.^[9]

The transition to the consideration of labour, the production of the means of subsistence, is the transition to the consideration of the essence of society.

The productive relation of man to nature includes human need, perceived as an end, the object of purposeful action, the means of action, and the purposeful action itself. The purposeful productive action of man on nature is labour.

In the simplest case, labour and production are identical (although, as K. Marx shows in *Capital*, this is an identity with a difference). Labour in general, as specifically human labour, is classically and clearly defined by K. Marx in *Capital*.

Since the development of labour and production, takes place in order to satisfy the physical needs of human beings, the development of labour (and production) is an external necessity.

The necessity of the development of labour (and production), which is internal, is generated by labour (and production) itself. From the point of view of internal necessity, the development of labour (and production) is a self-movement.

What, then, is the internal source of the development of labour? It must lie in the specific nature and interaction of the necessary components of labour in general.

Labour as self-development, as an end in itself, is carried out to satisfy needs, but these are needs "internal" to labour, needs of labour itself. The internal needs of the labour process are needs generated by the labour process itself, and the improvement of the labour process presupposes knowledge of the object, the means, the result of

labour, it presupposes creativity. Thus, the internal need for the development of labour, that is, the need for labour, is multifaceted: it is the need to acquire knowledge, the need for creativity, the need to improve the labour process, and so on.

The consideration of the labour process brings us back to man. But now the individual is seen through the prism of the labour process as self-development, through the prism of the essence. Now it is not only the individual that is fixed, but the qualities of the individual as a personality. Personality is the individual insofar as the social essence is accumulated in him, or the individual as the manifestation of the social essence^[10].

So far, we have discussed the productive relationship of the individual to nature, taken in itself. Man, however, does not engage in labour and produce in isolation from other people, but in interaction with other people, in society. The social character of labour is brought to life both by external necessity, by factors external to labour, and by internal necessity, by internal connections and relations within the labour process.

As labour develops, the internal factors related to the labour process, which determine the social character of labour, play an increasingly important role. In developed labour, external factors persist, although they are not the most important ones.

What, then, are the internal factors of the labour process that determine its social character? These are different moments of the labour process in general, which have become the particular activity of different human beings. For example, the formulation of labour objectives is carried out by some human beings, their execution by others, and the control of their execution by still others, and so on. In turn, the formulation of objectives can be divided into a number of interrelated moments (the labour of the scientist, the labour of the designer, the labour of the engineer, etc.), and the same applies to the execution. In this case, different human beings or

different groups of human beings carry out different moments of a single labour process. Here, different human beings act as carriers of different moments of the labour process. The labour process itself, the internal relation of its moments, determines the productive relation of a collective of human beings towards nature (ultimately of the whole of society, if the economy of the whole of society becomes an internally unified whole). Human beings, insofar as they carry out different moments of a single labour process, enter into technical relations with one another.

Man, ultimately enters into a productive relationship with nature, first and foremost in order to satisfy the needs conditioned by his bodily organisation.

The relations between human beings, from the point of view of the satisfaction of physical needs, are direct relations of the distribution of the products of labour, of production, among human beings. What determines the distribution of the products of labour, of production? The distribution in the labour process. The relations between human beings in the distribution of the products of labour, of production, and those relations in production itself which lead to the distribution of products, are relations of production.

Technique and technical relations are the means in the process of human transformation of nature. Consequently, human beings, as moments of technical relations, act as means, not as the end of production. The consideration of relations of production, on the other hand, is the consideration of the objective relations of human beings in production from the point of view of the possibilities of satisfying the material needs of human beings, i.e. from the point of view of the objectives of the transformation of nature.

Thus, we started from the fact of the bodily organisation of individuals and the physical needs that result from it, then moved on to production as a means of satisfying physical needs, and finally

returned, as it were, to the starting point. But now we are no longer talking about the physical needs of man as a particular living being, but about the relations of individuals to each other in terms of their physical needs, insofar as these relations are conditioned by production as a means of satisfying them. It is only at this stage of the movement of thought that the need to distinguish not only the category of “relations of production” but also the category of “productive forces” becomes fully apparent.

The category “productive forces” encompasses not only the instrumental relation to nature as such (hence not just technical relations), nor the relation to nature in itself.

What is reflected in the category of productive forces—and this is very important—is the productive relation to nature, not in isolation from social relations of production, but in internal connection with them.

From what has been said, it follows that the category of relations of production cannot be distinguished if cognition does not penetrate into the internal connection between production and needs, production and consumption, production and distribution, and exchange. If only an external connection is established between production and needs/consumption—where production serves merely as a means for consumption, for satisfying needs—then the production relations cannot be revealed in their essential character, for it is precisely within them that the unity of both moments is realised. If distribution is separated from production, then although the relations of production appear explicitly in the distribution of the products of production, they cannot be understood as conditioned by production itself, and consequently the relations of production in production itself disappear, and the distribution of products appears arbitrary.

Based on the consideration of productive forces and relations of production, there is, as it were, a return to the starting point, to the individual. But now the individual appears as a personality and the relations between individuals as personal relations.

Thus, the starting point of consideration is man as he is immediately given, i.e. man as a living being, forced to maintain his physical existence, to satisfy his physical needs and to perpetuate his species. The transition to the characterisation of labour, the production of means of subsistence, is the transition to the consideration of the essence, the internal interaction of human beings. Returning then to individuals, we see that they now appear, enriched by internal, essential interrelations, as personalities, and their relations as personal relations.

All other social relations, e.g. moral, aesthetic, etc., turn out to be forms of the relations of human beings as personalities, personal relations.

We shall confine ourselves to these brief remarks on the consideration of the interrelation of the aspects of society as a functioning “organic” whole, for our task is not to consider society systematically as an organic whole, but to show the possibility and necessity of such consideration.

Notes

[1] Letter from K. Marx to Pavel Vasilyevich Annenkov, December 28, 1846

[2] As above.

[3] Translator’s note: The author refers to the Aristotelian definition of the end, purpose or final “cause” (τέλος, télos) as that for the sake of which a thing is done.

[4] K. Marx, Theses on Feuerbach, 1845

[5] Translator’s note.

[6] V. Zh. Kelle. Afterword to the book by F. Tökei “Towards a Theory of Social Formations”, 1975, p. 264-265.

[7] K. Marx. Capital Volume One, Part I: Commodities and Money, 1867

[8] Translator’s note

[9] K. Marx. The German Ideology. 1845

[10] In our opinion, this should be the basis for the distinction between the personality and the individual. A person cannot consider himself to be a true personality as long as their primary goal is only the maintenance of their own physical existence and reproductive relationships.

Sixtieth anniversary of the victory against fascism: a festival of progressive humanity

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

First published in Lalkar, May 2005.

The second world war, like the first, was the product of the growth of interimperialist contradictions. It began as a war for redivision and domination of the world. The crash of 1929, and the depression that followed it, made an interimperialist war a certainty. At the same time, all the imperialist countries were united in their hatred of the socialist Soviet Union, seeking for any opportunity to crush it. In this complicated situation, the Soviet Union, through building her economic and military strength, as well as through some very deft diplomatic footwork, made sure that the then-coming war, instead of being a war waged against the USSR by the combined forces of imperialism, would be a war between two groups of imperialist bloodsuckers.

Only after the Nazi invasion of the Soviet Union in June 1941 did the war assume an antifascist character. Even then, as the narrative below clearly demonstrates, it was the Soviet Union alone (with the support and sympathy of hundreds of millions of people around the world, including the peoples of the imperialist countries) that fought against fascism, whereas her allies, Britain and the USA, were throughout determined to defend their respective imperialist interests and ready to come to terms with Nazi Germany. Only the advance of the Red Army frustrated their schemes.

Sunday 8 May this year (2005) marked the 60th anniversary of the victory against Hitlerite German fascism, which victory is popularly known in western Europe as VE (Victory in Europe) Day. It is indeed a festival of progressive humanity, to bring about which tens of millions of people all over the world paid with their lives.

While people everywhere fought against Hitler's

fascist Germany, made sacrifices and contributed to the final victory against it, the most outstanding contribution was without doubt made by the peoples of the USSR under the victorious banner of Marxism-Leninism and the leadership of the Bolshevik party headed by the legendary Josef Stalin who, smashing all imperialist plots and conspiracies against the Soviet Union, led the Soviet people—indeed, the people of the world—in the successful fight against the Hitlerite plague.

To rid mankind of the menace of fascism, and in the interests of socialism and democratic liberty, the Soviet people lost no fewer than 27 million men, women and children.

FALSIFICATION OF HISTORY

This 60th anniversary, this festival of progressive humanity, has become the occasion for the bourgeois falsification of history. Western bourgeois ideologists, from Trotskyist slanderers to penny-a-liner journalists, are busily engaged in juggling facts and falsifying events. There is a kind of division of labour between the Trotskyist variety of bourgeois ideologues on the one hand, and the ordinary ('ordinary' because shorn of 'Marxist' and 'left' terminology and therefore more easily recognisable and less dangerous) bourgeois ideologists on the other.

This 60th anniversary, as was the case with the 60th anniversary of the D-Day landings last year, has been greeted with a torrent of nauseatingly unctuous and hypocritical cant in the imperialist print and electronic media, with the sole purpose of hiding the real meaning, content and causes of the second world war, and to belittle the decisive contribution of the socialist USSR in smashing the seemingly invincible Nazi war machine.

Ten years ago, on the occasion of the 50th

anniversary of the victory against fascism, we were treated to headlines such as ‘Germany’s fate settled in the Atlantic’, ‘How Hitler was defeated by his own madness’ etc, when the fact is, as every well-informed person knows, that the fate of Nazi Germany was sealed on the eastern front, in the titanic battles of Moscow, Leningrad, Stalingrad and Kursk. Here is one example, which typifies the thrust of the entire imperialist propaganda machine, of precisely the kind of falsification of history alluded to above:

“British democracy is alive and kicking. That is the message from the people of this country on this anniversary weekend. For those who fought to destroy Hitler’s Third Reich 50 years ago were inspired by more than a love of country, passionate though that was. They went to war and won the victory over fascism for a greater cause. This infused their patriotism and earned them immortal greatness.

“Ordinary folk knew in their hearts that what was at stake was no less than the survival of simple, decent values: their right to be heard, to speak their minds without fear of the knock on the door at dawn, to run their lives according to their own lights. To live and let live, to go about their daily business in freedom under the law. Above all, to make and unmake governments elected in their name.

“The struggle and sacrifice of those who fought in the European war enabled Britain to remain a sovereign nation. Let us never forget that the red, white and blue Union flag we fly this weekend flew alone in the face of an all-conquering Nazi tyranny before the tide turned in 1942. We were fighting for our own freedom and to free Europe from despotic rule.” (Leading article, Sunday Times, 7 May 1995)

Of course, no one except the most malicious person would deny that ordinary British people, and the British soldiers who fought in the second world war, were inspired by the ideal of ridding humanity of the menace of fascism. That, however, is not at issue. What is at issue is the cause for which the ruling classes of Britain, France and the United States went to war against Germany.

All objective observers agree that British imperialism went to war against Nazi Germany not in the interests

of freedom and the fight against fascism but to protect its own colonialist and imperialist interests after all the attempts of safeguarding the same through appeasement (that is through bartering other people’s freedom in return for saving its own skin and material interests) had resulted in an ignominious and scandalous collapse.

Here, briefly, are the facts that led to the Union flag flying alone ‘in the face of an all-conquering Nazi tyranny before the tide turned in 1942’.

1. Imperialism’s hatred for the USSR

All imperialists, of the Nazi and ‘democratic’ variety alike, and all imperialist politicians, social democrats no less than Conservatives, were fired by an intense hatred of the USSR, the only socialist state at the time, for the simple reason that through planned socialist construction, she was building a new life for her people, free of exploitation, oppression, unemployment, misery and degradation. And this at a time when the entire capitalist world was in the iron grip of the hitherto worst slump, which had forced 50 million working people on to the scrap heap, rendering them jobless, homeless and hungry.

The Soviet Union alone stood as a shining beacon and an example to the world’s workers of how their lives, too, could change qualitatively for the better if only the state power was in the hands of the working class. Encircled as it was by bloodthirsty imperialists, the USSR was well aware of the dangers confronting it. Its leadership followed an extremely complicated, and singularly scientific policy on the question of war with imperialism, which may be summarised as follows.

2. Soviet position on war with imperialism

First, it was the endeavour of the Soviet Union not to embroil herself in a war with imperialism.

Second, since it was not entirely up to her to avoid such a war, then, if imperialism should impose a war on the Soviet Union, the latter should not find herself in the position of having to fight alone, let alone having to face the combined onslaught of the principal imperialist countries.

Third, to this end, divisions between the fascist imperialist states on the one hand and the 'democratic' imperialist states on the other should be fully exploited. These divisions were real, based on the material interests of the two groups of states under consideration. Uneven development of capitalism had seen to it that Germany, Italy and Japan, having spurred ahead in the capitalist development of their economies (a development that had rendered obsolete the old division of the world), were demanding a new division, which could not but encroach upon the material interests of the 'democratic' imperialist states. There was thus real scope for this conflict of interests to be exploited by the socialist USSR.

Fourth, to this end, the USSR, pursuing a very complicated foreign policy, did its best to conclude a collective security pact with the 'democratic' imperialist states, providing, in the event of such aggression taking place, for collective action against the aggressors.

Fifth, when the 'democratic' imperialist states, overcome by their hatred of communism, refused to conclude a collective security pact with the USSR and continued their policy of appeasement of the fascist states, in particular that of Nazi Germany in an effort to direct her aggression in an eastwardly direction against the Soviet Union, the latter was forced to try some other method of protecting the interests of the socialist motherland of the international proletariat. Addressing the 18th party congress of the CPSU in March 1939, Stalin exposed the motives behind the policy of non-intervention adopted by the 'democratic' imperialist countries, particularly Britain and France, thus:

"The policy of non-intervention reveals an eagerness, a desire ... not to hinder Germany, say ... from embroiling herself in a war with the Soviet Union, to allow all the belligerents to sink deeply in the mire of war, to encourage them surreptitiously in this; to allow them to weaken and exhaust one another; and then, when they have become weak enough, to appear on the scene with fresh strength, to appear, of course, 'in the interests of peace', and

to dictate conditions to the enfeebled belligerents.

"Cheap and easy!" (Report on the work of the central committee to the eighteenth congress of the CPSU(B) by JV Stalin, 10 March 1939)

Further, referring to the Munich agreement, which surrendered Czechoslovakia to the Nazis (the leader writer of the Sunday Times cited above, displaying monumental 'forgetfulness', studiously avoided any reference to this pact, correctly fearing that such a reference would at once expose the hypocritical assertion that Britain's ruling class went to war against Nazi Germany in the interests of the fight against fascism and for 'decent values'), Stalin continued: "One might think that the districts of Czechoslovakia were yielded to Germany as the price of an undertaking to launch war on the Soviet Union ..."

By way of outlining the tasks of Soviet foreign policy, as well as by way of a veiled warning to the ruling classes in the 'democratic' imperialist countries, Stalin went on to stress the need "to be cautious and not allow our country to be drawn into conflicts by warmongers who are accustomed to have others pull chestnuts out of the fire for them".

Thus it was that in the face of intransigent refusal on the part of Britain and France to conclude a collective security pact, and in the aftermath of the Munich agreement, about which the Soviet Union was not even consulted, that the latter turned the tables on the foreign policy of Britain and France by signing, on 23 August 1939, the German-Soviet Non-Aggression Pact.

Sixth, in signing this pact, the USSR not only ensured that she would not be fighting Germany alone, but also that the latter would be fighting against the very powers who had been trying, by their refusal to agree on collective security, to embroil the USSR in a war with Germany. On 1 September 1939, Hitler invaded Poland. Two days later, the Anglo-French ultimatum expired, and Britain and France were at war with Germany.

Of course, it is understandable that imperialism even today should attack and accuse the USSR and Stalin of 'betrayal' for concluding the non-aggression

pact with Germany (conveniently ‘forgetting’ that the real betrayal had taken place at Munich a year earlier), for this pact advanced the cause of socialism and the liberation of humanity from the yoke of fascism. But those sorry Marxists who still, taking their cue from imperialism, continue to criticise the USSR for concluding the German-Soviet Non-Aggression Pact need to have their heads examined. They could do far worse than listen to the right-wing Austrian Professor Topitsch.

Professor Topitsch, whose anticommunist credentials and pro-imperialist sympathies are impeccable, and who cannot therefore be accused of harbouring any soft corner for Stalin or the USSR that he led, has this to say on the issue under consideration:

“Thorough analysis of the interplay of the main events has led me to the conviction that ... Stalin was not only the real victor, but also the key figure in the war; he was, indeed, the only statesman who had at the time a clear, broadly-based idea of his objectives.”

Further: “The events of the summer of 1939 show the fateful consequences of Hitler’s lack of statesmanlike qualities and a world-oriented political vision, and make him look very inferior to his Russian counterpart. With regard to political intelligence and political style, their relationship is like that of a gambler to a chess grandmaster, and the assertion that the führer fell like a schoolboy into the trap set for him by Moscow can hardly be called exaggerated.”

On the Hitler-Stalin pact the same author writes:

“After the conclusion of this treaty, Hitler and Ribbentrop may have regarded themselves as statesmen of the highest calibre; instead their actions betrayed a frightening lack of political intelligence. Whereas Stalin had thoroughly pondered over the content and phraseology of the agreements, his opposite numbers were obviously incapable even of carefully reviewing the consequences which might result for Germany from those fateful documents. In point of fact, the two treaties fitted in perfectly with Soviet long-term strategy, to involve Germany in a war with the British and the French, make it

dependent on Russia and, if the opportunity should arise, bring about its extinction as an independent power. Far-sighted as he was, Stalin was already thinking at this early stage of obtaining a favourable starting point for the realisation of such plans.” (E Topitsch, *Stalin’s War*, 1987, pp4-7)

Through its April 1941 Treaty of Neutrality with Japan, the Soviet Union successfully managed to achieve in the east that which it had achieved in the west through the non-aggression pact with Germany.

Seventh, the provisions of the additional secret protocol went far enough to safeguard the Soviet ‘spheres of interests’, which proved vital to Soviet defences when the war actually reached her.

Finally, the German-Soviet Non-Aggression Pact bought the Soviet Union an extremely valuable period of two years for strengthening her defence preparedness before she entered a war she knew she could not stay out of forever.

When the war was finally forced on the Soviet Union, she made the most heroic contribution in the crowning and glorious victory of the allies against Nazi Germany. The Red Army and the Soviet people showed their tenacity, and the tenacity and superiority of the socialist system, by defeating the Nazis in the USSR and pursuing them all the way to Berlin, liberating in the process country after country from the Nazi jackboot occupation and bringing socialism to eastern Europe.

All revolutionary and honest bourgeois historians and politicians agree on the above summary. Only the most die-hard anticommunists, particularly the Trotskyites, ever dare to dispute it.

3. Bourgeois predictions of Soviet collapse

By the summer of 1941, through a combination of luck and some bold strokes, Hitler’s armies had chased the British off the continent of Europe and thus become the masters of western and central Europe, whose people groaned under fascist occupation. Hitler was at last in a position to wage war against the USSR, which he launched under the codename Operation Barbarossa at 3.30am on 22 June 1941.

When, on that fateful day, the German army crossed the border into the USSR, most western bourgeois politicians and military strategists gave her no more than six weeks before what they regarded as her inevitable collapse in the face of the mighty German armed forces. Their judgement had obviously been coloured by the fate of countries such as Poland and France, each of which lay prostrate within less than two weeks of being invaded by the German army. They were affected too by the fate of the British army, so humiliatingly expelled from the continent in the May 1940 fiasco, which goes by the name of the 'Dunkirk spirit'.

Furthermore, the bourgeois ideologues believed in their own anti-Soviet propaganda to the effect that the Soviet army had been 'decimated' and 'decapitated' as a result of the trial and execution of Tukhachevsky and other army officers on treason charges, and was therefore in no position to wage war; that the Bolshevik party had been 'denuded' of leadership consequent upon the three Moscow trials of the leading Trotskyites and Bukharinites on charges of treason, murder, sabotage and wrecking; that as a result of 'forced' collectivisation the peasantry was sullen and therefore most likely to revolt against the Soviet regime in the conditions of war. In all this, the bourgeois ideologists were cruelly deluded.

Even before the war against the Soviet Union started, the chief imperialist ideologue, namely, Leon Trotsky, made, with malicious glee, a number of predictions about the "inevitable" defeat of the USSR in the then coming war. In his *Revolution Betrayed*, he wrote: "Can we, however, expect that the Soviet Union will come out of the coming great war without defeat? To this frankly posed question we will answer as frankly; if the war should only remain a war, the defeat of the Soviet Union will be inevitable. In a technical, economic and military sense, imperialism is incomparably more strong. If it is not paralysed by revolution in the west, imperialism will sweep away the regime which issued from the October Revolution." (*Revolution Betrayed*, p216)

In 1940, nearing the end of his life—a life full of irreconcilable hostility towards Leninism—Trotsky,

with a zeal worthy of a better cause, again predicted the defeat of the USSR and triumph of Hitlerite Germany:

"We always started from the fact that the international policy of the Kremlin was determined by the new aristocracy's ... incapacity to conduct a war ...

"The ruling caste is no longer capable of thinking about tomorrow. Its formula is that of all doomed regimes 'after us the deluge' ...

"The war will topple many things and many individuals. Artifice, trickery, frame-ups and treasons will prove of no avail in escaping its severe judgement." (Statement to the British capitalist press on 'Stalin-Hitler's quartermaster')

"Stalin cannot make a war with discontented workers and peasants and with a decapitated Red Army." ('German-Soviet alliance')

"The level of the USSR's productive forces forbids a major war ... the involvement of the USSR in a major war before the end of this period would signify in any case a struggle with unequal weapons.

"The subjective factor, not less important than the material, has changed in the last years sharply for the worse ...

"Stalin cannot wage an offensive war with any hope of victory.

"Should the USSR enter the war with its innumerable victims and privations, the whole fraud of the official regime, its outrages and violence, will inevitably provoke a profound reaction on the part of the people, who have already carried out three revolutions in this century ...

"The present war can crush the Kremlin bureaucracy long before revolution breaks out in some capitalist country ..." ('The twin stars: Hitler-Stalin')

4. Bourgeois predictions belied

Not only Trotsky, but also the imperialist bourgeoisie (which paid Trotsky so well, and for whom it opened the columns of its press, to write such rubbish and to spew out so much anti-Soviet venom) believed in these baseless assertions. It therefore came as a total surprise to the imperialists when the Soviet Union,

far from collapsing under Nazi attack, proved to be the only force, not only to withstand but also to defeat and smash to smithereens the Nazi war machine.

As usual, and happily for humanity, all Trotsky's predictions were totally belied. After initial reverses in the first few weeks of the war, attributable in the main to the Nazi surprise attack, the Soviet defences stiffened. Before long they struck back.

The rest of the world, like Trotsky, had given the USSR only a few weeks before collapsing in the face of the onslaught of the allegedly invincible Nazi war machine. The Red Army and Soviet people, united as one under the leadership of the CPSU and their supreme commander Josef Stalin, exploded this myth of Nazi invincibility. Soviet victories in the titanic battles of Moscow, Stalingrad, Kursk, Leningrad and Berlin will forever be cherished not only by the peoples of the former, great and glorious Soviet Union, but also by all progressive humanity.

Each of these battles involved upwards of a million men on each side, and, in the words of Harrison E Salisbury: "Each inflicted on the Germans the kind of casualties which leave a lasting mark not only on an army but on a nation." (Introduction to Marshal Zhukov's Greatest Battles, MacDonald, London, 1969, pp12-3)

"The Battle of Moscow had been an epic event ... It had involved more than two million men, 2,500 tanks, 1,800 aircraft and 25,000 guns. Casualties had been horrifying in scale. For the Russians it had ended in victory. They had suffered the full impact of the German 'Blitzkrieg' offensive and, notwithstanding their losses ... they had been able to mount an effective counterattack. They had begun to destroy the myth of German invincibility." (Ian Grey, Stalin - Man of History, Abacus, p344)

This is how Marshal Zhukov evaluated the significance of the Battle of Moscow: "The final results of the Battle of Moscow proved to be inspiring for the Soviet side and depressing for the enemy.

"A German general, Westphal ... has acknowledged that the German army, once considered invincible, was on the brink of destruction ... The Germans lost a total of more than half a million soldiers, 1,300 tanks,

2,500 guns, 15,000 trucks and a great deal of other equipment ...

"The Soviet counter-offensive of the winter of 1941-2 was conducted under difficult conditions of a snowy, cold winter and, what is most important, without numerical superiority over the enemy ...

"For the first time in six months of war, in the Battle of Moscow the Red Army inflicted a major defeat on the main forces of the enemy. It was the first strategic victory over the Wehrmacht since the beginning of World War II ... The skilled defensive operations [by the Soviet army], the successful launching of counter-attacks and the swift transition to a counter-offensive greatly enriched Soviet military art and demonstrated the growing strategic operational-tactical maturity of Soviet military commanders and improved military mastery of Soviet soldiers in all services.

"The defeat of Germany at Moscow was also of great international significance. The people in all the countries of the anti-Nazi coalition received the news of the outstanding victory of the Soviet army with great enthusiasm. All progressive mankind linked that victory to its hopes for an approaching liberation from fascist slavery.

"The failures of German forces at Leningrad, at Rostov, near Tikhvin and the Battle of Moscow had a sobering effect on the reactionary circles of Japan and Turkey and forced them to assume a more cautious policy toward the Soviet Union.

"After the defeat of Germans before Moscow, the strategic initiative on all sectors of the Soviet-German front passed to the Soviet command ... After the defeat of the Nazis at Moscow, not only ordinary Germans but many German officers and generals were convinced of the might of the Soviet state and recognised that the Soviet armed forces represented an insurmountable obstacle to the achievement of Hitler's objectives." (Marshal Zhukov's Greatest Battles, pp100-2)

Marshal Zhukov concluded his account of the Battle of Moscow with the following question, and his answer to it: "I am often asked the question: 'Where was Stalin at the time of the Moscow battle?'

"Stalin was in Moscow, organising the forces and

means for the defeat of the enemy. He must be given his due. As head of the State Defence Committee, and with the members of the Supreme Headquarters and leaders of the People's Commissariats, he carried on major work in the organising of strategic reserves and the material-technical means essential for the military struggle. With his harsh demands, he achieved, one might say, almost the impossible." (Ibid, pp102-3)

Here is another evaluation, from the opposite end of the political spectrum, of Soviet strength, which the Hitlerites, intoxicated by their own deceptive propaganda and easy victories in the west, had failed properly to take into account.

Topitsch correctly points out that Operation Barbarossa was based on an overestimation of German and an underestimation of Soviet military might, as well as other assumptions, which began to come apart from the moment the German army crossed the Soviet frontier.

"When the Germans crossed the border into the east the feeling often came over them—from the Führer down to the common soldier—that they were thrusting open a door into the unknown, behind which Stalin had wicked surprises in store for them, and that in the end doom might be lurking in the endless wastes beyond." (Topitsch, *ibid*, p103)

After their initial successes, gained through the tactical advantage of their surprise attack on the USSR, the Nazis began to believe that victory was already theirs and indulged in fantastic plans for the future. "But gradually it became clear that the Soviet Union was anything but a 'Colossus with feet of clay'. In spite of enormous losses, this vast empire could keep hurling new masses of men and material at the invader, and soon increasing numbers of the new types of tanks and the dreaded rocket-launchers appeared on the battlefields. The 14-day victory developed into a war lasting at least four years, fought with the greatest bitterness on both sides, and the dramatic victories of the first weeks turned out to be the beginning of the end for the Third Reich." (p113)

"Stalin's ruthless energy made sure that all reserves within the depths of the country were mobilised.

Indeed, during the course of this frightful struggle the Soviet Union extended itself and took a decisive step towards becoming a superpower. By contrast, Germany was effectively diminishing itself with every step in its exhausting campaign in the east." (p115)

The surrender on 1 February 1943 at Stalingrad, by the fascist General Von Paulus and 23 other generals, mesmerised the world. The victory of the Red Army at Stalingrad was as incredible as it was heroic. The Nazi losses in the Volga-Don-Stalingrad area were 1.5 million men, 3,500 tanks, 12,000 guns and 3,000 aircraft. Never before had the Nazi war machine, which was accustomed to running over countries in days and weeks, suffered such a humiliating defeat, a defeat "in which the flower of the German army perished. It was against the background of this battle ... that Stalin now rose to almost titanic stature in the eyes of the world." (Isaac Deutscher, *Stalin—A Political Biography*, Pelican, London, 1966, p472)

From now on, nothing but defeat stared the Germans in the face, leading all the way to the entry of the Red Army into Berlin and the storming by it of the Reichstag on 30 April 1945—the same day that the Führer committed suicide. Six days later, Field-Marshal Wilhelm Keitel, acting on behalf of the German high command, surrendered to Marshall Zhukov.

REASONS FOR SOVIET VICTORY

How was it possible for the USSR to succeed where others had failed so miserably? There are several reasons for this success.

1. Elimination of the fifth column

First, because the CPSU and the Soviet regime ruthlessly purged the party, the government and the armed forces of the fifth column elements.

In addition to the testimony of the accused at the above-mentioned trials—and for this testimony there is no substitute—impeccable bourgeois sources, who cannot be suspected of the least partiality towards the Soviet regime, are on record confirming the guilt of the accused at these trials. Joseph E Davies,

at the time the American ambassador in Moscow, who, accompanied by an interpreter, attended and carefully followed the proceedings at the Moscow trials, was profoundly impressed.

On 17 February 1937, a month after the second trial, in a confidential dispatch to Cordell Hull, the US secretary of state, Ambassador Davies reported that almost all the foreign diplomats in Moscow shared his opinion of the justice of the verdict: "I talked to many, if not all, of the members of the diplomatic corps here and, with possibly one exception, they are all of the opinion that the proceedings established clearly the existence of a political plot and conspiracy to overthrow the government." (Joseph E Davies, *Mission to Moscow*, Victor Gollancz, London, 1942, p39)

Powerful, anti-Soviet forces saw to it that this truth about the fifth column in the USSR was not made public in the USA or elsewhere in the western world.

Again, on 11 March 1937, Ambassador Davies recorded in his diary: "Another diplomat, Minister --, made a most illuminating statement to me yesterday. In discussing the trial, he said that the defendants were undoubtedly guilty; that all of us who attended the trial had practically agreed upon that; that the outside world, from the press reports, however, seemed to think that the trial was a put-up job (facade, as he called it); that while he knew it was not, it was probably just as well that the outside world should think so." (Ibid, p83)

One week into the third Moscow trial (that of Bukharin and others), Ambassador Davies wrote on 8 March 1938 to his daughter Emlen thus: "The extraordinary testimony of Krestinsky, Bukharin, and the rest would appear to indicate that the Kremlin's fears were well justified. For it now seems that a plot existed in the beginning of November 1936 to project a coup d'état, with Tukhachevsky at its head, for May of the following year. Apparently it was touch and go at that time whether it actually would be staged.

"But the government acted with great vigour and speed. The Red Army generals were shot and the whole party organisation was purged and thoroughly cleansed. Then it came out that quite a few of those at

the top were seriously infected with the virus of the conspiracy to overthrow the government, and were actually working with the secret service organisations of Germany and Japan." (Ibid, p177)

Far from weakening the Soviet regime or the Red Army, these trials helped to eliminate precisely those elements who would have collaborated with the Nazis and acted as a fifth column. In the summer of 1941, shortly after the Nazi invasion of the USSR, Davies wrote the following appraisal of the historical significance of the Moscow trials:

"There was no so-called 'internal aggression' in Russia cooperating with the German high command. Hitler's march into Prague in 1939 was accompanied by the active military support of Henlein's organisations in Czechoslovakia. The same thing was true of his invasion of Norway. There were no Sudeten Henleins, no Slovakian Tisos, no Belgian De Grelles, no Norwegian Quislings in the Russian picture." (Ibid, p179)

"The story had been told in the so-called treason or purge trials of 1937 and 1938 which I attended and listened to. In re-examining the record of these cases and also what I had written at the time ... I found that practically every device of German fifth columnist activity, as we now know it, was disclosed and laid bare by the confessions and testimony elicited at these trials of self-confessed 'Quisling's in Russia ...

"All of these trials, purges and liquidations, which seemed so violent at the time and shocked the world, are now quite clearly a part of a vigorous and determined effort of the Stalin government to protect itself not only from revolution from within but from attack from without. They went to work thoroughly to clean up and clean out all treasonable elements within the country. All doubts were resolved in favour of the government.

"There were no fifth columnists in Russia in 1941—they had shot them. The purge had cleansed the country and rid it of treason." (Ibid, pp179-184)

An authoritative bourgeois correspondent concluded that the "purge eliminated Russia's fifth column. I found no British or American correspondent in Russia who thought that the famous confessions

made by Radek, Tukhachevsky, Rykov, Krestinsky, Pletnov, Rozengolts and others had been extracted by torture.” (Quentin Reynolds, *Only the Stars Are Neutral*, New York, 1943, p93)

Let George Sava be our final bourgeois witness. In his *War Without Guns*, having stated that “Russia’s splendid resistance surprised many a diplomat of the democratic countries, who were convinced that Russia could not resist more than ten weeks,” he went on to make the following perceptive, nay penetrating, observation:

“We may not understand the intricacies of Marxism, but we should have known that the grave Hitler has been digging for conservatives and democrats alike was intentionally made big enough to bury the Russians as well. Fortunately, unlike our diplomats, the Russians did realise the dangers and that is the reason for their ruthless suppression of fifth columnists. The executions which so horrified us and were termed enigmatic and barbaric, should have been seen in a different light by an intelligent diplomacy, particularly if they considered the fate of Norway and France and the role which fifth-columnists played in those two countries. A clever diplomat could have willingly admitted that a little well-directed shooting in France and Belgium on the Russian model might have saved Brussels, Oslo, Amsterdam and Paris.”

Thus it can be seen that once the western countries had become locked in a mortal conflict with Nazi Germany and became allies of the USSR, they had to overcome their deep-rooted anti-Comintern and anti-Bolshevik prejudices and speak the truth in public on the Moscow trials as on many other issues; they had to admit publicly that these trials, far from weakening the CPSU(B), the Soviet government or the Red Army, had, by liquidating the fifth column in the USSR, strengthened the party, the government and the Red Army. In making this belated admission they were only confirming the historical significance of these trials as being an integral part of the USSR’s struggle—indeed, the struggle of the world as a whole—against the menace of Nazi world domination.

Stalin, in his report to the 18th party congress, answered the rubbish uttered on this question by the bourgeois press in the imperialist countries thus:

“Certain foreign pressmen have been talking drivel to the effect that the purging of Soviet organisations of spies, assassins and wreckers like Trotsky, Zinoviev, Yakir, Tukhachevsky, Rosengoltz, Bukharin and other fiends has ‘shaken’ the Soviet system and caused its ‘demoralisation’. All this cheap drivel deserves is laughter and scorn. How can the purging of Soviet organisations of noxious and hostile elements shake and demoralise the Soviet system?”

“The Trotsky-Bukharin bunch, that handful of spies, assassins and wreckers, who kow-towed to the foreign world, who were possessed by a slavish instinct to grovel before every foreign bigwig and were ready to serve him as spies—that handful of individuals who did not understand that the humblest Soviet citizen, being free from the fetters of capital, stands head and shoulders above any high-placed foreign bigwig whose neck wears the yoke of capitalist slavery—of what use that miserable band of venal slaves, of what value can they be to the people, and whom can they ‘demoralise’?”

“In 1937, Tukhachevsky, Yakir, Uborevich and other fiends were sentenced to be shot. After that, the elections to the Supreme Soviet of the USSR were held. In these elections, 98.6 percent of the total vote was cast for the Soviet government. At the beginning of 1938, Rosengoltz, Rykov, Bukharin and other fiends were sentenced to be shot. After that, the elections to the Supreme Soviets of the Union Republics were held. In these elections 99.4 percent of the total vote was cast for the Soviet government. Where are the symptoms of ‘demoralisation’, we would like to know, and why was this ‘demoralisation’ not reflected in the results of the elections?”

“To listen to these foreign drivellers one would think that if the spies, assassins and wreckers had been left at liberty to wreck, murder and spy without let or hindrance, the Soviet organisations would have been far sounder and stronger [Laughter]. Are not these gentlemen giving themselves away too soon by so insolently defending the cause of spies, assassins

and wreckers?

“Would it not be truer to say that the weeding out of spies, assassins and wreckers from the Soviet organisations was bound to lead, and did lead, to the further strengthening of these organisations?”

Referring to the bloody but undeclared war at Lake Hassan on the Manchurian-Maritime provinces frontier, fought between the USSR and Japanese imperialism—a war in which the Japanese got a bloody nose, which restrained them from attacking the USSR again—Stalin went on to add: “What, for instance, do the events at Lake Hassan show, if not that the weeding out of spies and wreckers is the surest means of strengthening our Soviet organisations?” (‘Report to the 18th party congress’)

Thus the convergence of honest bourgeois and proletarian views alike compels us to the only conclusion possible, namely that the accused at the Moscow trials were justly tried and justly punished and that the liquidation of the accused eliminated the fifth column in the USSR, which in turn strengthened the ability of the Soviet regime and its armed forces to withstand, defeat and smash the seemingly invincible Wehrmacht.

If we are to believe the bourgeois-Trotskyist drivel—that after the trials the USSR’s armed forces were left bereft of a general staff—how, then are we to explain the existence in the Red Army of such brilliant and legendary generals, whose exploits are known the world over, as Zhukov, Chuikov, Shtemenko, Yeremenko, Timoshenko, Vasilevsky, Sokolovsky, Rokossovsky, Koniev, Voroshilov, Budenny, Mekhlis, Kulik and many, many more?

2. Socialism

Second, the USSR was successful because she had been building up her industry and collectivising her agriculture on the lines of socialism. The implementation of such a programme, in addition to endowing the USSR with material strength, brought a resurgence of proletarian pride in their achievements, an ardent faith in the bright future of socialism, and a grim determination to defend the gains of socialism against external and internal

enemies alike.

But this programme did not fall from heaven by itself, fortuitously as it were. It had to be fought for tooth and nail against its ‘left’ (Trotskyist) and ‘right’ (Bukharinite) opponents; it had to survive the wrecking, sabotage and treasonable conspiracies of the Trotskyite and Bukharinite capitulators and despicable lackeys of imperialism. In a word, it was a programme born out of, and amidst, conditions of fierce class struggle.

Although the Soviet Union would have dearly loved to have been left alone in peace to continue the task of socialist construction, her leadership was well aware of the dangers, of the fact that imperialism would drag her into the war. It was not, therefore, within Soviet power to avert involvement in a war with imperialism, for, as a Chinese saying has it, ‘The tree may prefer the calm, but the wind will not subside’. Precisely for this reason, with the impending war in mind, the leadership of the CPSU had refused, in the teeth of opposition from the camp of the Bukharinite capitulators, to slow down the tempo of industrialisation. Speaking at the conference of leading personnel of socialist industry on 4 February 1931, Stalin stressed this point in his characteristically frank and unambiguous manner:

“It is sometimes asked whether it is not possible to slow down the tempo somewhat, to put a check on the movement. No, comrades, it is not possible! The tempo must not be reduced! On the contrary, we must increase it as much as is within our powers and possibilities. This is dictated to us by our obligations to the workers and peasants of the USSR. This is dictated to us by our obligations to the working class of the whole world.

“To slacken the tempo would mean falling behind. And those who fall behind get beaten. But we do not want to be beaten. No, we refuse to be beaten! One feature of the history of old Russia was the continual beatings she suffered because of her backwardness. She was beaten by the Mongol khans. She was beaten by the Turkish beys. She was beaten by the Swedish feudal lords. She was beaten by the Polish and Lithuanian gentry. She was beaten by the British and

French capitalists. She was beaten by the Japanese barons.

“All beat her because of her backwardness, because of her military backwardness, cultural backwardness, political backwardness, industrial backwardness, agricultural backwardness. They beat her because to do so was profitable and could be done with impunity. You remember the words of the pre-revolutionary poet: ‘You are poor and abundant, mighty and impotent, Mother Russia.’ Those gentlemen were quite familiar with the verses of the old poet. They beat her, saying: ‘You are abundant,’ so one can enrich oneself at your expense. They beat her, saying: ‘You are poor and impotent,’ so you can be beaten and plundered with impunity.

“Such is the law of the exploiters—to beat the backward and the weak. It is the jungle law of capitalism. You are backward, you are weak—therefore you are wrong; hence you can be beaten and enslaved. You are mighty—therefore you are right; hence we must be wary of you.

“That is why we must not lag behind.

“In the past we had no fatherland, nor could we have had one. But now that we have overthrown capitalism and power is in our hands, in the hands of the people, we have a fatherland, and we will uphold its independence. Do you want our socialist fatherland to be beaten and to lose its independence? If you do not want this, you must put an end to its backwardness in the shortest possible time and develop a genuine Bolshevik tempo in building up its socialist economy. There is no other way. That is why Lenin said on the eve of the October Revolution: ‘Either perish, or overtake and outstrip the advanced capitalist countries.’

“We are fifty or a hundred years behind the advanced countries. We must make good this distance in ten years. Either we do it, or we shall go under.” (Stalin, *Collected Works*, Vol 13, pp40-1)

As a result of this gigantic effort, in 1940 gross output of Soviet industry was 8.5 times greater than the industrial production of tsarist Russia in 1913, whereas the output of large-scale industry had increased 12-fold and machine-building 35-fold.

Thoroughly biased as he was against Stalin, the Trotskyite Isaac Deutscher, in his biography of Stalin, was obliged to make the following admission as to the decisive factors that underlay the Soviet victory in the second world war:

“The truth was that the war could not have been won without the intensive industrialisation of Russia, and of her eastern provinces in particular. Nor could it have been won without the collectivisation of large numbers of farms. The muzhik of 1930, who had never handled a tractor or any other machine, would have been of little use in modern war. Collectivised farming, with its machine-tractor stations scattered all over the country, had been the peasants’ preparatory school for mechanised warfare.

“The rapid raising of the average standard of education had also enabled the Red Army to draw on a considerable reserve of intelligent officers and men. ‘We are fifty or a hundred years behind the advanced countries. We must make good this lag in ten years. Either we do it, or they crush us’—so Stalin had spoken exactly ten years before Hitler set out to conquer Russia. His words, when they were recalled now, could not but impress people as a prophecy brilliantly fulfilled, as a most timely call to action. And, indeed, a few years’ delay in the modernisation of Russia might have made all the difference between victory and defeat.” (Deutscher, *ibid*, p535)

Deutscher also dispelled any notion of popular hostility to the Soviet regime and correctly painted a picture of a Soviet people possessed of strong moral fibre, a strong sense of economic and political advance, and a grim determination to defend its gains:

“It should not be imagined that a majority of the nation was hostile to the government. If that had been the case no patriotic appeals, no prodding or coercion, would have prevented Russia’s political collapse, for which Hitler was confidently hoping. The great transformation that the country had gone through before the war had ... strengthened the moral fibre of the nation. The majority was imbued with a strong sense of its economic and social advance, which it was grimly determined to defend against

danger from without.” (Ibid, p473)

3. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolshevik)

The third reason for Soviet victory was that it was led by such a revolutionary proletarian party as the CPSU(B), whose leadership as well as lower ranks were characterised by an unreserved spirit of dedication to the cause of the proletariat, and a self-sacrificing heroism, and commanded the respect of non-party masses. Of 27 million Soviets who died in the war, three million belonged to the Communist party. David Hearst of the Guardian, in an article written in connection with the celebrations marking the 50th anniversary of VE Day, and filled with the customary anti-Stalinism (without which no bourgeois journalist can hope to keep his job and have his wallet stuffed), was compelled to make this admission:

“All contemporary accounts by war veterans testify to a high degree of ideological commitment by all sections of society in volunteering for action after June 1941, the educated and uneducated alike. Why? In what name did so many Communist party faithful go forward to meet certain death? In the name of the motherland? In the name of the Soviet Union, somehow dissociated from Stalin’s evil guiding hand, of which they themselves were among the first victims?” (‘Coming to the aid of the party’, The Guardian, 1 May 1995)

Having satisfied the moneybags who own the Guardian, and the editor, by a reference to ‘Stalin’s evil guiding hand’, and having thus established his impeccable bourgeois journalistic credentials, Mr Hearst nevertheless found himself stumbling on the truth when he continued thus, by way of answering his own question:

“Contemporary eye-witness accounts point to the contrary. A typical reaction is the veteran Ivan Martinov’s: ‘Every one of us knows that it was the Communist party which led everything at that time. The party formed the basis of the state machine. Everyone knew that when our servicemen were captured, the Nazi order would be, “Communists,

jews and commanders take one step forward”, and they would be shot. Therefore the massive joining of the party during the war, meant only one thing—heroism and belief in the party cause.”

It may not be to his liking, but the fact of the matter is, as David Hearst must know, millions of Soviet soldiers, partisans and civilians went to their deaths with the slogan: “For the motherland and for Comrade Stalin” on their lips—such were the love and affection with which the Soviet masses cherished their socialist motherland and its helmsman, such was the charisma (‘evil guiding hand’, if it pleases bourgeois scribblers and such other anti-proletarian gentry) of Josef Stalin, who inspired the Soviet people to unprecedented feats of heroism.

By November 1942, the Germans occupied 700,000 square miles of Soviet territory and a pre-war population of 80 million; millions of Soviet citizens were compelled to abandon their cities, villages, factories and plants and move eastward to avoid enemy occupation. Soviet troops were compelled by the extremely difficult military situation to retreat into the interior with substantial losses in men and material.

“But even during that difficult period neither the Soviet nation nor its armed forces lost faith in the prospect of the ultimate defeat of the enemy hordes. The mortal danger helped to rally our people even more closely around the Communist party, and, despite every hardship, the enemy was finally stopped in all sectors.

“The mass heroism of Soviet soldiers and the courage of their commanders, reared by our party, were demonstrated with particular force during the fierce fighting of that [November 1942] period. A positive role was played by the personal example of party members and Young Communists who, when necessary, sacrificed themselves for the sake of victory.” (Marshal Zhukov’s Greatest Battles, p152)

4. The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

The fourth reason for the victory of the Soviet Union was the existence of this unique institution in the history of humanity, namely the Union of Soviet

Socialist Republics (USSR)—a multinational state established by the victorious proletariat consequent upon the Great October Socialist Revolution, which had outlawed exploitation of one human being by another within each of its constituent parts, and exploitation of one nation by another. In truth, this was a free and fraternal association of dozens of nations who lived together to construct a common bright future, and where injury to one was regarded as an injury to all.

David Hearst, in the article referred to above, cited Professor Yuri Polyakov, a historian and a member of the Academy of Science, who brought together all the reasons that inspired the Soviet people to heroic resistance and victory in the Great Patriotic War. Here is what Prof Polyakov had to say:

“The workers and peasants were fighting for their socialist state. A Kazakh or Kyrgyz, who under the Soviet empire got for the first time in their history his own statehood, was fighting for his motherland, Kazakhstan or Krygyzia.

“The German invasion brought with it a very strong sense of danger to the Soviet Union. Everyone understood that the union would be destroyed under German occupation. But ideology also played its part ... The generals and officer class came from simple people who believed in the justice of the struggle and the state they were defending. In great measure this belief was linked to the belief in Soviet power, as the power that had brought economic development to the whole Union.” (Cited in *The Guardian*, *ibid*)

And these are the words of a Professor in Yeltsin’s fiercely anticommunist Russia, where ‘historians’ were given large bribes to write ‘histories’ that painted the former Soviet Union and its leadership in the darkest colours, where, let alone poor Stalin, biographies of the great Lenin were brought out that described him in these flattering tones: “Lenin was the anti-Christ ... All Russia’s great troubles stemmed from him.”

Have we not always maintained that anti-Stalinism was only a cover for anti-Leninism? Since the Soviet state has been destroyed and capitalism restored,

Khrushchev’s successors no longer have to speak in coded Aesopian language.

Having quoted Prof Polyakov, David Hearst concluded his article with this pertinent observation: “If this explanation is correct, the motives behind the immense effort and huge cost of pushing the Germans back have disquieting resonances for today’s post-communist leadership: the Great Patriotic War is a monument to the three institutions that Yeltsin has destroyed—the Communist party as an organising body, socialism as a state ideology, and the Soviet Union as a working collective entity.

“Even the decision to celebrate the 50th anniversary of VE Day with a grandiose state occasion is a change of policy. Four years ago not one state leader attended the 50th anniversary commemoration of the Battle of Moscow. Last year it was the humble city of Novgorod’s turn: a relatively minor liberation compared to the massive losses at Moscow, but Yeltsin was careful to send his greetings to the inhabitants. The 1995 campaign to reclaim the Great Patriotic War for Russia’s, rather than the Soviet Union’s history, had begun.

“Today’s debate is, as all these debates are, more about the present than the past ... the events of 50 years ago are still being lived through today. Russia’s industrial decline under its painful transition to a market economy is being likened to the effect on industry of the German invasion. To Yeltsin’s opponents the war effort creates an inverted image of Russia today. ‘If we could do it then, we can do it again today,’ is the constant assumption of any war nostalgia.

“There are too many parallels, too much undigested matter, and the state of Russia, shorn of its fraternal republics and its international influence is too young a state. The veterans are still an important electoral block: with their families they can muster about 20 million votes. They are disciplined voters, and highly politicised. So when Yeltsin mounts the podium in Red Square to take the official salute of the Veterans’ Parade on 9 May, he is not just thinking of the past but this year’s parliamentary elections, and

possibly next year's presidential elections. Like all his predecessors, Yeltsin has good reason today to be cautious about the past." (Ibid)

It is unquestionably true that the present-day peoples of the former Soviet Union, in marking the 60th anniversary, as indeed ten years ago on the occasion of the 50th anniversary, of their victory in the Great Patriotic War, in paying tribute to the valour, heroism, sacrifice, steadfastness and single-minded sense of purpose of their Soviet fathers and grandfathers (tens of millions remembering their own part in it) in that titanic struggle, cannot but be haunted by the memories of their socialist motherland and cannot help comparing their present-day misery (courtesy of the wonders of capitalist restoration with its mafia economy, prostitution, drug-trafficking, street crime, killing of old people to get hold of their apartments, unemployment, homelessness and subservience to foreign imperialism) with the life under the former glorious Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

All this cannot augur well for the present-day tsars of Russia.

INITIAL SOVIET REVERSES

The fascist German attack on the Soviet Union on 22 June 1941 was followed by considerable Soviet reverses and the loss of great chunks of Soviet territory. How are those reverses to be explained? The bourgeois-Trotskyist explanation of these reverses amounts to a shameless falsification of history characteristic of this gentry. It runs variously something like this: that Stalin trusted Hitler not to attack the USSR, and hence, they argue, the Soviet-German 'non-aggression pact' was signed; that Stalin had "decimated the army corps", executing, among others, Marshal Tukhachevsky, "possibly the most brilliant Russian soldier of this century"; that there was no experienced communist leadership, since Stalin had "either killed or imprisoned" them all; that Stalin had neglected military preparations; that he had alienated the peasantry through "forced

collectivisation"; and so on and so forth ad nauseam and ad absurdum.

We have dealt with these important questions elsewhere, but shall merely note in passing that the very people who attribute Soviet reverses to a lack of leadership are the self-same gentry who attribute subsequent Soviet successes to a leaderless Soviet people!! No, these hysterical bourgeois Trotskyist fairy tales and slanders masquerading as historical explanations will not bear any serious scrutiny.

Here, then, are the real reasons for the initial Soviet reverses.

1. Surprise attack

First and foremost, the Hitlerites had the advantage of a surprise attack. Surprise can by no means be given the meaning given it in this context by the Trotskyites and other bourgeois ideologues: namely, that Stalin did not expect Hitler to attack the Soviet Union. What jokers these gentry are! Of course he knew that the Hitlerite fascists hated the socialist Soviet Union more than any other country and they were out to destroy communism. Any fool, even of the Trotskyist variety, was well-acquainted with this fact.

But, while the fascist intentions were clear as clear can be, the actual date of the attack could still be a surprise—and indeed was so. If the Bolshevik party, and above all Stalin, entertained such illusions in Hitler, it would be impossible to explain the tempo of Soviet industrialisation, the Russo-Finnish war, the incorporation of the Baltic states into the USSR, the wresting of Bessarabia from the then monarchical-fascist Rumanian regime, and the reincorporation of the former Soviet territories in western Poland when the Polish state collapsed in the face of the Nazi attack.

It was precisely because Stalin and the Bolshevik party knew only too well of the intentions of German fascism and its appetite for destroying the socialist Soviet Union that Stalin concluded the Soviet-

German Non-Aggression Pact, which secured for the Soviet Union nearly two years of peace and a valuable opportunity for preparing her forces to repulse Nazi Germany as and when she should risk attacking the USSR despite the pact—and also frustrated the attempts of Anglo-American imperialism to direct Hitler in the eastern direction, towards the Soviet Union. This was the meaning and the essence of the Munich surrender by British prime minister Neville Chamberlain to Hitler.

The Bolshevik party, under the leadership of Stalin, turned the tables on Anglo-American imperialist ruling circles by concluding the non-aggression pact with Germany, which proved so advantageous to the Soviet Union and to socialism, and so harmful to world imperialism. By its brilliant tactics, the Bolshevik party caused its two deadly enemies—German fascism on the one hand and Anglo-French-American imperialism on the other hand—to fight against each other rather than against the Soviet Union, and finally to compel one of these enemies, namely Anglo-American imperialism, to fight on the Soviet side against German fascism.

As a consequence, the end of the war resulted in the further weakening of imperialism, giving a tremendous boost to the world proletarian and national-liberation movements all over the globe, bringing in its wake people's democracies in eastern Europe, the earth-shaking successes of the Chinese Revolution and the loosening and freeing from colonial grip of countless countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America. In view of these results, which changed the political and economic geography of the entire globe, it is understandable, and not in the least surprising, that imperialists and their ideologues—Trotskyites and ordinary ideologues—should concentrate their attack with such venom on Stalin. These venomous attacks alone are proof enough of the correctness of Stalin's brilliant tactics.

2. Earlier Nazi mobilisation

Second, the Soviet reverses can be explained by the earlier mobilisation of the Germans and the fact that they had become seasoned through two years of experience in modern warfare. The 176 German divisions brought up to the Soviet frontiers and hurled by Germany against the USSR were in a state of complete readiness, only awaiting a signal to move into action, whereas the Soviet troops still had to effect mobilisation and move up to the frontier.

But let no one conclude from this that there were not Soviet troops on the frontier and the Germans simply walked in unhindered. The German army had met with no serious resistance on the continent of Europe. Only on Soviet territory did it meet with such resistance, which destroyed the myth of invincibility of the Hitlerite fascist troops. As a result of this resistance, the finest divisions of Hitler's German-fascist army were destroyed by the Red Army.

Thus in the first four months after the German invasion of the USSR, the losses of the two sides stood as follows:

Soviet losses—350,000 killed, 378,000 missing, 1,020,000 wounded. A total of 1.728 million.

In the same four months, the German killed and wounded and prisoners totalled 4.5 million.

By the winter of 1942/3, the initiative had already passed to the Red Army. In the three months of the Red Army's winter offensive, the Germans lost 7,000 tanks, 4,000 planes, 17,000 guns and large quantities of other weapons. In the first 20 months of the war against Germany, in its defensive operations, the Red Army put out of action nine million German fascist troops, of which no less than four million were killed on the battlefield. In the three months of the 42/3 winter offensive alone, the Red Army routed 112 enemy divisions, killing more than 700,000 and taking over 300,000 prisoners.

The outstanding encirclement and annihilation at Stalingrad of an enormous picked army of Germans, numbering 330,000, shall always remain an eloquent tribute to the fearless fighting spirit of the Red

Army—and to its brilliant tactics.

3. Absence of a second front

Last, but not least, the Soviet Union's initial reverses can be attributed to the absence of a second front in Europe against fascist troops. In the absence of such a front, the German fascists were not compelled to dissipate their forces and to wage war on two fronts, in the west and in the east. Thus the German rear in the west was secured and this enabled Germany to move all its troops against the USSR, which single-handedly fought against the forces of Germany and her Finnish, Rumanian, Italian and Hungarian allies.

In the first world war there were two fronts, and therefore Germany was able to station only 85 of its 220 divisions on the Russian front. If one takes into account the forces of Germany's allies during the first world war, there were 127 German divisions stationed on the Russian front.

In stark contrast, there was no second front during the second world war, with the result that of the 256 German fascist divisions, 176 were stationed on the Soviet front. If we add to these 22 Rumanian, 14 Finnish, ten Italian, one Slovak, one Spanish and 13 Hungarian divisions, this brings the number of fascist divisions on the eastern front close to 240. The remaining divisions of Germany and her allies performed garrison service in occupied countries such as France, Belgium, Norway, Holland, Yugoslavia, Poland, Czechoslovakia etc, while a few fought in Libya for Egypt against Britain.

“Because of the absence of a second front, Germany was able to keep as little as 20 percent of its armed forces on other fronts and in occupied countries.” (Zhukov, *ibid*, p115)

Thus 80 percent of the Nazi armed forces were concentrated in the east, along the entire front from the Barents Sea to the Black Sea.

As early as May 1942, Soviet foreign minister Molotov reached a complete agreement with Britain and the United States that a second front would

be opened in Europe in 1942. This agreement was confirmed the following month. However, within a month of this confirmation, it had been put on the back burner, causing Stalin to send a message, in which he hardly bothered to disguise his anger, to Churchill: “As to ... opening a second front in Europe, I fear the matter is taking an improper turn.

“In view of the situation of the Soviet-German front, I state most emphatically that the Soviet government cannot tolerate the second front in Europe being postponed till 1943.”

On 12 August 1942, Stalin met Churchill and US presidential envoy Harriman in Moscow. During this meeting, Churchill, fully supported by Harriman, refused to honour their earlier promise concerning the second front. A day later, in his memorandum of 13 August 1942, Stalin conveyed the Soviet anger at the Anglo-American betrayal of an agreement solemnly reached barely three months earlier in these blunt terms:

“It will be recalled that the decision to open a second front in Europe in 1942 was reached at the time of Molotov's visit to London, and found expression in the agreed Anglo-Soviet communiqué released on 12 June last.

“It will be recalled further that the opening of a second front in Europe was designed to divert German forces from the eastern front to the west, to set up in the west a major centre of resistance to the German fascist forces and thereby ease the position of the Soviet troops on the Soviet-German front in 1942.

“Needless to say, the Soviet high command, in planning its summer and autumn operations, counted on a second front being opened in Europe in 1942.

“It will be readily understood that the British government's refusal to open a second front in Europe in 1942 delivers a mortal blow to Soviet public opinion, which had hoped that the second front would be opened, complicates the position of

the Red Army at the front and injures the plans of the Soviet high command.

“I say nothing of the fact that the difficulties in which the Red Army is involved through the refusal to open a second front in 1942 are bound to impair the military position of Britain and the other allies.

“I and my colleagues believe that the year 1942 offers the most favourable conditions for a second front in Europe, seeing that nearly all the German forces—and their crack troops, too—are tied down on the eastern front, while only negligible forces, and the poorest, too, are left in Europe.

“It is hard to say whether 1943 will offer as favourable for opening a second front as 1942. For this reason we think that it is possible and necessary to open a second front in Europe in 1942.

“Unfortunately, I did not succeed in convincing the British prime minister of this, while Mr Harriman, the US president’s representative at the Moscow talks, fully supported the prime minister.”

At the time when Stalin sent the above memorandum, although the Battle of Moscow had been won, the USSR, approaching as she was the Battle of Stalingrad, which was to test her strength to the utmost, could hardly be said to have emerged from the woods. These were singularly difficult times for her and the USSR was literally fighting for her life, for it would be another five months before the turning point of the war, the Soviet victory and Nazi rout at Stalingrad, would be achieved. Churchill could not but have been aware of all this. And yet his response was to deny that Britain and the USA had ever given any undertaking for opening a second front in Europe in 1942.

A month after the Soviet victory at Stalingrad, Churchill sent a message to Stalin stating that preparations were under way for a “cross-channel operation in August, in which British and United States units would participate”.

Stalin, quite correctly regarding this as yet another dilatory ploy, wrote back asking for “shortening these

limits to the utmost for the opening of a second front in the west”, stressing “so that the enemy should not be given a chance to recover, it is very important, to my mind, that the blow from the west, instead of being put off till the second half of the year, be delivered in spring or early summer”.

But to no avail.

WHY NO SECOND FRONT?

Why was there no second front in the west? There was no second front because, almost right up to the end of the war, Britain and America never gave up their duplicitous desire to come to an understanding with Hitler and leave him free to concentrate his forces on the Soviet frontier, or, if the possibility should present itself, to march hand-in-hand with Nazi Germany on Moscow. Nothing came of those desires for a variety of reasons.

1. Imperialist hopes for a Soviet defeat

That Anglo-American imperialism harboured such designs and ambitions, is clear from the following testimony.

While being compelled by the force of circumstances to be on the same side as the USSR during the second world war, while being obliged to pay hypocritical public tributes to the resistance and heroic fighting spirit displayed by the Red Army, the western imperialist leaders, in particular Churchill, imbued as they were with a burning hatred of communism, never gave up their anti-Soviet plots. Way back in October 1942, at the height of the battle of Stalingrad, realising the impossibility of the Soviet Union being crushed by Nazi Germany, Churchill commenced his anti-Soviet planning.

Churchill’s real policy aims in the war were revealed in a secret memorandum he dictated as early as October 1942, but whose contents were not made public until Harold Macmillan revealed them to a meeting of the European Community in Strasbourg in September 1949. Realising the real possibility of

the Nazis being destroyed by the Red Army, Churchill stated in this memorandum that instead of carrying forward the policy of genuine coalition with the Soviet Union, he believed “it would be a measureless disaster if this Russian barbarism overlaid the culture and independence of the ancient states of Europe”. In view of this, he blocked the opening of the second front.

In a speech that he made in Woodford, England on 23 November 1954, Churchill boasted in these terms: “Even before the war had ended and while the Germans were still surrendering by hundreds of thousands, I telegraphed Lord Montgomery, directing him to stack German arms so that they could be easily issued again to the German soldiers, with whom we should have to work if the Soviet advance continued.”

Churchill’s boast, made fully nine years after the end of the second world war, proved so embarrassing in imperialist circles, then busy orchestrating the cold war crusade against the USSR by putting out the lie that they had been forced into this position by Soviet belligerence and malevolent designs towards a peace-loving west, that the Times was prompted to comment: “What purpose or good can it serve at this time ... it certainly will not help to convince the Russians that the western powers are straightforward in their declarations of peace.

“Nor by suggesting that we were ready to use Nazi-indoctrinated troops in 1945, will it help the cause of West German rearmament now.”

One wonders what the reaction of the ordinary British people and soldiers would have been had they but been privy to Churchill’s thinking during the war, and if they had known too that in his rabidly anti-Soviet plots he had the full agreement and backing, not only of Bevin, but also of Attlee, the darling of the Bennite left and other prettifiers of the postwar imperialist Labour administration.

At the Yalta conference in 1945, with the imminent fall of Germany in mind, Stalin, Roosevelt and Churchill reached accord on the future of Germany,

which included its de-Nazification, destruction of German militarism and war potential, trial and punishment of Nazi war criminals, war reparations, and the creation of a democratic and peaceful Germany. Further, Germany was temporarily to be divided into four occupation zones: the eastern zone to be occupied by Soviet troops; the northwestern zone by British; the southwestern by US and a French zone in the west between the British and US zones. Berlin was to be under the control of the four allied powers.

On learning of the decisions of the Yalta conference, Hitler’s propaganda chief, Goebbels, was so infuriated that he wrote an editorial on 25 February in the fascist weekly, *Das Reich*, in which he stated:

“If the German people lay down their arms, the Soviets—even after the agreements between Churchill, Roosevelt and Stalin—would immediately occupy all of east and southeast Europe, including large parts of the Reich. Before this vast territory, including the entire Soviet Union, an iron curtain would descend.”

The Sunday Times of 7 May 1995, reporting the above-quoted remark of Goebbels, made this revealing and apposite observation: “One of the war’s great rhetoricians had coined another memorable phrase.

“Churchill, with his expert eye for a good line, was to make it his own later. But in the fatal spring of 1945, the ‘iron curtain’ was a keynote phrase in German diplomacy. Even with Hitler dead and Germany in ruins it resurfaced when Count Schwerin von Krosigk, the rump Reich government’s new foreign minister, made a broadcast to the nation for the ears of western leaders on 2 May: ‘In the east the iron curtain, behind which, unseen by the eyes of the world, the work of destruction goes on, is moving steadily forward.’ Insisting that Germany, too, wanted a new ‘world order’ free from war, he added: ‘But one cannot create such an order by making the wolf into a shepherd.’” (‘After Berlin next stop Moscow?’

by Peter Millar)

2. Plots for a new anti-Soviet alliance

By the end of March 1945, the Nazi leadership, fully aware that the game was up and the days of Nazi Germany strictly limited, tried to turn the tide by a reversal of alliances, hoping to convince Britain and the USA that the real threat was the 'red menace' of 'imperialist Bolshevism'.

In pursuit of precisely such a reversal of alliances, the German armies, while in headlong retreat everywhere on the western front, offered very stiff resistance on the eastern front. In reply to Churchill's communication dated 5 April 1945 that "the German armies in the west have been broken", Stalin expressed himself in the following terms on 7 April: "The Germans have 147 divisions on the eastern front. They could safely withdraw from 15 to 20 divisions from the eastern front to aid their forces on the western front.

"Yet they have not done so, nor are they doing so. They are fighting desperately for Zemlenice, an obscure station in Czechoslovakia, which they need as much as a dead man needs a poultice, but they surrender without any resistance such important towns in the heart of Germany as Osnabrück, Mannheim and Kassel.

"You will admit that this behaviour on the part of the Germans is more than strange and unaccountable."

Not so strange, considering that on the night of 23 April 1945, a mere two weeks after Stalin's above communication to Churchill, in a cellar of the Swedish consulate in the old Hanseatic port of Lübeck, Count Folke Bernadotte, envoy from allegedly neutral Sweden to Nazi Germany, and Heinrich Himmler, chief of the SS, held a secret meeting at which Himmler signed a document of surrender to Britain and the USA on the assumption that the latter two countries would now take over the eastern front and march on Moscow, hand in hand with Germany. Hearing of the death on 12 April 1945

of 'jewish' Roosevelt, Goebbels really believed that the 'miracle' was in the making.

That this was not the case is solely to be explained by the fact that by the time of Himmler's secret meeting with Count Bernadotte, "Hitler's fate in the bunker was sealed by the Red Army advance. Nonetheless, the Nazi leadership knew that Churchill had grave doubts about the fate of eastern Europe if the Soviets established hegemony. In the closing days of the war the analyses in London and Berlin were uncannily identical." (Sunday Times, *ibid*, our emphasis)

Earlier still, in the autumn of 1944, when on the surface it appeared that the Allies were working single-mindedly in their final drive to victory, Churchill, with the knowledge of the Americans, entered into negotiations with Kesselring, the German commander in Italy, for a separate peace. The Soviet Union came to know of it and Stalin, in a telegram, questioned Churchill. The latter was obliged to tender an abject apology, which was accepted by Stalin.

So much, then, for the rubbish concerning British imperialism's 'fight against fascism'.

The Soviet Union had good reason to be suspicious. The virtually unopposed crossing of the Rhine at Remagen was part of a deal to get Anglo-American imperialist troops to the eastern front, particularly as the advance by the latter was spearheaded by the US military's most rabid anticommunist, General Patton. The Soviet Union was also fully aware of Operation Sunrise, conducted by Allen Dullet, head of American special operations and future chief of the CIA, "who had repeated face-to-face talks with a senior SS general about a 'separate' surrender of German troops. Moscow was furious. The six-year hot war in Europe was over and the 45-year cold war had just begun." (*ibid*)

On 28 March, General Eisenhower had informed Stalin in a telegram that after reaching the Elbe his forces would advance along the Erfurt-Leipzig-Dresden axis, thus cutting the remaining German

forces in two. Not liking the sound of this proposition, on 31 March Churchill sent a telegram to Eisenhower asking: “Why should we not cross the Elbe and advance as far eastward as possible?”

Churchill elaborated on this theme in a letter to Roosevelt on 1 April thus: “The Russian armies will no doubt overrun all Austria and enter Vienna. If they do, and also take Berlin, will not the impression that they have been the overwhelming contributor to a common victory be unduly imprinted on their minds, and may not this lead them into a mood which will raise grave doubts and formidable difficulties in the future?”

“I therefore consider that from a political standpoint we should march as far east into Germany as possible and that should Berlin be within our grasp we should certainly take it.”

As Roosevelt died suddenly on 12 April, Churchill never received a reply to his letter of 1 April. But Churchill persisted. With the defeat of Germany imminent, Churchill’s plan was to create a new front in Europe against the sweeping advance of the Soviet Union, which, according to him, represented mortal danger to the ‘free’ world. Under this plan, Berlin had at any cost to be occupied by Anglo-American forces, and, if possible, Prague too.

As the US joint chiefs of staff supported Eisenhower’s plan, Churchill lost the argument over Berlin. This, however, in no way dampened his anti-Sovietism. On 19 April, in a telegram to Anthony Eden, then visiting Washington, he regretted that Anglo-American forces were “not immediately in a position to force their way into Berlin” and emphasised the importance of Montgomery taking Lübeck as a matter of urgency—the sole purpose of this move being to cut the Red Army off from Denmark. Churchill concluded his telegram with the following words:

“Thereafter, but partly concurrent, it is thought well to push on to Linz to meet the Russians there; and also by an American encircling movement to gain the region south of Stuttgart.

“In this region are the main German installations connected with their atomic research, and we had better get hold of these in the interests of the special secrecy attaching to this topic.”

In his reply, Eden expressed full agreement with Churchill’s plan, only adding, by way of a reminder: “I am sure you still have Prague in mind. It might do the Russians much good if the Americans were to occupy the Czech capital.”

But the Red Army’s inexorable march made certain that as with Berlin, so with Prague, history would write the closing chapter of the second world war in a manner very different from that which would have met with Churchill’s approval.

Churchill, this supposedly irreconcilable warrior against Nazism, was so impressed by Goebbels’ thinking and turn of phrase, that he returned to it repeatedly in his private communications with Harry Truman, who succeeded Roosevelt as US president. In his telegram of 12 May to Truman, Churchill expressed his foreboding at the turn of events in Europe in truly Goebbelsian terms:

“What will be the position in a year or two,” he asked, “when the British and American armies have melted and the French have not yet been formed on any major scale, when we may have a handful of divisions, mostly French, and when Russia may choose to keep two or three hundred on active service?”

“An Iron Curtain is drawn down upon their front. We do not know what is going on behind.

“There seems little doubt that the whole of the regions east of the line Lübeck-Trieste-Corfu will be in their hands.

“To this must be added the further enormous area conquered by American armies between Eisenach and the Elbe, which will, I suppose, in a few weeks’ time be occupied, when the Americans retreat, by the Russian power.

“All kinds of arrangements will have to be made by General Eisenhower to prevent another immense

flight of the German population westward as this enormous Muscovite advance into the centre of Europe takes place.

“And then the curtain will descend again to a very large extent, if not entirely. Thus a broad band of many hundreds of miles of Russian-occupied territory will isolate us from Poland.”

Barely a month before the Potsdam conference, in a last-ditch effort to postpone the retirement, as agreed under the Tripartite accord reached at Yalta in February, of the American forces from the areas occupied by them to their prescribed occupation zone, Churchill returned to his Goebbelsian obsession with the Soviet Union and the descent of the iron curtain in his letter of 4 June:

“I view with profound misgivings the retreat of the American army to our line of occupation in the central sector, thus bringing Soviet power into the heart of western Europe and the descent of an iron curtain between us and everything to the eastward.

“I had hoped that this retreat, if it had to be made, would be accompanied by the settlement of many great things which would be the true foundation of world peace.”

Again, facts on the ground made certain that Truman had no choice but to comply with the Tripartite accord. This was especially so as the USA still badly needed Soviet armed might for the war in the east against Japan. The successful testing of the atom bomb by the USA was shortly to change all this.

Within a few weeks of the defeat of Nazi Germany, Churchill instructed the war cabinet to draw up a contingency plan for a massive attack against the Red Army resulting in the “elimination of Russia”. This was revealed by documents released by the Public Record Office in the autumn of 1998. Churchill’s plan, code-named Operation Unthinkable, was detailed in a top secret file entitled ‘Russia: Threat to Western Civilisation’. It envisaged tens of thousands of British and US troops, supported by 100,000 defeated German Nazi soldiers, turning on their

wartime ally in a surprise attack stretching from the Baltic to Dresden.

The plan was based on the assumption that the third world war would begin on 1 July 1945—that is, less than two months after VE Day celebrations of the ‘Allied’ victory in Europe. However, the plan was quickly squashed by the chiefs of staff, who believed that it would involve Britain in a protracted and costly war with no certainty of victory. General Sir Alan Brooke, chief of the imperial general staff, pointed out to Churchill that the Japanese had sunk two battleships that he had sent, unprotected, to Malayan waters with just a dozen or two planes. The Red Army, he pointed out, had 7,000 much superior attack bombers. Any attempt to launch a pre-emptive strike against the Red Army through the Northern Corridor, the Baltic states, as envisaged by the Churchill plan, with the support of the Royal Navy, would simply mean that the latter (the Navy) would end up as iron coffins on the sea bed. The plan was dropped. Fifty years later it became public knowledge with the release of the aforementioned file.

As for the other ‘antifascist’ fighter, Truman, in 1941, before the US entry into the war, he expressed himself in the New York Times of 24 July 1941: “If we see that Germany is winning the war, we ought to help Russia; and if Russia is winning we ought to help Germany, and in that way let them kill as many of each other as possible.”

General Leslie Groves, who was in charge of the Manhattan Project that produced the atomic weapons dropped on the Japanese cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, frankly stated the anti-Soviet aims of this weapons project in these terms: “There was never any illusion on my part from about two weeks from when I took charge, that Russia was the enemy, and the project was conducted on that basis.”

The absence of a second front reveals clearly that Britain and America had gone to war against Germany not to fight against fascism, which both of them had done much to bolster up, prior to the war,

in the hope of hurling it against the USSR; that they had gone to war not in the interests of liberty and self-determination of nations, but, on the contrary, to preserve their colonial and imperialist interests against the encroachment of rapacious German imperialism. Of all the allied powers, the Soviet Union alone entered the war and continued it until victory in the interests of socialism, liberty and the right of the oppressed and colonial peoples to self-determination.

3. D-Day: the long-delayed second front

Eventually, at the Tehran conference of the Big Three, which took place in December 1943, the date for the opening of the second front was set for 5 June 1944—in the event, this was postponed until 6 June because of unfavourable weather.

By the time of the Tehran conference, however, not only had the Soviet army been victorious at Stalingrad but also at Kursk, which had witnessed the biggest tank battle in history. After this, the Red Army's inexorable march to Berlin had begun. No force on earth could stop it.

Such a prospect could not but alarm and terrify Anglo-American imperialism. If the Red Army were to liberate the continent of Europe from Nazi occupation and tyranny all by herself, as she certainly had then the capacity to do, surely that would doom the rule of capital. The D-Day landings, of which we hear so much nonsense every year, were launched not to free Europe and to defeat the Nazi armed forces; for the Nazi army had been smashed single-handedly in the previous three years by the Red Army, which had fought the Nazi war machine and “torn out its guts”, to use Churchill's apt expression. In one of his last messages to Stalin, Churchill made a frank admission that the honour of sealing “the doom of German militarism” belonged to the Red Army and the Soviet Union, adding that “future generations will acknowledge their debt to the Red Army”.

It was thus with the object of saving as much

for imperialism as possible that the invasion of Normandy was finally launched by the western allies of the Soviet Union on 6 June 1944, in which 200,000 men and nearly 5,000 ships took part, and on which day western bombers flew 14,000 sorties. All the same, the Red Army was the first to reach Berlin and hoist the red flag on the Reichstag building. In the process it had liberated eastern Europe, helped to de-Nazify it, and helped establish people's democracies, which were moving stridently along the road of socialism before having their development reversed by the triumph of Khrushchevite revisionism within the USSR itself.

ATTEMPTS TO BELITTLE SOVIET CONTRIBUTION

1. Diversionary tactics of the bourgeois historians

As we celebrate the 60th anniversary of the victory against fascism, the imperialist bourgeoisie is doing everything in its power to simply belittle or ignore altogether the decisive contribution of the Soviet Union in defeating Hitler's fascist army. They concentrate on minor events of the war such as the Battle of the Bulge, which began on 16 December 1944 and ended with an allied victory in mid-1945, thanks to the Russian offensive, which saved the British and Americans from a crushing defeat.

In the battle of the Bulge, Hitler, by making a thrust towards Antwerp, had hoped to cut off the British and American armies from the Channel, producing a “second Dunkirk” and thus compelling them to make a separate peace with Germany and leaving him free to concentrate on the USSR. The Soviet offensive in the east, which took the Red Army all the way to Berlin, not only frustrated Hitler's plans for a separate peace, but also saved the British and American armies from an ignominious defeat.

The relatively minor significance of the Battle of the Bulge, as well as the decisive Soviet help in

making an allied victory possible in this battle—both these facts are recognised by the most impeccable of bourgeois authorities. “The battle of the Bulge was the biggest battle on the western front, but it was relatively minor compared with those in the east,” said John Pimlott, a senior lecturer at Sandhurst, on the occasion of the 40th anniversary of the defeat of Nazi Germany.

And no less a person than Winston Churchill in his book *The Second World War*, acknowledged the help the Soviet Union gave to the allied armies by advancing the date of the Soviet offensive in the east: “It was a fine deed of the Russians and their chief to hasten their vast offensive, no doubt at a heavy cost of life.”

John Pimlott again: “The Russian offensive caused Hitler to transfer what remained of the Sixth Panzer Army to the eastern front and this relieved the pressure significantly in the Ardennes.”

Thus is it clear that on the western front, the biggest battle, the Battle of the Bulge, which in turn was a “relatively minor affair” compared with the battles in the east, was only won with enormous Soviet help, whereas on the eastern front, the Soviet Union fought singlehandedly for three-and-a-half years, confronting and successfully beating the 240 divisions hurled by Hitler against the USSR. Anyone with knowledge of the history of the second world war cannot fail to notice that all the main events of that war took place on the Soviet-German front; that it was the Soviet Union and the Red Army that in the course of three-and-a-half long and grim years fought one-to-one against the gigantic military machine of the fascist bloc, bled it white, and then finally crushed Hitler’s Germany.

The Soviet people were the principal creators of this great victory.

2. Incurable counter-revolutionary Trots

Before the war, as noted earlier, Trotsky had gleefully predicted the collapse of the USSR as a result of the

war with imperialism. Through the kind act of one of his own followers, Jackson, who assassinated Trotsky, the latter was spared the humiliation and pain that undoubtedly would have been his lot of having to witness, and live with, the brilliant exploits of the armed forces and the peoples of the USSR.

His followers, the present-day Trotskyites, while not daring to deny the Soviet Union’s heroic successes in the war against fascism, attribute these successes to the allegedly leaderless “Soviet people”. Far from recognising that the organiser and inspirer of these victories was none other than the Bolshevik party under the brilliant leadership of Josef Stalin, these Trotskyist hens on bourgeois dung-heaps cackle ad nauseam about “Stalinist bureaucracy”, which had allegedly killed god knows how many tens of millions of peasants in “forced collectivisation”, had “decimated” the Red Army by executing high-ranking officers before the war, and which had killed and imprisoned the “truly Bolshevik” leaders and “most experienced communists”. These lies and filth are the daily (sorry, weekly) diet of the various Trotskyist anti-working-class scandal sheets.

Here is an example of the counter-revolutionary trickery and deception, typical of all Trotskyist outfits, taken from one such scandal sheet, *Workers Power*, in its editorial, entitled ‘VE Day: what is there to celebrate?’ First comes the assertion of the counter-revolutionary ignoramus who wrote this leading article that, in 1934, “Lord Beaverbrook’s *Daily Mail* greeted Mosley’s British Union with the immoral headline ‘Hurrah for the Blackshirt!’ ... the same Lord Beaverbrook was minister in charge of aircraft production in the ‘antifascist’ war.” (No 189, May 1995)

Surely something wrong editor, as *Private Eye* would say. Actually, to put the record straight, it was Lord Rothermere’s *Daily Mail* that came out with the headline greeting the Blackshirts. Lord Beaverbrook owned the *Express* group of newspapers, the same group with which Trotsky had such a close

relationship, and in return for whose gold Trotsky wrote such a lot of anti-Soviet reactionary filth. But this is by the by. Now to the more important point at issue.

The editorial, having stated that British imperialism was fighting for its imperialist interests throughout the war, continues with the following counterrevolutionary hotchpotch: “That is why revolutionary socialists said then that British workers should not support their bosses’ war. Of course it was not a question of supporting Hitler either, but of saying ‘No truce with the British bosses, the main enemy is at home.’

“For four out of the war’s five years the real conflict was fought on the eastern front. Twenty million soldiers and civilians were killed. Six million Jews were exterminated. Hitler had to crush the Soviet workers’ state in order to survive—even though power there had been usurped by a totalitarian bureaucracy. In that conflict the Trotskyists everywhere were at the forefront of the fight for solidarity with the USSR, even though they had been the first victims of Stalin’s purges.

“That is why ... socialists can and should celebrate the Red Army’s victory over fascism.

“But only with two cheers. Because what the Soviets on the Volga had in common with the Anglo-US armies on the Rhine was their political purpose: the imposition of a stable capitalist order in Europe and the crushing of working-class independence.”

And further: “Across eastern Europe workers rose against the Nazis as the Red Army approached. Time and again they seized factories only for the Stalinists chiefs to move in and hand them back to what was left of the ruling class.

“All across Europe, east and west, the real antifascist fighters—the partisans—found themselves disarmed and, in some cases, liquidated by the combined forces of Stalinism and imperialism ...

“Stalinism and imperialism crushed [the revolutionary] spirit. Their victory laid the

foundations of a ‘world order’ of wars, oppression and famine, haunted by the mushroom cloud.

“That is the victory our rulers are celebrating this month—the postwar counter-revolution. That is why no worker should be waving the red-white-and-blue on 8 May.”

Let us try and unravel the real counter-revolutionary essence contained in the above contradictory and self-annihilatory mumbo jumbo.

First, we are correctly told that while the real conflict was for four years fought on the eastern front, British imperialism was largely fighting the Germans in north Africa in the interests of safeguarding her colonial possessions and oil wealth. From this, not only the real revolutionary socialists of the day, but also millions of ordinary decent working people drew the conclusion, and put forward the demand, that Britain must open a second front in the west so as to help the Red Army, which was having to face the entire strength of the German fascist armed forces alone.

At such a time to say “No truce with the British bosses, the real enemy is at home,” is only a subterfuge for covering a counter-revolutionary line with ‘revolutionary’ phraseology, an expertise in which Trotskyism is at its par excellence, for in essence, it is tantamount to saying “Let the Red Army go to hell, our fight is at home and the fate of the socialist Soviet Union is no concern of ours.” And yet we are told that the “Trotskyists everywhere were at the forefront of the fight for solidarity with the USSR”. Devoid of the demand for the opening of a second front in Europe to ease the position of the Soviet Union, this Trotskyist solidarity was not merely meaningless, but a counter-revolutionary activity aimed at sabotaging the mobilisation of public opinion in Britain for the opening of the second front.

Secondly, we are told that Hitler had to crush the Soviet workers’ state and that we should celebrate the Red Army’s victory over fascism. But what is there to celebrate, when in the very next sentence we are

informed that the Red Army, in common with the Anglo-US armies, had but one political purpose, viz, “The imposition of a stable capitalist order in Europe and the crushing of working-class independence”? What is there to celebrate if, as we are told by this Trotskyist leader writer, the real antifascist fighters were “liquidated by the combined forces of Stalinism and imperialism”?

What is there to celebrate if, as we are told, “Stalinism and imperialism crushed” the revolutionary spirit of the working class and if, as we are told, “their victory laid the foundations of a ‘world order’ of wars, oppression and famine, haunted by the cloud”? What is there to celebrate, even with two cheers, if, as we are told, the Red Army was instrumental in securing a victory whose political purpose was “the imposition of a stable capitalist order in Europe” and to crush “working-class independence”?

If all this is true, then not only should we not be waving the Union Jack in the celebrations of our rulers this month; we ought not to be waving the Red Flag in celebrating the victory of the Red Army either, if, as we are told, it was as instrumental as the Anglo-US armies in imposing a “‘world order’ of wars, oppression and famine”.

That being so, would it not have been better to have cut out all the guff and stated from the beginning that the Red Army, being an instrument of “Stalinist bureaucracy” was indistinguishable from the Anglo-US armies; that the Soviet regime differed not a whit from the regimes in France, Britain, the USA and Germany; that the war was an imperialist war on all sides; that the enemy of the workers everywhere, including the USSR, was at home; and so on and so forth? That is what the counter-revolutionary writer of this editorial wanted to say, and that is what he should have said.

Had he, however, done that in an honest and straightforward manner, he would have exposed his counter-revolutionary line and the absurdity of his arguments at once for all to see. He could have fooled

no one. So he had to speak in coded language, to clothe his arguments in ‘revolutionary’ phraseology in an effort to hide his counter-revolutionary Trotskyist line from the honest but ignorant youngsters who, seduced by fashionable Trotskyist catchphrases, have the misfortune to be members of organisations that pretend to be socialist, but which in essence are anti-proletarian and anticommunist to the core.

ANTI-SOVIET PLOTS SMASHED

The Soviet Union of those days dashed the hopes of democratic as well as Nazi imperialists, who had longed to overwhelm her. In the face of the strength of Soviet socialism, the unbreakable unity of the peoples of the USSR, the might of the Red Army, the heroism of the Soviet masses, and the brilliance of her diplomacy, all imperialist anti-Soviet plots ended up in smoke.

1. German miscalculations

The Hitlerites had hoped to “finish off” the Soviet Union in six to eight weeks in a “lightning war” of the kind that had succeeded in western Europe. These hopes were based on a number of miscalculations.

First, they had counted on the instability of the Soviet system, believing that after the first serious blow and the first setbacks of the Red Army, uprisings would break out and the Soviet Union would disintegrate into its component parts, thus facilitating the advance of the German fascist hordes right up to the Urals. Instead, these setbacks strengthened the alliance of the Soviet working class and peasantry, as well as the friendship of the peoples of the USSR, converting this family of peoples of the Soviet Union into a single and unshakeable military camp, selflessly supplying its Red Army.

As Stalin put it: “It is quite probable that any other state, having suffered such territorial losses as we have now, would not have withstood the test and would have fallen into decline. If the Soviet system has so successfully passed through this trial and even

strengthened its rear, then this means that the Soviet system is now the most stable one.” (Speech to the Moscow Soviet, 6 November 1941)

Secondly, the Hitlerite fascists had counted on the lack of fighting experience of the Red Army, but they miscalculated here too, for the morale of the Red Army proved higher than that of the Germans, because the Red Army was defending its native socialist motherland against alien invaders and, correctly believing in the justice of its cause, performed heroic and miraculous deeds of chivalry. The German army, on the other hand, was waging an aggressive war and plundering a foreign country. Having no possibility of believing even for a moment in the justice of its vile cause, it degenerated into corrupt hordes of professional plunderers devoid of all moral principles or conscience.

Hitler’s ‘Blitzkrieg’ failed because in the defence of the socialist motherland, in the fire of this Great Patriotic War, were forged new fighters, who became a deadly menace to the German army. The Soviet people came to death grips with their bitterest and most cunning enemy, German fascism; overcoming numerous difficulties, Soviet troops fought with valour and heroism against an enemy armed to the teeth with tanks and aircraft; the Red Army, the Red Airforce and the Red Navy self-sacrificingly fought for every inch of Soviet soil, displaying unexampled bravery; side by side with the Red Army, the entire Soviet people rose in defence of their socialist motherland. This explains why Hitler’s Blitzkrieg came to such a sorry pass.

Once he had embarked on the conquest of the USSR, Hitler’s defeat became inevitable, not only because of the moral degradation of the German fascist invaders, who had lost human semblance long ago and sunk to the level of wild beasts, but also because of their European and German rear - and, most important, because of the might of the Soviet Union, which delivered ceaseless death blows at the fascist invaders till they could take it no more and collapsed. Whereas

the German army became demoralised as a result of plunder and outrages against the civilian population, the heroic fight that the people of the USSR were waging for their freedom, honour and independence evoked the admiration of all progressive humanity.

2. Strength of Soviet antifascist fight

Even in the midst of this grim life-and-death struggle, the Soviet people, the Bolshevik party and its leader, Josef Stalin, never for a moment forgot the proletarian internationalist aspect of the Soviet people’s war of liberation against the German fascist invaders. Right at the beginning of the war, in his radio broadcast of 3 July 1941, Stalin said:

“The aim of this national patriotic war in defence of our country against the fascist oppressors is not only to eliminate the danger hanging over our country, but also to aid all the European peoples groaning under the yoke of German fascism. In this war of liberation, we shall not be alone. In this great war we shall have true allies in the peoples of Europe and America, including the German people which is enslaved by the Hitlerite mis-rulers.”

This was a theme Stalin and the Bolshevik party were to stress again and again. On the occasion of the 25th anniversary of the October Revolution, Stalin, in his speech at a celebration meeting of the Moscow Soviet on 6 November 1942, returned to the theme and contrasted the German and Soviet war aims in the following terms.

The German programme, he said, may be summed up as: “racial hatred, domination of ‘chosen’ nations; subjugation of other nations and seizure of their territories, economic enslavement of subjugated nations and plunder of their national wealth; destruction of democratic liberties; the institution of Hitlerite regimes everywhere”.

In contrast, the Soviet aim was: “the abolition of racial exclusiveness; the equality of nations and the inviolability of their territories; the liberation of the enslaved nations and the restoration of their sovereign

rights; the right of every nation to arrange its affairs as it wishes; economic aid to the nations that have suffered and assistance to them in achieving their material welfare; restoration of democratic liberties; the destruction of the Hitlerite regime”.

STALIN AND THE GREAT PATRIOTIC WAR

It is impossible to write anything like a serious and meaningful account of the Soviet war effort and its contribution in smashing German fascism and militarism while refusing to recognise the supremely important role played by Stalin. Yet precisely this is being attempted by the bourgeoisie everywhere. There is a kind of division of labour between the imperialist bourgeoisie of the west and the new bourgeoisie of Russia. Whereas the former attempt to malign Stalin by attributing to him all kinds of imaginary blunders, the latter are trying to do the same by a conspiracy of silence.

On 8 May 1995, on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the victory against fascism, Boris Yeltsin unveiled a giant bronze statue to General Zhukov beside the Kremlin. Zhukov certainly deserves, as do several other Soviet generals of that period, a statue to honour his services. But the desire to honour Zhukov is not what caused the Yeltsin clique to install his statue, for as Jonathan Steele of the Guardian rightly remarked at the time: “The homage to Zhukov saves the authorities from the need to mention Stalin, which always arouses controversy. His name did not come up in any of the four speeches yesterday.” (The Guardian, 9 May 1995)

Those who attempt to spit at the moon end up spitting at their own faces, runs an old saying. Attempts to belittle the role of Stalin and to malign him will fare no better, for history has already passed judgement in the form of the glorious achievements of the former USSR, under his leadership, in every field—including, of course, the victory of the Red Army in the Great Patriotic War. Zhukov himself would have agreed with this statement.

Stalin’s leadership during the war was nothing short of inspirational. When Moscow was under the shadow of the enemy guns, Stalin refused to leave Moscow. The traditional Red Army parade to mark the anniversary of the October Revolution took place, as usual, in Red Square on 7 November 1941. These are the words with which Stalin inspired the Red Army soldiers:

“Comrades, men of the Red Army and Red Navy, commanders and political instructors, men and women guerrillas, the whole world is looking to you as the forces capable of destroying the plundering hordes of German invaders. The enslaved peoples of Europe who have fallen under the yoke of the German invaders look to you as their liberators. A great liberating mission has fallen to your lot. Be worthy of this mission! The war you are waging is a war of liberation. A just war. Let the manly images of our great ancestors—Alexander Nevsky, Dimitry Donskoy, Kazuma Minin, Dimitry Pozharsky, Alexander Suvorov and Mikhail Kutsov—inspire you in this war! May the victorious banner of the great Lenin be your lodestar!” (Emphasis added)

Although the credit for the victory must correctly be given to the Soviet armed forces and the heroic efforts of the Soviet people, no narrative of these fateful years is complete without a reference, indeed a fulsome tribute, to the undisputed leader of the CPSU(B), the Soviet people, and the supreme commander of the Soviet forces—Josef Stalin. Even a renegade like Gorbachev was obliged, apropos the Soviet victory in the second world war, to admit that: “A factor in the achievement of victory was the tremendous political will, purposefulness and persistence, ability to organise and discipline people, displayed in the war years by Josef Stalin.” (Report at the festive meeting on the 70th anniversary of the Great October Revolution held in Moscow on 2 November 1987, p25)

Ian Grey, who is a bourgeois but honest writer, has this to say: “The massive setbacks and the immediate

threat to Moscow would have unnerved most men, but the impact on Stalin was to strengthen his grim determination to fight. No single factor was more important in holding the nation from disintegration at this time.” (Op cit, p335)

Further: “It was in a real sense his [Stalin’s] victory. It could not have been won without his industrialisation campaign and especially the intensive development of industry beyond the Volga. Collectivisation had contributed to the victory by enabling the government to stockpile food and raw materials to prevent paralysis in industry and famine in the towns. But also collectivisation, with its machine-tractor stations, had given the peasants their first training in the use of tractors and other machines.” (Ibid, p419)

Quoting Isaac Deutscher, who is far from friendly to Stalin, approvingly, Ian Grey continues: “Collectivised farming had been ‘the peasants’ preparatory school for mechanised warfare’ ...

“It was his victory, too, because he had directed and controlled every branch of Russian operations throughout the war. The range and burden of his responsibilities were extraordinary, but day by day without a break for the four years of the war he exercised direct command of the Russian forces and control over supplies, war industries, and government policy, including foreign policy.” (Ibid, pp419-20)

Finally, the same writer says: “It was his victory, above all, because it had been won by his genius and labours, heroic in scale. The Russian people had looked to him for leadership, and he had not failed them. His speeches of 3 July and 6 November 1941, which had steeled them for the trials of war, and his presence in Moscow during the great battle of the city, had demonstrated his will to victory. He ... inspired them and gave them positive direction. He had the capacity of attending to detail and keeping in mind the broad picture, and, while remembering the past and immersed in the present, he was constantly looking ahead to the future.” (Ibid, p424)

Innately hostile as he is to Stalin, Deutscher is nevertheless obliged to paint this picture of Stalin’s role during the war:

“Many allied visitors who called at the Kremlin during the war were astonished to see on how many issues, great and small, military, political or diplomatic, Stalin personally took the final decision. He was in effect his own commander-in-chief, his own minister of defence, his own quartermaster, his own minister of supply, his own foreign minister, and even his own chef de protocol. The Stavka, the Red Army’s GHQ, was in his offices in the Kremlin.

“From his office desk, in constant and direct touch with the commands of the various fronts, he watched and directed the campaigns in the field. From his office desk, too, he managed another stupendous operation, the evacuation of 1,360 plants and factories from western Russia and the Ukraine to the Volga, the Urals and Siberia, an evacuation that involved not only machines and installations but millions of workmen and their families. Between one function and the other he bargained with, say, Beaverbrook and Harriman over the quantities of aluminium or the calibre of rifles and anti-aircraft guns to be delivered to Russia by the western allies; or he received leaders of the guerrillas ... from German occupied territory and discussed with them raids to be carried out hundreds of miles behind the enemy’s lines.

“At the height of the battle of Moscow, in December 1941, when the thunder of Hitler’s guns hovered ominously over the streets of Moscow, he found time enough to start a subtle diplomatic game with the Polish General Sikorski, who had come to conclude a Russo-Polish treaty ... He entertained them [foreign envoys and visitors] usually late at night and in the small hours of the morning. After a day filled with military reports, operational decisions, economic instructions and diplomatic haggling, he would at dawn pore over the latest dispatches from the commissariat of Home Affairs, the NKVD ...

“Thus he went on, day after day, throughout four years of hostilities—a prodigy of patience, tenacity and vigilance, almost omnipresent, almost omniscient.” (Isaac Deutscher, *Stalin*, pp456-7)

And further: “There is no doubt that he was their [the Soviet troops’] real commander-in-chief. His leadership was by no means confined to the taking of abstract strategic decisions, at which civilian politicians may excel. The avid interest with which he studied the technical aspects of modern warfare, down to the minute detail, shows him to have been anything but a dilettante.

“He viewed the war primarily from the angle of logistics ... To secure reserves of manpower and supplies of weapons, in the right quantities and proportions, to allocate them and transport them to the right points at the right time, to amass a decisive strategic reserve and to have it ready for intervention at decisive moments—these operations made up nine-tenths of his task.” (Ibid, p459)

This is how Deutscher captures the victory parade in Red Square at the end of the war: “On 24 June 1945, Stalin stood at the top of the Lenin Mausoleum and reviewed a great victory parade of the Red Army which marked the fourth anniversary of Hitler’s attack. By Stalin’s side stood Marshall Zhukov, his deputy, the victor of Moscow, Stalingrad and Berlin. The troops that marched past him were led by Marshall Rokossovsky.

“As they marched, rode, and galloped across Red Square, regiments of infantry, cavalry and tanks swept the mud of its pavement—it was a day of torrential rain—with innumerable banners and standards of Hitler’s army. At the Mausoleum they threw the banners at Stalin’s feet. The allegorical scene was strangely imaginative ...

“The next day Stalin received the tribute of Moscow for the defence of the city in 1941. The day after he was acclaimed as ‘Hero of the Soviet Union’ and given the title of Generalissimo.”

In “these days of undreamt-of triumph and glory”,

continues Deutscher, “Stalin stood in the full blaze of popular recognition and gratitude. These feelings were spontaneous, genuine, not engineered by official propagandists. Overworked slogans about the ‘achievements of the Stalinist era’ now conveyed fresh meaning not only to young people, but to sceptics and malcontents of the older generation.” (Ibid, p534)

CONCLUSION

The victory of the USSR was also a victory for the whole of progressive humanity. That is why the 60th anniversary must be marked as a festival by progressive humanity everywhere. At the same time, we must never forget the sacrifices made by the people of the world, especially the people of the Soviet Union, in order to free humanity from the plague of Hitlerite fascism.

We must also never forget to fight in defence of the hard-won rights and democratic liberties of the working class and the oppressed people, for any complacency on this score can only be at the cost of much greater sacrifices in the future—as the German people, and with them the rest of humanity, discovered in the thirties and forties. This is especially important at a moment when the dark clouds of racism, national oppression and the wars unleashed by imperialism, not to mention millions starved to death each week, are a daily reality for hundreds of millions of people all over the world.

The second world war was a product of imperialism, as was the first. It started as an interimperialist war to decide which group of bandits—the Anglo-French-American or the German-Italian-Japanese—were to have what share of the loot, colonies, markets and avenues for export of capital. Only the Soviet Union and the broad masses of humanity everywhere fought against fascism and for human advance. More than 50 million were killed in this war, of which 12 million were done to death in fascist concentration camps; another 95 million were left invalid. The losses of the

Soviet Union alone were simply colossal.

Soviet victory came at a terrible cost. Twenty-seven million Soviet citizens, including 7.5 million Soviet soldiers, lost their lives. In comparison, the USA lost just under 300,000 soldiers and the British empire's losses amounted to 353,652, of which Britain's losses totalled no more than 224,723. To this must be added 60,000 British civilian deaths.

In addition, a third of Soviet territory and economic resources were devastated: 1,710 towns and 70,000 villages were completely destroyed; six million homes and buildings were demolished; 31,800 industrial plants were stripped bare; and 98,000 collective or state farms were broken up and their livestock, totalling 64 million animals, was destroyed or taken to Germany.

This is the cost that the socialist Soviet Union had to pay. This is the cost that the Soviet Union, and the Soviet people, had to pay for the attempt by imperialism to prolong its outmoded life and for the betrayal of socialism by social democracy—especially German social democracy, which crushed the German revolution in 1918, restored the power of the bourgeoisie, and facilitated the rise of Nazism, thus creating a monster which eventually had to be faced, and defeated, by the Soviet Union.

And it is a measure of the resilience of the socialist system, the heroism of the Soviet people, and the leadership of the CPSU(B) with Stalin at its head, that without any reparations or outside economic help, within three years from the end of the war, the Soviet economy had been built to its pre-war level. And, in the following three years it had doubled in size—an achievement which baffled friend and foe alike.

At a time when the imperialist bourgeoisie in the west, along with the new bourgeoisie in Russia, are trying to belittle the Soviet contribution, the role of the Soviet people, of the CPSU(B) and of its undisputed leader, it is worth remembering the titanic battles and the scale of effort involved in defeating

Hitlerite Germany. The Soviet armed forces, in the course of the Great Patriotic War, managed to destroy 506 German divisions and 100 divisions belonging to German satellites. In comparison, British and American imperialism combined destroyed no more than 176 German divisions. In the war against the USSR, Germany lost ten million men, accounting for three quarters of its total losses in the second world war.

The victories of the Red Army in the historic battles of Moscow (October 1941-January 1942), Stalingrad (August 1942-February 1943), Kursk (Spring/Summer 1943) and Berlin (Spring 1945) shall forever remain an eloquent tribute to the Soviet people, to the socialist system, to the CPSU(B) and to Josef Stalin.

Humanity at large shall never fail to express its gratitude for the contribution of the Soviet Union in the defeat of Nazi Germany.

To get an idea of the dedication of the Soviet soldier, his love of the socialist motherland and of the Communist party, we cannot help quoting the following letter from Reuben Ibarriera on the eastern front to his mother: "I am taking advantage of a spare moment to write these few lines. You mustn't worry about me, I am getting on OK.

"Mama, when I said goodbye to you, you told me not to be afraid. I thought that was almost an insult, and I must tell you that my hands won't tremble when I kill those dogs.

"Once again, Mama, I must tell you that I consider it an honour and a source of pride that I have the chance to fight in the ranks of the great and invincible Red Army against the tyrant of humankind. I am sure that here we will smash his teeth in, for, as I told you, here in every woman and in every man there lives a hero, a Bolshevik. These people are really amazing. I can tell you that sometimes I am moved to the depths of my soul. Such people just cannot be beaten.

"That's all for today. Much love from your loving son, whose wish is that you should keep on working harder and harder for the sake of our cause." (Quoted

in *The Russian Version of the Second World War*, London, 1976)

Millions of Soviet soldiers cheerfully went to their death in the fight against fascism with the following words on their lips: “For the motherland and for comrade Stalin”.

At the time, everyone, including Churchill, recognised the colossal Soviet contribution towards the defeat of Nazi Germany. On 4 February 1945, on the occasion of the Soviet Army Day, Churchill, while plotting against the Soviet Union, was nevertheless obliged to send this message:

“The Red Army celebrates its twenty-seventh anniversary amid a triumph which has won the unstinted applause of their allies and has sealed the doom of German militarism. Future generations will acknowledge their debt to the Red Army as unreservedly as do we who have lived to witness their proud achievements.”

Soviet Union no more

Thanks to the treachery of Khrushchevite revisionism, the great and glorious Soviet Union, which gave so much to save the world from the scourge of fascism, is no more. Thanks to the same treachery, socialism is no more in the land of Lenin and Stalin.

What Nazis with millions of soldiers, thousands of tanks and aircraft, could not achieve through four years of a most devastating war against the land of the Soviets, the revisionists achieved almost without firing any shots. From this, the most important lesson to be drawn by the international proletariat is that revisionism is its most deadly enemy.

Since the collapse of the Soviet regime and the disintegration of the USSR, the imperialist bourgeoisie and all manner of reactionaries have triumphantly asserted that “Marxism is destroyed”. There is nothing new in these assertions, which are as old as Marxism itself. We conclude this article by answering these assertions in the following, never to

be forgotten words of Stalin:

“It is said that in some countries in the west, Marxism has already been destroyed. It is said that it has been destroyed by the bourgeois-nationalist trend known as fascism. That, of course, is nonsense. Only people who are ignorant of history can talk like that.

“Marxism is the scientific expression of the fundamental interests of the working class. To destroy Marxism, the working class must be destroyed. But it is impossible to destroy the working class. More than 80 years have passed since Marxism came into the arena. During this time scores and hundreds of bourgeois governments have tried to destroy Marxism. And what has happened? Bourgeois governments have come and gone, but Marxism has remained.

“Moreover, Marxism has achieved complete victory on one sixth of the globe; moreover, it has achieved it in the very country in which Marxism was considered to have been utterly destroyed. It cannot be regarded as an accident that the country in which Marxism has achieved complete victory is now the only country in the world which knows no crises and unemployment, whereas in all other countries, including the fascist countries, crisis and unemployment have been reigning for four years now. No, comrades, that is no accident.

“Yes, comrades, our successes are due to the fact that we have worked and fought under the banner of Marx, Engels, Lenin.

“Hence, the second conclusion: We must remain true to the end to the great banner of Marx, Engels, Lenin.” (Collected Works, Vol 13, pp386-7)

Eternal glory to all those heroes who fell in the fight against fascism!

Eternal glory to the great and glorious USSR!

Eternal glory to JV Stalin!

Down with imperialism and its variant, fascism!

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

Aleksandar Đenic | New Communist Party of Yugoslavia (Serbia)

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

A Few Examples of the Success of Yugoslav Socialism (the list is long, but it exceeds the scope of this essay)

1) Industry and Agriculture

From the 1950s onwards, the share of industry in Yugoslavia’s Gross Domestic Product (GDP) continuously increased, while the share of agriculture declined. By the end of the 1960s, industry had become the dominant sector in the economy, while agriculture increasingly became a secondary sector. This shift in the structure of the economy was crucial for the modernization process of Yugoslavia during the socialist period. During the 1970s and 1980s, the share of industry in GDP was around 40%. The socialist system enabled faster industrial production development than in many other countries at the time. Yugoslavia became an industrialized country, with developed sectors such as metallurgy, the automotive industry, electrical engineering, and shipbuilding. The chemical industry also developed, and the country produced tractors, combine harvesters, cultivators, and other agricultural machinery that were recognized worldwide (for example, the IMT tractor was exported to 81 countries). The textile industry was also an important sector.

According to data from 1981, there were 8,779,735 active workers in Yugoslavia, making up 43.4% of the total population. Of this number, 2,602,122 worked in agriculture and fishing, 2,209,698 in industry and mining, 689,297 in construction, 589,169 in trade, and 445,367 in transport and communications. The state owned about 24% of agricultural production,

and food industry complexes became significant scientific centers.

2) Health Policy in Yugoslavia

Socialist Yugoslavia provided free and quality healthcare. During World War II, the number of doctors decreased, so in 1945, one doctor served 10,000 people, and many doctors were not up to date with medical advancements. The lack of middle-level medical staff was pronounced, and in 1945, there were only 4,000 healthcare workers. Most hospitals were destroyed or damaged, and treatment conditions were very modest.

Healthcare was developed under Soviet influence, and in 1946, health insurance was introduced for workers and civil servants, covering 12% of the population. In 1950, a law was passed to expand coverage, including family members, and from 1959, farmers also became part of the system.

In the 1950s, intensive efforts began to develop primary healthcare. By 1988, 450 health centers and 2,550 healthcare stations were established. Private practice was banned. Prevention of infectious diseases was crucial, and vaccination yielded excellent results in reducing diseases like malaria, typhoid fever, polio, diphtheria, and others. Yugoslavia became one of the largest vaccine producers in the world.

The health of the population did not depend solely on the healthcare system but also on other social factors, such as education, infrastructure, and better living conditions. Increased access to clean water, better nutrition, and recreation contributed to improving overall health. Free vacations (factories had their own resorts in the mountains and by the sea) and sports activities were also widely available. By 1978, 82% of the population was covered by

health insurance. The number of doctors in 1987 was 47,869, and the number of hospital beds increased to 142,427. The infant mortality rate was reduced to a quarter of the pre-war level. Life expectancy between 1950 and 1991 increased by 15.5 years for men and 18.8 years for women.

Healthcare funding was organized through self-management interest communities (SIZ), and employees contributed 8% of their gross salary to healthcare (today they contribute 37%), which was the main source of funding. Healthcare workers and citizens had the opportunity to influence the management of healthcare institutions. Healthcare spending during economic growth decreased from 7.1% of Gross National Income in 1969 to 3.95% in 1986.

3) Education

Socialism significantly reduced illiteracy in Yugoslavia, so that by 1981 it was less than 10%. At that time, about a third of the population had completed secondary education, while 6% obtained a university degree or higher professional qualifications. By 1945, there were three universities in Yugoslavia: the University of Zagreb (founded in 1669), the University of Belgrade (founded in 1808), and the University of Ljubljana (founded in 1919, as the first university in Yugoslavia). By the 1980s, the number of universities in the country had grown to 17, and the average number of students in higher education reached 400,000 annually, with over 45% of students being women. Primary education was compulsory, and education from kindergarten to doctorate was free. The primary school became an educational and developmental institution that included many extracurricular activities. In addition to classes, children participated in sections involving sports, arts, and culture, as well as visits to theaters, cinemas, and operas. These activities were key to the overall development of children, enabling them to develop their talents and interests outside the classroom.

4) Development of Scientific Centers

Scientific centers in socialist Yugoslavia played an important role in the development of science, technology, and industry in the country, as well as in strengthening international cooperation with other socialist states and the capitalist world. From 1945 to 1991, Yugoslavia developed a specific model of scientific organization and research, which was focused on integrating science with industrial development, as well as promoting socialist values through education and research. Scientific centers in socialist Yugoslavia were crucial for the country's development in all aspects – from industrial production and technology to education and social innovations. Yugoslavia aimed to become a technologically and scientifically developed country, which produced many important projects, and many of these centers continue to play a significant role in the scientific communities of their respective countries.

5) Development of Computer Science

The development of computer science in socialist Yugoslavia was a dynamic process that began in the 1950s and culminated in the 1980s, when Yugoslavia became a recognizable player in the field of computing and information technologies. The development of computer science in Yugoslavia started in the first half of the 1950s when the first rudimentary computers appeared. At that time, Yugoslavia was following global trends, but due to the economic situation, it was still in a phase of development. In the 1960s and 1970s, Yugoslavia began developing its own computer industry, which was a key step toward further progress in computer science. The golden years for computer science development in Yugoslavia were the 1980s, when the country began to integrate into the broader international network in the field of computing technologies, particularly through programming, software products, and academic cooperation. The development of the domestic computer industry, investments in education, and international cooperation enabled

Yugoslavia to become an important actor in the field of computing before the internet revolution. Many of the infrastructures developed at that time remain the foundation for further technological development in post-Yugoslav states.

6) Housing Policy

The right to housing was an integral part of the legislation of socialist Yugoslavia. In this context, the construction industry rapidly advanced in the early post-war decades, with significant help from volunteer labor. Through funds from the housing solidarity fund, from 1961 to 1980, 1.2 million housing units were built, which accounts for more than 35% of all currently existing apartments in Serbia. In this way, the housing issue was resolved for a large part of the population. All enterprises were required to allocate 4% of their income for housing construction. In Belgrade alone, between 1965 and 1974, more than 80,000 apartments were built. These apartments were free of charge, and citizens had the opportunity to take out favorable loans for building their own homes. Many families, in this way, built their weekend houses. Apartments were designed according to high standards – every window had to provide at least two hours of daylight. In addition to housing units, the blocks contained schools, shops, kindergartens, proximity to health centers, as well as numerous green areas, benches, and sports fields for football and basketball.

7) Culture and Art

In Yugoslavia, significant investments were made in culture, enabling its development and accessibility to the masses. Culture centers were built in nearly every village, and music and ballet schools were free of charge, which remained the standard up until today. Large funds were allocated to publishing and libraries, leading to the printing of thousands of copies of literary classics, social sciences, philosophy, and professional journals, all of which were available to everyone. In addition, many theaters were built, and amateur theaters and cultural-artistic societies

were encouraged. Due to investments in education and cinema, Yugoslavia became internationally recognized for its film industry. At the same time, many writers who gained international fame emerged on the Yugoslav cultural scene. This approach to art allowed many artists—sculptors, painters, actors, and directors—to gain worldwide recognition. Art and culture were available to all, which enabled children from working-class and rural families to become top-tier artists.

8) Energy System

Yugoslavia was rich in rivers, which allowed for the construction of numerous hydroelectric plants (over 20 significant hydroelectric plants and more than 50 thermal power plants were built). The largest of these was the Đerdap Hydroelectric Plant, located on the Danube river, which was built in collaboration with socialist Romania. This plant was one of the largest infrastructure projects of its time. In addition to hydroelectric plants, Yugoslavia also developed the Krško Nuclear Power Plant in Slovenia. These investments allowed Serbia and other parts of former Yugoslavia to maintain independence in electricity supply. Today, Serbia continues to use these energy resources, which allow it to have one of the cheapest electricity rates in Europe.

9) Youth Volunteer Actions (Volunteer Work)

Youth Work actions and volunteer work played a significant role in the social life and economic development of Yugoslavia, especially during the socialist era. They represented a form of organized volunteering and collective labor on major infrastructure projects, which often had political and ideological significance. Work actions in Yugoslavia were organized initiatives where citizens, mostly young people, participated in large infrastructure projects and the construction of national importance buildings. These actions were based on volunteerism, but with strong social and political support from the state. Many of them were part of a broader plan for the modernization of the country and the development

of a socialist economy. Work actions and volunteer work were an integral part of Yugoslav society, as they enabled the construction of key infrastructure objects, but they also had a deeply ingrained political and ideological dimension. Although the circumstances and motivations for participation in these actions changed over time, they remained a symbol of Yugoslav solidarity and collective labor.

10) Environmental Care: The Afforestation Policy in Socialist Yugoslavia: Structure and Development

The afforestation policy in socialist Yugoslavia, which lasted from 1945 to 1991, was a key part of the strategy for environmental conservation and the sustainable development of natural resources. Afforestation had ecological, economic, and social goals, and various initiatives and organizations significantly contributed to improving forest areas and restoring degraded lands. The Goran Movement, an organization gathering young people, played a central role in implementing afforestation across Yugoslavia. Young volunteers were engaged in tree planting, forest area restoration, and the reclamation of land affected by erosion. In addition to physical labor, the Movement also had an educational character, offering workshops and seminars on ecology and nature protection. The afforestation policy in Yugoslavia was part of a broader ecological and economic strategy aimed at balancing nature protection with the need for industrial resources. The Goran Movement and other volunteer engagements of young people played a crucial role in raising ecological awareness and building a socialist community. Despite challenges in implementation, afforestation left a significant mark on the conservation of the country's natural resources.

11) Sport

Mass (amateur) sport was promoted in Yugoslavia. Sports were accessible to youth across the country, and all necessary equipment was provided by the sports clubs. In this context, gymnasiums were built in schools, and some schools even had their own

Olympic-sized swimming pools. A large number of sports fields, complexes, swimming pools, and fitness tracks were constructed, along with the necessary equipment for engaging in mass sports.

12) Socialism, Security, Sovereignty

What socialist Yugoslavia provided to its citizens was security. Socialist Yugoslavia was a multi-ethnic and multi-confessional community that ensured 45 years of peace and development for its people, where there was no hatred among people and national identity was not important. Crime was a foreign phenomenon, and mass killings by individuals were unimaginable. There were a certain number of terrorist attacks organized by the Ustaše emigration (assisted by Western services) aimed at destabilizing the country. It is important to emphasize that socialist Yugoslavia was a sovereign country, with control over its territory and decisions made independently, while the countries formed after it are fragmented republics that are in NATO, or where NATO is present, as in Bosnia and Herzegovina, or in the occupied southern part of Serbia, Kosovo and Metohija, where decisions are made in Brussels and Washington, and the government is formed by the American ambassador.

The Final Triumph of the Counter-Revolution: The Path to the EU from 2000 to 2025

After the criminal NATO aggression, emergency elections were organized for the President of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. The Western opposition formed the Democratic Opposition of Serbia (DOS), which included 20 organizations. According to official results, the pro-Western candidate Vojislav Koštunica won 48.96% of the votes, while Slobodan Milošević received 38.62%. This meant that a second round of elections should have been held. However, the pro-Western opposition claimed that Koštunica had won 50.24% of the votes and had already won in the first round. This claim was followed by the organization of a “colored revolution,” with the opposition entering the Federal Assembly and burning the election results.

The new pro-Western government declared that the “Bastille had fallen” and that communism in Yugoslavia had been finally overthrown. NATO had failed to break the resistance of the people of Yugoslavia during the aggression, but through its fifth column, with the October 5th coup in 2000, it succeeded in installing a government modeled on its own. A key role in this counter-revolution was played by the “Otpor” (Resistance) movement, which mobilized young people under CIA instructions. Later, its leaders founded the CANVAS organization (known for its distinctive logo—a clenched fist), which participated in the colored revolutions and their attempts in the Arab Spring, Venezuela, Georgia, Ukraine (twice), Bolivia, Belarus, Hong Kong, and many other countries.

From then until today, puppet regimes have alternated, and a common feature of these governments has been that they acted under the orders of Brussels and Washington. In this context, the new pro-imperialist governments began dismantling the socialist state and system, initiating mass privatizations and implementing neoliberal reforms. Only some examples will be mentioned here, as the crimes committed against the people, putting them in a state of slavery, exceed the scope of this text.

1) Destruction of the Financial Sector

After the coup, the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia immediately joined international financial institutions like the IMF and the World Bank, which operated in the interests of imperialism. Soon, it began borrowing from Western creditors, while the domestic financial sector was destroyed. Upon taking power, the four largest state banks and the Social Accounting Service, which controlled the market, were liquidated, and foreign banks that now dominate the market replaced them.

2) Privatization

The reactionary process of privatization created a million-strong army of unemployed people and

handed public property over to foreign and domestic, mostly foreign, bourgeois exploiters. The initial accumulation of capital in Yugoslavia, as in other former socialist states, was achieved by plundering public resources by those close to the authorities, creating a domestic bourgeoisie. In rigged tenders, large companies were sold for symbolic amounts of just a few euros, while many firms were sold below their market value. The restoration of capitalism enabled the creation of a domestic bourgeoisie and various parasitic structures, leading to mass dissatisfaction, a drastic decline in production and citizens’ living standards, an increase in crime, mafia activities, and plundering, as well as the negative influence of international financial and industrial monopolies on our economy. Our people became aware that there was no “fair” privatization—every privatization was a robbery of public resources that the working class of Yugoslavia had created over decades. The entire privatization process was accompanied by the revision of citizens’ social rights, acquired during the socialist construction period, as well as the abolition of many achievements in the fields of social protection, healthcare, education, culture, science, and sports. This policy had a particularly negative impact on everyday life through inflation, constant increases in rent, utility services, transportation, food, and other basic needs.

3) Destruction of the Army

The phrase “He who does not feed his army, will feed someone else’s” best describes the period after the counter-revolutionary coup, when the army reform began, which essentially meant a process of demilitarization. NATO officers were engaged in implementing this reform, and a NATO office was opened within the General Staff. Gradually, compulsory military service began to be abolished, and by 2010 it was completely eliminated. A large number of patriotically oriented officers were retired, while military equipment began to be destroyed, along with the military industry that produced equipment for the needs of the army.

In 2003, the Yugoslav Army had 206,000 active soldiers and 680,000 in reserve, while the number of people fit for military service reached as high as 2,300,000. One of the most illustrative examples of the reduction of military power was the purchase of the steel mill in Smederevo by the American company US Steel, which melted down tanks and then sold the factory for just one dollar.

Today, although the Serbian Army is renewing its capacities, both technical and industrial, it has only 25,000 soldiers (Serbia made up 87% of the population of the former FRY) and an active reserve of only 2,000 people.

4) Deindustrialization and Economic Dependence

The puppet authorities quickly began implementing a policy of aligning Serbia with the European Union, which serves large capital and represents a prison for nations. In the EU, the rich become even richer, while the poor become even poorer. Through this policy, deindustrialization of the country was carried out, and factories, built over decades by workers in socialism, were stolen and handed over to domestic tycoons and foreign capitalists. Under pressure from the EU, Serbia's economy was reoriented towards a market economy and the development of small and medium-sized enterprises. Mineral and natural resources were sold off at bargain prices.

Industrial production in 2012 was at only 38.4% of the level from 1989, and in recent years, it has hovered around 50-55% of that period. Serbia experienced one of the largest deindustrializations in Europe since World War II. In the first years after the counter-revolution, the number of industrial workers was reduced by more than 50%.

Exports of industrial products are low, which negatively affects the trade balance and payment balance situation. Today, Serbia's industry is not competitive either on foreign or domestic markets. Industrial activity is far below the country's potential. Revenues from privatization were not invested in revitalizing industry but were mainly used for current consumption. Part of Serbia's industry lost its

previous markets in the EU, Eastern Europe, and the non-aligned countries. Additionally, the competition from foreign goods in the domestic market, after the liberalization and reduction of customs duties, further weakened the position of domestic producers.

The deindustrialization of Serbia is one of the indicators of the loss of sovereignty, as the country was placed in a dependent position toward Western centers of capital, exporting raw materials while simultaneously buying finished products from them. Today, Serbia's gross domestic product (GDP) is composed of 51% services, 26% industry, and 6% agriculture. Employment in agriculture is 16%, in industry 28%, while services account for 56% of total employment. Serbia's annual debt amounts to about 60% of GDP, while the total debt of all Yugoslav republics from 1991 has risen from 15 billion to 145-160 billion dollars.

Unemployment in Serbia currently stands at just over 8% (although if you are unemployed for more than 2 years, you are no longer considered unemployed in statistics), and the largest share of trade exchanges occurs with EU countries, whose share in trade is 59%. Large enterprises employ 44% of workers, while these companies account for 57% of total profit. Micro-enterprises make up 13%, small 20%, and medium 23%. Around 98% of companies in Serbia are privately owned, while only 1.3% are state-owned. Private companies employ 85% of the workforce, while state-owned enterprises employ only 14.5%. Private companies generate more than 91% of gross added value, while state-owned companies generate only 8%. Private companies account for 97.5% of exports, while state-owned companies account for only 2.3%, with imports from private companies accounting for 93.5%, and from state-owned companies 6.3%. In terms of exporters, private companies account for more than 99.2%, while state-owned enterprises achieve only 0.55%. Private companies also participate with more than 99.3% in the number of importers, while state-owned enterprises account for only 0.55%.

Due to the market logic of capital, which assumes the

free flow of people, goods, and services, many young, highly educated people decide to seek their fortunes outside of Serbia. Serbia is also the leader in Europe in terms of brain drain. A large number of young, especially highly educated individuals, are leaving the country in search of better living and working conditions. These migrations represent a great loss for the country, as investments in the education of professionals often end up benefiting other countries that make use of their potential. These professionals often accept jobs in Western imperialist countries for significantly lower wages than they would be willing to work for in their home country, as they have no other options. This phenomenon clearly shows that poor and underdeveloped countries stand no chance in competition with developed, imperialist countries that are the center of global capital.

Serbia also encourages foreign investors by offering them subsidies of 10,000 euros per employee. However, after the subsidy period expires, many foreign companies often close their operations. Additionally, the Labor Law allows employers to easily dismiss workers, and in some factories, such as the South Korean company Yura, workers are forced to wear diapers to avoid losing time by going to the toilet during work hours. In many factories, union activists are harassed, and in many companies, the union is practically banned. The current Labor Law was written by the American Chamber of Commerce (as well as many other laws). The legislative framework is largely subordinated to the interests of large capital, rather than the welfare of workers.

Demographic changes and migration significantly impact Serbia's economy. According to the 1991 census, Serbia had around 9.78 million inhabitants, of which around 1.95 million lived in Kosovo and Metohija. If we subtract the population from that area, Serbia had around 7.82 million people. According to the 2023 census, Serbia's population has decreased to around 6.62 million, representing a decline of 1.21 million people. This number would have been even greater if it were not for the million refugees who came to Serbia, mainly from Croatia, Bosnia and

Herzegovina, as well as from Kosovo and Metohija. In the last decade, between 30,000 and 60,000 people leave Serbia every year, mostly in search of a better life in Western Europe.

Uneven regional development also affects migration within the country. Young people from underdeveloped parts of Serbia are moving to Belgrade and Vojvodina. During 2020, 109,747 people changed their place of residence, meaning they permanently moved to another city or municipality. Of this number, 43,428 people moved to Belgrade, while 38,562 people left the capital. When including those who did not register, this number is much higher.

In Serbia, urban residents make up 61.2% of the total population. Statistics show that as many as 69.5% of young people between the ages of 18 and 34 still live with their parents, which is significantly above the EU average, where that percentage is 47.9%. This trend is a consequence of the inability of most young people to afford to buy an apartment or take out a housing loan. Additionally, more than half of young parents live with their parents or in homes they inherited. Buying a new apartment or taking out a housing loan is unimaginable for the vast majority of citizens in Serbia.

According to data from 2020, as much as one-fifth of the population (21.1%) was 65 or older, while only 14.3% was younger than 15 years old. The population growth rate compared to 2019 was negative and amounted to—6.7 per thousand. These demographic and migratory trends lead to a shortage of labor in Serbia, which is why the number of migrations from countries such as Sri Lanka, India, Bangladesh, as well as from Africa and other regions, has increased recently. Furthermore, more than 370,000 people have arrived in Serbia from Russia, and estimates suggest that this number could exceed 400,000.

5) Political Court—The Hague Tribunal

One of the first tasks of the new authorities in Yugoslavia after the counterrevolution was to extradite those who fought against American

imperialism to the Hague Tribunal. In order to justify the role of the United States and Western imperialism in the breakup of Yugoslavia, it was crucial to accuse one side and demonize it. The goal was to portray one side as the “wolves” and the other as the “innocent sheep” led to slaughter. In this context, the principle of selective justice was applied, where only the consequences are discussed, while avoiding the discussion of the causes of the civil war in Yugoslavia and the role of Western imperialism in that process.

Here, no one seeks to justify the Serbs who committed horrific crimes during the war and who deserve to be punished, but the problem is that it is propagandistically portrayed that only the Serbian people and their leadership are responsible for the war and crimes in the former Yugoslavia, while Western imperialism and the separatists under its control are avoided as a responsible factor. The aim was to condemn the Serbian people, as it was the Serbs who were the most prominent opponents of the destruction of Yugoslavia, a country where all Serbs lived together.

After the counterrevolution, the president of the FRY during the NATO bombing, Slobodan Milošević (who was killed in The Hague before he could be sentenced), as well as the entire leadership of the FRY and the Bosnian Serbs, were arrested and extradited to the Hague Tribunal. When looking at the funding of the Hague Tribunal, it is clear that the United States, the EU, and their allies provide the most funding for the court, which suggests that its decisions were made in their interest. The International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia indicted 161 individuals, of which 94 were Serbs (58.39%). Interestingly, representatives of the US, NATO, and the EU, who are most responsible for the crimes, were not held accountable, but instead lectured on human rights.

6) The Destruction and Commodification of Education and Healthcare

Healthcare in Serbia has been systematically destroyed, with private healthcare services

increasingly favored over public ones year after year, to the detriment of the public sector. Many doctors work simultaneously in both private and state institutions, often referring patients to private clinics. The government, under pressure from the International Monetary Fund, has passed numerous regulations prohibiting employment in public healthcare institutions (the latest decision extending the ban is valid until the end of 2026), which has led young healthcare workers to leave for Western countries. Long waiting lists for scans, surgeries, and other medical services (some of which people wait for years) force individuals to turn to private medicine, while those without financial means are left to fate. The destruction and privatization of the pharmaceutical industry and research centers have led to rising drug prices and a decrease in their quality. State pharmacies were sold off during privatization, and one of the last remaining, Apoteka Beograd, which has existed since 1830, is being sold to betting shops and casinos due to its prime locations. Private healthcare centers, many of which are foreign-owned, are making huge profits off citizens who are forced to receive treatment there. A striking example of the state's neglect of healthcare is the abandoned hospital with new equipment built during the COVID-19 pandemic, now overgrown with weeds. The shortage of healthcare workers and the aging medical professionals further challenge the Serbian healthcare system.

Similarly, the education system is gradually becoming commercialized, with extreme commercialization starting with the implementation of the Bologna Declaration in 2006, which was signed in 2003. According to this declaration, education is increasingly reduced to market-oriented courses, with knowledge treated as a commodity that anyone can purchase. In practice, this has led to the overproduction of fake diplomas and doctorates, seriously degrading the quality of the education system. Students have become clients, and education has become a privilege for the wealthy, with fewer than 5% of students coming from working-class and

peasant families. Private universities proliferated in the 1990s, and after the 2000s, their overproduction led to an even greater decline in education quality. At many private universities, children of wealthier parents simply buy their degrees. Primary and secondary education is increasingly aligned with European standards and EU ideology, aimed at educating obedient generations who will be part of the administrative elite within the EU. Furthermore, colonial discourse dominates university curricula, with the curriculum adjusted to the interests of the EU. The government wanted to bring foreign, unaccredited universities to Serbia and offer scholarships to certain students, but after professors protested, the law was withdrawn. However, the president stated that he would insist on bringing foreign universities to Serbia, but the current student protests have removed this issue from the agenda. In secondary education, the introduction of a dual training system, under the guise of “vocational advancement,” has led children to work in private companies for minimal compensation, effectively reintroducing child labor. Colonial discourse also dominates primary education, as, for example, Palestinian FATAH and the PLO are labeled as terrorist organizations in history textbooks.

The degradation of education and low wages are leading to serious problems. At some faculties in recent years, there have been no applications for programs such as mathematics, chemistry, physics, and Serbian language teaching, and due to the lack of staff, the state has allowed students to teach these subjects in primary and secondary schools, which further exacerbates the quality of education.

7) *The Fire Sale of Mineral and Natural Resources*

After the counterrevolution, Serbia began selling off its mineral and natural resources, primarily to foreign capital. One of the best examples of this approach to mineral resources is the attempt by the Serbian government to grant a 99-year concession for lithium extraction to the company Rio Tinto, with an annual rent of 4%. German Chancellor Olaf Scholz

visited Serbia to support this policy, as the issue of Serbian lithium had become an important point in his political campaign. Although the people of Serbia have managed to prevent the British-Australian company’s lithium exploration several times—given its globally negative impact—the government persistently insists on this plan. The reason for this is the strategic importance of Serbian lithium for the European Union in the competition with China over electric vehicle production.

8) *The Breakup of the State Union*

The Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, which was supposed to serve as the nucleus for the restoration of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, was broken up in 2006 through a rigged referendum, aided by a puppet regime in Montenegro led by Milo Đukanović. This event fits into the continuity of imperialist policy in the broader process of dismantling the SFRY. As a result, Serbia lost its access to the sea, and Montenegro became a member of NATO. This process of fragmentation continued later, with the self-declared independence of the false state of Kosovo, which remains under NATO’s protectorate.

9) *Anti-Communist Propaganda and the Invention of Traditions as EU Ideology*

After the fall of the Berlin Wall, history began to be falsified in most former socialist countries. The Council of Europe adopted numerous resolutions condemning former socialist regimes following the collapse of the Eastern Bloc. For example, the Resolution on measures for dismantling former totalitarian systems emphasized that the main goal of transitional processes is to create a pluralistic democracy based on the rule of law and respect for human rights. This includes freedom of choice, economic pluralism, protection of private property, freedom of the press, development of civil society, as well as decentralization, demilitarization, demonopolization, and debureaucratization of former socialist regimes. The resolution highlighted

the need to rehabilitate individuals who were victims of communist crimes and to return property to churches and individuals who were harmed by the state through nationalization, confiscation, or other forms of expropriation during communist totalitarianism. It stressed the necessity of adopting a lustration law, with a process that must meet democratic standards, meaning that guilt must be individual, not collective, and there must be a presumption of innocence until proven otherwise, with the right to appeal, as the aim of lustration is not to convict people (this is the task of the prosecution), but to protect the newly established democracy.

Additionally, a Resolution was adopted on the need for international condemnation of crimes committed by totalitarian communist regimes, which stated that the hallmark of these systems was the massive violation of human rights, mass collective and individual executions, concentration camps, deportations, torture, forced labor, and ethnic or religious persecutions, as well as other forms of violence. According to the authors of the resolution, these regimes were characterized by the absence of political pluralism, “violence against freedom and conscience, thought and expression, and freedom of the press.” The resolution pointed out the problem that communist criminals, unlike those belonging to the National Socialist ideology, have not faced justice after the fall of these regimes. One of the primary issues identified was the lack of awareness of these crimes in European societies. It also noted the problem of certain communist parties operating legally without distancing themselves from the atrocities committed during socialism. According to this assertion, it is essential to raise awareness about these criminals to prevent the repetition of such crimes in the future, while the moral condemnation of these crimes plays a crucial role in educating future generations. The resolution emphasized the clear stance of the international community on the past, which “can serve as a reference for future joint actions.” It also noted that the victims of crimes committed by communist totalitarian

regimes, whether they are still alive or their families, “deserve sympathy, understanding, and recognition for their suffering.” The assembly believes that such resolutions will pave the way for “reconciliation and encourage historians to continue their research aimed at determining and verifying what happened.”

In this context, the European Parliament adopted a Declaration proclaiming August 23 as European Day of Remembrance for the Victims of Stalinism and Nazism, the day the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact was signed. In the justification of this declaration, it refers to the United Nations Charter on the non-applicability of war crimes, as well as the Council of Europe Convention on the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms. According to the claims in this declaration, this date was chosen because a series of secret documents from the Molotov-Ribbentrop agreement divided Europe into two spheres of influence between Germany and the Soviet Union. The declaration emphasizes that both Stalinism and Nazism are responsible for imprisonments, deportations, and torture, which fall under the category of crimes against humanity. It also notes that this resolution is being adopted because “the impact of the Soviet order and occupation on the citizens of post-communist states and its significance are little known in Europe.”

This declaration was reaffirmed by the European Parliament Resolution of April 2, 2009, on European Conscience and Totalitarianism. One of the key arguments presented in the resolution is that European integration emerged as a response to the suffering caused by the Two World Wars, Nazi tyranny leading to the Holocaust, and, on the other hand, the spread of totalitarian and undemocratic communist regimes in Eastern Europe. The resolution notes that Europe cannot be united until it confronts its past, where Western Europe was under Nazism, and Central and Eastern Europe were under Communism. The text condemned fascist regimes in Portugal, Greece, and Spain, while emphasizing the uniqueness of the Holocaust. This Resolution aims for Europe to develop a unified stance on its shared

history and create an honest common discussion about Nazism, Stalinism, Communism, and Fascism and the crimes committed by these regimes. In the first point of this document, the European Parliament expressed solidarity with all the victims of totalitarian and undemocratic regimes in Europe, and at the same time, paid tribute to those who fought against tyranny and oppression.

The latest in a series of resolutions in this spirit was adopted by the European Parliament on September 19, 2019, regarding the importance of European remembrance for the future of Europe, which emphasizes the greatest responsibility for the start of World War II and the division of Europe between the USSR and Nazi Germany. The argument used was the signing of the Molotov-Ribbentrop non-aggression pact, which divided Europe through a series of secret agreements, with Poland being first attacked by Hitler and then Stalin. It was noted that, after World War II, Europe reconciled, while the countries of Eastern and Central Europe were under Soviet occupation and communist dictatorship. According to this resolution, Stalinism and Communism are treated as synonyms and emphasized that, like Nazi regimes, they were responsible for murders, crimes, deportations, and concentration camps. Therefore, in many EU countries, the propagation of Nazi and Communist ideologies and their symbols is banned. The resolution calls for countries to condemn communist and Nazi regimes and ban any propaganda of Nazism and Stalinism in EU countries, including the removal of monuments, street names, and other symbols associated with this period. The document urges all EU countries to include this date in their school curricula to raise awareness about the history of totalitarian regimes among younger generations. This resolution discusses how EU and NATO integration not only brought the countries of Eastern and Central Europe back into the family of free democratic nations but also brought socio-economic development to these countries. It stresses the need to raise awareness of the crimes of communism and the need for European nations to confront extreme

political ideologies like Nazism and Communism, their propaganda, regimes, and symbols. It was noted that the Russian people suffered the most under communist totalitarianism and that this country and its leaders should face their totalitarian past and stop celebrating and denying communist crimes. In the context of these documents, in many EU countries, communist symbols and those related to the former socialist countries have been banned as part of the decommunization process.

Countries that sought to join the EU mostly enacted laws condemning political persecution during the socialist era. These laws were adopted in line with resolutions and declarations by the European Parliament, which condemned all totalitarian regimes, interpreted as a condemnation of all regimes ruled by communist parties, regardless of their actual character and historical changes. Thus, Serbia adopted the Rehabilitation Law, which aligns with the country's policy of joining the EU and distancing itself from its socialist past. In order for Serbia to join the EU, chapters are opened between Serbia and the EU during this process. Throughout this process, Serbia aligns its legal system with the norms prescribed by the EU.

Although trials in post-war Yugoslavia were conducted according to international law (not revolutionary law) for fascists, Nazis, and collaborators with the occupiers, and this was an international obligation of Yugoslavia as one of the founding members of the United Nations, the EU, like in other Eastern European countries, demanded their legal rehabilitation, arguing that Yugoslavia conducted trials based on ideological principles. Since the beginning of negotiations between the EU and Serbia, the European Parliament has passed resolutions every year reporting on the progress of negotiations between the two sides. Thus, in the EP resolutions from 2014 to 2016, the Serbian government was urged to fully implement the Rehabilitation Law without discrimination. The Rehabilitation Law was adopted in Serbia in 2006, with amendments made in 2011. Through the application of the Rehabilitation

Law, over 3,000 people in Serbia were rehabilitated, mostly those convicted for the most serious war crimes during World War II.

It is impossible to separate these processes from the historical and political context in which they emerged. They arose as counter-revolutionary processes. The aforementioned resolutions manipulate historical facts, stripping them of context, and represent anti-communist propaganda. The historical fact is that the Soviet Union, led by communists, was the most responsible for the defeat of Nazism, that communists led the largest anti-fascist resistance in war-torn Yugoslavia, followed by the largest resistance in Greece, also led by communists, as well as in other countries, and that big capital, as mentioned earlier, gave Hitler his power. However, these resolutions clearly show a precise template by which former socialist countries in Eastern Europe were dismantled, referring to the propagandistic pamphlets of Karl Friedrikh, Zbigniew Brzezinski, Hannah Arendt, Raymond Aron, and Claude Lefort on totalitarianism. According to this pattern, these directives were carried out across Eastern Europe. Here, we see the logical contradiction of these resolutions, which claim to fight against monism but are themselves imposing a monistic way of thinking. These decisions promote an anti-communist narrative that dehumanizes communists, creating an anti-totalitarian discourse used to condemn everything related to communism, while, on the other hand, post-socialist societies tacitly rehabilitate anti-communist movements (regardless of their fascist and collaborationist character).

The normalization of Nazi collaborationists and Nazis in the public and political discourse in former socialist countries paralleled the fall of socialism and the implementation of neoliberalism. Many political emigrants, a large part of whom were on the side of the collaborationist forces or openly sided with the Nazis, returned to former socialist countries. Former dissidents, along with communist converts, overnight became heralds of democratic processes in these countries. The remains of former state enemies,

Nazis, and their collaborators, were transferred from the countries where they had been buried to the countries of their origin, and funeral ceremonies were organized with full state (and church) honors.

Historical textbooks, literature, films, art, and all other social factors underwent a 180-degree change. Former collaborators and Nazis returned to the historical stage, having suddenly become national heroes and patriots, celebrated as individuals who sacrificed their lives in the fight against communist totalitarianism. Under the banner of the fight against communism, neo-fascist movements have once again raised their heads across Eastern Europe. Many of them have been normalized and rehabilitated.

What is universal about these movements, although each has its specificities in different countries, is that they express pronounced anti-communism, anti-Semitism, racism, and chauvinism, which is mostly directed at ethnic minorities in their countries, while in the former USSR and Poland, Russophobia is also expressed. Additionally, fascist and collaborationist organizations (and in some cases, paramilitary formations) have been politically normalized, even though many of these countries are in the European Union or on their way to it. In all these societies, it has become common to rename streets, schools, and other public institutions, while the demolition of some monuments and the construction of new ones is a reality that closely follows these phenomena. The most extreme example of the rehabilitation of Nazism is in Ukraine, where its indelible consequences can still be seen today.

The factual situation is that every law protects the legislator, and its essence is to defend the existing social order. Based on this, the legal system in a state represents the ideological framework of a society. Its role is to regulate the political and economic processes occurring within it. In this spirit, we can say that some judicial processes after World War II in Yugoslavia had an ideological and political character. The communist government wanted to condemn the previous system and those involved in war crimes, thereby legitimizing socialist construction

and its economic and political system, and with it, the socialist concept of citizenship. However, they were no less political and ideological than today's courts. Thus, every judicial process is ideological and political, and it cannot be value-neutral. The same is true for the rehabilitation of nationalist icons that are crucial for the nationalist narrative, which ran parallel to the neoliberal transition in Serbia. The dominant narrative, for ideological and political reasons, sought to sever ties with the "totalitarian past" and justify its role by delegitimizing socialism and the left as an alternative to the current political system.

The process of dealing with the former socialist regime is not an isolated case in Serbia. It is part of a broader political and ideological revenge that is being applied across Europe, especially in its eastern part. Nazi and socialist regimes are, to a large extent, legally equated. For this position, both a legal and a moral-political framework has been established. What was in the sphere of propaganda warfare in the West during the 20th century has, by the end of the 20th and the beginning of the 21st century, found its legal framework in the East. Thus, any criticism of liberalism and the EU as an ideological concept can easily be characterized and categorized as totalitarianism. Anti-communist resolutions and declarations passed throughout the old continent have provided the necessary "conscience" for Europe. In line with such an ideological offensive, it was important to discredit the alternative to the existing neoliberal processes, which nationalists themselves used to rehabilitate their policies.

Although the European Union is formally based on the principles of anti-fascism, the fact remains that there is tolerance within it for numerous neo-fascist and collaborationist movements, with former socialist countries, now members or candidates for membership, leading the way. By disregarding critical historical analysis, a wide normalization and rehabilitation of individuals convicted for the worst war crimes took place across Eastern Europe. Overnight, the worst war criminals and their

movements were declared fighters for democracy and human rights. They became victims overnight, and their crimes were relativized. Numerous resolutions passed by EU institutions and their implementation at the level of national judiciaries aimed to condemn "real socialism" as a totalitarian dictatorship and equate it with the other side of the totalitarian coin, German National-Socialism.

The Rehabilitation Law was adopted after Serbia began its policy of rapprochement and alignment of its legal framework with the EU. In this context, this phenomenon is not characteristic only for Serbia but occurs within the broader context of postsocialism, as part of a wider process of normalizing political forces in public discourse that were the losers of 1945 in Eastern Europe. Although the Rehabilitation Law in Serbia did not apply to individuals convicted for crimes committed during World War II, the vast majority of cases (and the most public outcry) related to that period. By adopting the Rehabilitation Law and its application, the Nuremberg Trials were effectively denied.

Legal rehabilitations within the new paradigm of ethnonational and neoliberal citizenship in Serbia aimed to legitimize the ruling ideological model and, in doing so, delegitimize the previous socialist system. In Serbia, legal rehabilitations were carried out within the framework of forming an ethnonational citizenship, which was incompatible with the paradigm of the anti-fascist movement with a supranational character, as was the case with the partisans. Therefore, the nationalist narrative, through the rehabilitation of individuals, movements, and symbols associated with it during World War II, resorted to inventing traditions about its victorious role and democracy, masking its crimes and collaboration. The Rehabilitation Law has an ideological and political character, and its application was politically motivated, with the aim of historical revenge.

Within the neoliberal offensive, whose narrative insisted on dismantling the totalitarian former socialist systems that existed in the East, the

nationalist narrative began to exploit the void it created. In Serbia, the nationalist narrative seized this opportunity, presenting itself as an innocent victim of communist totalitarianism. The neoliberal concept of citizenship in Serbia was tolerant of the right-wing narrative, although in some respects, the ethnic concept of citizenship contradicts it. In the case of Serbia, it is useful insofar as it rehabilitates collaboration and condemns revolution, and thus any socialist alternative. Legal rehabilitations within the new paradigm of ethnonational and neoliberal citizenship in Serbia are based on strong anti-communism and historical revisionism, with a narrative focused on the present and future, rather than rectifying historical injustice.

10) Colonial Discourse and the Erasure of History

The colonial discourse that dominates in Serbia, a result of Western imperialism, is carried out through the control of two so called opposing narratives. On one side, there is the conservative-nationalist (or chauvinistic) discourse, and on the other, the liberal-civic (or auto-chauvinistic) discourse. The conservative-nationalist discourse often idealizes the past, presenting it as a golden age that was allegedly destroyed by the “evil communists.” According to this narrative, Serbs are depicted as naive and good, while other nations are said to have always acted against them. It is emphasized that Serbs wanted to build a state with their Slavic brothers but sacrificed their statehood by entering Yugoslavia. Unfortunately, for others in Yugoslavia, it was merely a stop on the way to gaining independence. Serbs are shown as innocent and loyal, while all others were evil and waited for their moment to stab Serbs in the back. Sometimes, it is claimed that Serbs missed their historical opportunities, which resulted in wars, sanctions, and bombings. Within this discourse, Albanians are often portrayed as an inferior, almost evolutionarily backward people, who “stole” Kosovo due to, according to this view, the naivety of the Serbs, the Yugoslav idea, and communist policies. To return Kosovo to Serbia, this discourse demands

“liberation” from Yugoslav and communist illusions, because only then can Serbs achieve their national interests and restore their former greatness. Although criticism of the West is sometimes heard within this discourse, it is often stated that Serbia belongs to the European family of nations. It is emphasized that Serbia has historically defended Europe, and thus the Western world should side with the Serbs, not their “enemies.” A similar discourse exists in other former Yugoslav republics and among the Balkan peoples.

On an abstract level, the nationalist discourse opposes NATO and the EU, as they bombed us, and the EU recognized the independence of Kosovo. However, instead of criticizing NATO, which, according to this discourse, keeps the Balkans under occupation, the hatred is largely directed towards other nations, calling for revenge. For example, fans of Red Star, one of Serbia’s most famous sports clubs, forbid Croats, Bosniaks, and Albanians from playing, yet have no issues with athletes from NATO countries such as the USA, France, Germany, or others. When discussing the “return of Kosovo,” it is often implied that Albanians should be expelled, but there is never mention of expelling NATO forces or the US, who have military bases in the area.

This discourse thus contributes to legitimizing the NATO pact, as it is claimed that “peace buliding missions” in the Balkans are necessary to maintain peace. According to this logic, the withdrawal of NATO would allegedly cause “new bloodshed.”

The other discourse implemented in Serbia is liberal-civic. This discourse is often portrayed as the opposite of the nationalist one.

According to this line of thought, the guilt for war crimes lies predominantly with Greater Serbian nationalism, and the propaganda mantra about war criminals sentenced by the Hague Tribunal is constantly repeated, even though the tribunal was politically oriented. This discourse also focuses on the narrative of the so called Srebrenica genocide, which, although it is a terrible crime, represents a form of imperialist propaganda. This narrative insists on selective justice, accusing only the Serbian side while

completely ignoring the role of Western imperialism and separatists, who were supported by the US, EU, and their allies. In this way, the responsibility of Western countries for the distraction of Yugoslavia is minimized, and the dominant colonial discourse is imposed as the only correct one.

Although this discourse is used to justify Western hegemony, in practice, it encourages the conservative-nationalist discourse by manipulating the emotions of the masses. Serbian victims are hardly ever mentioned, or they are spoken of very little, further fueling national divisions. This discourse is mainly spread through non-governmental organizations, media openly aligned with the West, and universities influenced by Western financial flows. In this way, youth who are anti-nationalist in sentiment are attracted and, through manipulation and brainwashing, become instruments in fueling hatred without even realizing it. Also, this discourse argues that idea of Yugoslavism was good, but unattainable in practice.

In essence, the “reconciliation” policy based on selective justice does not lead to true reconciliation but instead stirs new conflicts, because according to this narrative, the Serbian side is always guilty, which places a large part of the Serbian population into the conservative-nationalist discourse that uses the sentiment of injustice to argue that no one cares about Serbian victims. The goal of this discourse is not reconciliation but maintaining divisions to facilitate the control of territory, which NATO uses to manage the space of the former Yugoslavia and the entire Balkans.

These two discourses are nothing but two sides of the same coin, originating from the same source. These discourses feed off each other. Both discourses are transmitted through state ideological apparatuses and become subjects of daily conflict, not only in political discourse but also in many families whose members take different sides. Both discourses come to the same conclusion. Yugoslavia is impossible in the long run. However, historical practice has shown us that if there is no Yugoslavia, there is occupation,

meanin there is no true sovereignty. Through ideological manipulations carried out at all levels, the “divide and rule” policy becomes an integral part of the lives of ordinary people. Thanks to these manipulations, the system of Western imperialism remains dominant.

The way history is erased in Serbia is best illustrated by the fact that the “Eternal Flame” monument, erected in honor of all victims of the NATO aggression, was extinguished immediately after the counterrevolution. This monument was never even registered as a cultural monument, and the flame on it was never reignited. There are also other examples, such as the Hotel Jugoslavija and the General Staff building. These buildings were under state protection and represented symbols of socialist construction, but they were bombed during the NATO aggression. Hotel Jugoslavija lost its protection, the urban planning plan was changed, and a private investor close to the government was allowed to demolish the hotel and build new structures according to their own desires. As for the General Staff building, the government removed its special protection and allowed Trump’s son-in-law, Jared Kushner, to transform the building into a luxury hotel, which is an insult to all citizens of Serbia. There were protests, including protests by architects, professors, and academics, but the government killed three birds with one stone—it erased the memory of socialist symbols, NATO bombings, and supported big capital.

11) Cooperation with NATO

The NATO alliance has had its office in the Serbian General Staff since 2014, located in a building that was bombed during the 1999 conflict. The State Union of Serbia and Montenegro signed an agreement in 2005 that allows NATO to move freely on Serbia’s roads, with NATO forces exempted from any responsibility. In 2006, Serbia joined NATO’s Partnership for Peace program, and in 2011, Serbia hosted a NATO summit. In 2013, a NATO Youth Summit was organized, aiming to raise awareness among young people about the importance of Serbia’s potential membership in

the organization and warn about security risks if this does not happen.

A pivotal moment came in 2014, when the Serbian government signed a Status of Forces Agreement (SOFA) with NATO in Washington. The agreement was ratified by the National Assembly in July 2015. In January 2015, the Serbian government signed the IPAP agreement, an operational document outlining a broad range of joint activities and further development of cooperation with NATO in nearly all areas. In September of the same year, an agreement with NATO on procurement and logistical support was signed, which was ratified in February 2016.

Between 2006 and 2018, 150 military exercises were conducted between Serbia and NATO, with the most recent being the “Platanski Vuk (Wolf)” exercise in June 2024 in southern Serbia. In July 2024, Serbia’s Foreign Minister Marko Đurić represented Serbia at the NATO summit in Washington. He stated that Serbia wants to play a constructive role in regional and global issues despite its limited capacities. He also mentioned that a potential investment of \$1.7 billion in Serbia’s solar energy sector could help diversify energy sources, as the country is currently too dependent on Russia in this field. Due to all these events, it is often said in Serbia that the country did not join NATO, but NATO has entered Serbia.

12) Constitution, Legal Legislation, and Harmonization of Laws with the EU

The entire legislation adopted after the counter-revolutionary processes in Serbia in 2000 was largely shaped under the influence of the EU. The installed authorities adhered almost exclusively to orders from Brussels, submitting reports on implemented measures to the European Commission at the end of each year. When you complete this process, that is, lose even the smallest form of sovereignty and thoroughly destroy your economy, you are ready to enter the EU. The European Union is essentially an imperialist creation that protects the interests of monopolies, and its legislation is designed to maintain and deepen economic disparities among

its members. The essence of the EU lies in protecting private property and enabling the free flow of goods and services—which in practice is often neither free nor fair.

In 2005, the private sector in Serbia became dominant over the state sector. Under pressure from Western imperialists, Serbia adopted a new constitution in 2006, which completed the process of capitalist restoration. This constitution abolished the dominance of social property over the means of production, which had been guaranteed by the previous constitution, while simultaneously legalizing privatization and enabling the plundering of citizens. In line with EU models, the constitution guaranteed the inviolability of private property. Also, with this constitution, Kosovo and Metohija were granted a significantly weaker legal status, and the autonomous province of Vojvodina acquired a broader degree of autonomy, opening the possibility for further disintegration of the country and the creation of new satellite entities under the influence of imperialist powers.

Consequences of the Counter-Revolution in the Balkans and NATO Occupation

The Balkan Peninsula is today under military occupation by NATO. The only countries that are not members of the NATO alliance are Serbia and Bosnia and Herzegovina. However, Bosnia and Herzegovina is under international protectorate, and around 1,100 NATO soldiers are stationed on its territory, with the possibility of increasing this number if necessary. Also, the southern Serbian province is under NATO occupation. In this sense, Serbia is practically the only country in the region that is militarily neutral and not a member of NATO, but is surrounded on all sides by NATO member countries.

The policy of Western imperialism toward the Balkans is part of NATO’s eastward expansion in relation to Russia, as well as the goal of controlling the Mediterranean and Western Asia (the Middle East). In this context, Western imperialism applies a “divide and rule” strategy. The concept of “Balkanization”

was created for this policy, which refers to the creation of small, ethnically conflicted groups in a small space, whose mutual conflicts exhaust the region and prevent any lasting agreement.

It can be said that Serbia has made a full circle, returning to the positions it held in the 19th century. Just as Austria-Hungary considered Serbia its province, today the European Union does the same. However, just as Serbia had some form of independence at that time due to a struggle rooted in the people, it still has some form of independence today, despite the heavy control of Western imperialism, because it is not a member of the EU and NATO. Although sovereignty is limited, Serbia today has the highest degree of sovereignty in Europe, with broad support from the people who oppose membership in NATO and the EU.

Conclusion

This text addresses the idea that history does not follow a unilinear course and that there are no universal templates that can be applied from one place or historical moment to another. The practices and objective material needs of today's society, as well as specific circumstances, differ from those in past periods. The dialectical method and materialist approach, as scientific worldviews, point precisely to this fact. Therefore, when analyzing certain phenomena, it is important to explain phenomena, describe it, and predict what can be expected in the future.

In this context, the text outlines the process of forming a strong communist movement in the former Yugoslavia, with an emphasis on the objective material circumstances that influenced it. It shows how, despite great ups and downs, this movement managed to rise from the ashes and, from a small group of revolutionaries, lead the largest anti-fascist uprising in occupied Europe. It also considers the successes and mistakes in the construction of socialism in Yugoslavia. It is important to note that the mistakes and criticisms were connected to the specific historical circumstances of that time and

were related exclusively to Yugoslavia.

This essay also analyzes how counter-revolutionary forces in Yugoslavia eventually prevailed and what the consequences were. Progressive forces must openly discuss these issues to avoid repeating similar mistakes in the future. Moreover, the current defeat of socialism in Yugoslavia can serve as a lesson for contemporary socialist countries, which should learn from our mistakes, as it is often better to learn from others' defeats than from one's own.

The experience of Serbia and Yugoslavia shows that the chances for small countries are only possible when they are part of regional alliances based on the principles of solidarity and sovereignty. When these principles are abandoned, downfall follows, with consequences that are catastrophic for millions of people. Some mistakes must be acknowledged because, without them, there would have been no counter-revolution in Yugoslavia, Eastern Europe, or the Soviet Union. However, it is important to emphasize that socialism had a thousand flaws, but also a million virtues, while capitalism has a million flaws and no virtues. Despite the mistakes of Yugoslav socialism, it was the greatest civilizational leap in the history of our peoples.

Therefore, it is important to understand that, for the vast majority of people, even the worst socialism is better than the best capitalism. As long as inequalities exist—hungry and full, rich and poor, oppressed nations, the exploitation of man by man—the idea of social justice will not disappear. That is why the triumph of counter-revolution in Yugoslavia, Eastern Europe, and the USSR is the current state, but socialism will ultimately prevail. This will not happen due to the will of an individual or a group, but because it is a lawful stage in the development of human society, a human need, and the wheel of history cannot be stopped.

The imperialist epoch is the epoch of socialist revolution and the decay of bourgeois society

Party of Committees to Support Resistance—for Communism (CARC Party, Italy)

Supplement to The Voice of the (new)Italian Communist Party No. 72 – December 2022

The author of the article that we, as CARC Party, are submitting to Platform for publication is the (new) Italian Communist Party. The (n)ICP is the party in Italy that has developed a strategy for socialist revolution and, consequently, is a party operating underground.

CARC Party is a party with public offices that avails of the political freedoms conquered by the anti-fascist Resistance in Italy (1943–1945) and of the struggles of the ‘70s.

The relationship that exists between the CARC Party and the (n)ICP is one of ideological unity and unity on the strategic objective: to make Italy a new socialist country. However, they are two distinct organizations. The discovery of the need for two parties to make revolution in an imperialist country like Italy is a novelty in the international communist movement, but it is the result of our experience in light of the conditions we find ourselves operating within.

Foreword

This article is an excerpt from the pamphlet produced in December 2022 by the (new)Italian Communist Party in collaboration with CARC Party (Ideological) Training Center. It illustrates the main features that distinguish the imperialist epoch from the bourgeois society of previous centuries and the main events of the approximately 150 years of the imperialist epoch.

In order to pursue their immediate and historical aims, communists base their line of action on the objective conditions in which the class struggle takes

place. Today they must base it on the features of the imperialist epoch, i.e. the epoch of the socialist revolution and the decay of bourgeois society. The analysis of the situation and the political line to follow comes, for communists, from the understanding of the nature of the imperialist epoch in the same way in which the treatment of a disease depends on the diagnosis we make of the disease.

We communists owe to Lenin and his work *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism* (1916) the name of the new epoch and the illustration of its main global economic features.

In *The German Ideology* (1846) Marx and Engels wrote: “we call communism the movement that society is making towards a new epoch, towards the new humanity...”, whose features are pointed out at the end of the second chapter of the *Communist Manifesto* (1848). In the early years of the 20th century, some representatives of the conscious and organized communist movement (Rosa Luxemburg, Rudolf Hilferding, Nikolai Bukharin and others) substantially united in the Second International dealt with imperialism at a theoretical level, to understand what was happening and the driving causes of the course of things. The research was accentuated when they found themselves in the World War I since 1914. In the spring of 1916 Lenin made a painstaking study (*Notebooks on Imperialism*) arriving at the conclusions set out in *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*, definitively published in 1917 after his return to Russia. Throughout the first world wave of the proletarian revolution (1917-1976), the representatives of the communist parties of the imperialist countries paid little or no attention to the nature of the imperialist epoch: this was one of

the factors that determined the inability to promote the socialist revolution until the establishment of socialism, demonstrated in the last century by the communist parties of all the imperialist countries (with the exception of the weakest link in the imperialist chain, that is Russia).

The lag accumulated in the scientific knowledge of the reality of imperialism by the communists of the imperialist countries first gave rise to the theses of the modern revisionists on the “parliamentary road to socialism through structural reforms” and to other theories whose common conclusion is that it is not necessary to establish socialism and whose basis is the thesis that “the world is completely different”, imperialism and then globalization created a new mode of production, changed the nature of capitalism that Marx analysed and exposed in detail in *Capital*.

Even today, in the field of mass activity, this lag contributes to keeping the communists bogged down in economism and electoralism, while the transformations that occurred in the imperialist epoch both in the economic and political fields lead to the same conclusion, namely that the promotion of claim struggles and participation in the bourgeois political struggle must be consciously aimed at the establishment of socialism, which is based on three fundamental pillars:

1. dictatorship of the proletariat, 2. planned management of the economy aimed at satisfying the needs of the resident population and its relations of solidarity, cooperation and exchange with other countries and 3. promotion of the population’s growing access to specifically human activities.

The divergences and uncertainties existing in the international communist movement on the nature of the war underway in Ukraine and on the role of the Russian Federation and the People’s Republic of China are also an expression of the need to recover this lag.

Generations of communists have “lived off the income” of Leninist analysis, either by re-proposing

it in its entirety, almost as if imperialism were an immobile object and not an epoch in the historical movement of the capitalist mode of production, or by retouching it here and there the way in which an ancient fresco is restored, or by trying to update it by eclectically adding elements inferred from the empirical observation of contemporary phenomena. We adopt the conception of imperialism elaborated by Lenin in January-June 1916 and, in the light of it, we analyse the current world imperialist system. However, we must take into account:

- (1) Lenin’s pamphlet is meant to be, and Lenin expressly stated this in the preface to the first publication in April 1917, a popular pamphlet because of the tsarist and war censorship, under which the pamphlet was to be published. It deals only with the main economic features and not with the political ones nor with the reason why the old capitalism described by Marx *Capital* (Book 1, Chapter 13 titled Machinery and large-scale industry)—centred on the production of goods, which (at least in Great Britain) becomes overwhelming from about 1750—in the last decades of the 19th century passes into imperialism. This reason is the absolute overproduction of capital;
- (2) historical development between 1916 and today.

Table of contents

PART ONE—WHAT IS IMPERIALISM

1. Introduction
2. Imperialism and the previous stages of bourgeois society
3. From bourgeois democracy to regime of preventive counter-revolution
4. From cyclical crises to crises due to absolute overproduction of capital
5. The international development of Antithetical Forms of Social Unity (AFSU)
6. The basic feature of imperialism

PART TWO—HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF IMPERIALISM SINCE 1916 ONWARDS

1. Introduction
2. The main stages of the history of imperialist epoch
3. The first socialist countries in the first, second and third stage
4. The role played by US imperialist groups
5. Types of current countries
6. Globalisation and its disruption (sanctions, pandemic, war in Ukraine)
7. Conclusions

PART ONE—WHAT IS IMPERIALISM

1. Introduction

We call imperialism the type of society shaping out in Europe and North America in the late 19th and early 20th centuries and spreading from there to the whole world. By the same term we also denote the epoch of history that we are living through and that succeeded the epoch of bourgeois society that developed from Europe in the first centuries of the second millennium A.D. and gradually spread to the whole world.

Imperialism is also the epoch of the decay of bourgeois society and the establishment of socialism. The last stage of bourgeois society is that of Machinery and large-scale industry (1750–1900) described by Marx in *Capital* (Book I, Chapter 13). This stage ends

in the ten-year cyclical crises described by Marx in *Capital* (Book 1, Chapter 23), in the formation of the five economic features of imperialism described by Lenin in *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism* (1916), and with the transition from the political regime of bourgeois democracy (in which the main opposing classes are on the one hand the nobility and clergy and on the other the bourgeoisie) to the regime of preventive counter-revolution (in which the main opposing classes are the bourgeoisie and the proletariat).

What distinguishes imperialism from all the stages of bourgeois society that preceded is:

(1) that the overall, progressive role played by the bourgeoisie in human history fails. The bourgeoisie has become a decaying class. The dominance of men over nature, together with the creation of productive forces that make men capable of producing the material conditions of their own existence without effort and by employing a small part of their time, constitutes the progress resulting from the centuries-old dominant role played by the bourgeoisie. In what sense the bourgeoisie now became decaying? In the sense that, due to the persistent domination of the bourgeoisie, the dominance men achieved over nature is turning into a catastrophe through several operations: imposition of the division of men between the hungry and the “obese”, between the unemployed and those chained to work; imposition of customs and habits (urbanisation, tourism, air transportation, production, use and dissemination of substances that did not exist in nature, multiplication of electromagnetic waves, etc.) destructive of nature and human health; production and imposition of the use of unnecessary or even harmful substances, objects and services; moral and intellectual brutalization and intoxication of the human species, etc.;

(2) the establishment of socialism (the socialist revolution)—the first stage of society with no more class division, the communist society—is underway. The intellectuals of the bourgeois left try to recreate

the history of the 20th century without considering the main constituent element of the history of this century: the clash between revolutionary forces (the USSR and the protagonists of the first world wave of proletarian revolution) and the imperialist bourgeoisie, which tries at all costs to extend its existence. Therefore, their recreations are not scientific and we cannot take them as a guide for our conduct.

We communists owe to Lenin and his 1916 work *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism* the naming of the new epoch and the illustration of its main world economic features.

The transition of bourgeois society to imperialism took place in the period between 1875 and 1914 in Europe and the USA. In this period, which culminates in World War I (i.e. a war for a different partition of the world among the imperialist powers), bourgeois society takes on the five features described by Lenin in 1916 and before him to some extent by John Atkinson Hobson (*Imperialism*, 1902), Rudolf Hilferding (*Financial Capital*, 1910), Rosa Luxemburg (*The Accumulation of Capital*, 1913), Nikolai Bukharin (*Imperialism and the World Economy*, 1916) and other Marxists:

1. in the production of commodities (goods and services), monopolies made free individual competition between capitalists marginal;
2. finance capital took over capital employed in commodity production and made it its tool and minor part;
3. the export of capital took over the export of commodities;
4. the major capitalist powers divided the world among themselves and established the colonial system (the Berlin Conference for the partition of Africa took place between November 1884 and February 1885);
5. a few large monopolies divided the world production of the most important commodities (the partition of the world among capitalist monopolies)

among themselves.

The basic feature of the new stage is that the production of the material conditions of human existence (food, clothing, footwear, housing, furniture, heating and cooling systems, protective instruments, tools and machines, means of transportation, etc.) as commodities becomes a secondary aspect of the valorization of capital and the activities of the bourgeoisie (although still an ineradicable aspect of them), subordinate to the valorization of capital through financial and speculative transactions.

The history of the imperialist epoch is the history of two kinds of contradictions intertwining:

- the contradictions between imperialist powers and groups over the partition of the world;
- the contradictions between imperialist powers and groups on the one hand and, on the other hand, the forces promoting and leading the socialist and the new democratic revolution (anti-imperialist and anti-feudal, linked to national liberation from foreign powers and the development of capitalist productive forces).

Concerning the imperialist epoch, the main backward or wrong conceptions to be fought in our ranks refer to two theses.

1. Imperialism is only a new trait of the old capitalism, that is, of the stage of bourgeois society that Marx discusses in *Capital* (Book 1, Chapter 13 titled *Machinery and large-scale industry*), that is of the epoch 1750–1900: thus, it would be a society still relevant to the capitalist mode of mercantile production of the material conditions of existence.

2. Imperialism is an entirely new mode of production compared to the old capitalism: the chief representative of this school of thought is Bukharin, whom Lenin refutes extensively in the *Report on the Party Program*.

Understanding the nature of the imperialist epoch is not an academic matter: the analysis of the situation and the political course to follow comes from this

understanding, in the same way that the treatment of a disease depends on the diagnosis we make of the disease.

- Advocates of the thesis that imperialism is merely a new feature of the old capitalism consider, for example, the present one a cyclical crisis like those of the period 1825–1865, i.e., a crisis that is part of a “normal” (except for the size) alternation of conjuncture cycles and that, like all cyclical crises, sooner or later will cease of its own accord, because the disruption of the productive system, by reducing productive capacity, creates the conditions for the resumption of production. So, for the popular masses and their organizations it would be a matter of feeling the pinch while waiting for better times, at most persuading or inducing governments to adopt anti-cyclical, “damage control” policies (public spending plans and social safety net). This interpretation of the current crisis is also supported by parties and political figures who claim to be faithful to the principles of the communist movement, but in fact dogmatically transpose into the present Marx’s analysis concerning the crises of capitalist countries in the pre-imperialist epoch (when free competition among many independent capitalists still prevailed) and (this interpretation) finds an apparent basis in the fact that even in the stage of absolute overproduction of capital the real economy (production of commodities that entered or were brought into the material conditions of existence by the imperialist bourgeoisie) proceeds between ups and downs, in accordance with the anarchic nature of the capitalist system of production. Its actors depend on each other for the purchase and sale of commodities but, conversely, each acts as if independent from the others and all of them act without understanding among themselves about what each should produce, how, when, in what amount and for whom.

Repeaters of the thesis that imperialism created a new mode of production and changed the nature

of capitalism that Marx analysed and expounded in detail in *Capital*, deny that a new mode of production needs to be established for which capitalism itself created the prerequisites (theory of the common good, etc.) and, thus, all the political substance of the communist conception. They deny the division of present society into social classes and the special mission of the working class (see the “disappearance of the working class”, the “theory of the multitudes,” etc.), they deny the class struggle as the engine of society’s development, they deny the dictatorship of the proletariat as the inevitable outcome of the class struggle through which the division of humanity into classes will be eliminated (failure or overcoming of “twentieth-century communism”, “post-Fordism”, “postmodernism”, “the class struggle is outdated”, etc.).

2. Imperialism and the previous stages of bourgeois society

Bourgeois society is a succession of stages that developed from one another: each stage as a superstructure of the stage that preceded it until the completion (at the end of the 19th century) of the Machines and large-scale industry stage. From there the epoch of imperialism begins. The history of bourgeois society consists of a succession of stages that developed as overlapped floors of the same building. The capitalist mode of production developed by the successive superstructures described in chapters 11, 12 and 13 of *Capital*:(*)

- the original or primitive accumulation (*Capital*, Book 1, Chapter 24): expropriation of the rural population and its expulsion from the land: for more read the index of the sub-chapters of chapter 24 of *Capital*, Book 1;
- capitalist mass production: capitalists who make some people work, on their own commission and in competition with each other, at home or united in small artisan companies;
- cooperation (*Capital*, Book 1, Chapter 11): from the

15th century to the mid-16th century. Multiple workers united in one large company under the orders of the same master who dictates characteristics and times (workers are like artisans each doing the same work, but all dependent on the same capitalist);

- manufacturing (Capital, Book 1, Chapter 12): from the mid-16th century to the last third of the 18th century. The main feature of this superstructure is that the production of a commodity is accomplished by workers who each make successive parts of it (the division of labour among workers each of whom works with his own tools and has his own specialization);
- large-scale industry (Capital, Book 1, Chapter 13): from the last third of the 18th century to the last quarter of the 19th century.

Between 1875 and 1914 there is the transition to the imperialist epoch of bourgeois society (but only in the Russian Empire socialist revolution took place).

(*) It is good to keep in mind that for details and dates Marx sticks generally and especially to Great Britain, the country where capitalism (born in Italy in the 3rd and 4th centuries of the second millennium, i.e. the age of the communes; the “Ciompi revolt” is from 1378) had its full development.

The capitalist mode of production has developed like a skyscraper with many floors built on a given ground: the simple mercantile economy, characterized by exchange among direct producers where, indeed, commodities are exchanged, on average, each one according to its value (the socially necessary labour time to produce it). It has a foundation and a ground floor, then has a first and second floor, etc. At each floor it transforms itself: the categories that were main on the first floor are no longer main on the second floor but live, if they live at all, in secondary aspects of the second floor. And so from one floor to the upper one. However, if the upper floor crumbles for some reason, the system downgrade to the lower floor and the secondary aspects become main once

again, in order to run categories (aspects) that were secondary to the upper floor.

Let’s take for example the primitive accumulation, also called original accumulation because it constitutes the prehistory of capital and the mode of production corresponding to it, that is, the separation of the worker from the means of production (from ownership of the means of production), in particular the expropriation of rural producers (the peasants) and their expulsion from the land (see England in the late 15th century) which generates a mass of workers willing to work in manufacture at its inception. This primitive accumulation is a concluded or, anyway, now largely secondary process in imperialist countries, while it is the substance of the ongoing recolonization of backward countries by imperialist groups as part of globalization. This is what is currently called land grabbing, which has grown enormously since 2007–2008 and involves Africa, Southeast Asia, Latin America. Land grabbing is the expropriation of entire communities from the land they live on and use to grow and produce their food. These lands are bought or leased by governments of other countries, private corporations and investment funds to open mines, install plantations, build luxury touristic complexes (so-called resorts), do unnecessary major public works, etc.

3. From bourgeois democracy to regime of preventive counter-revolution

This is the transition that occurs in political relations, in the early 1900s in the Anglo-Saxon imperialist countries and after 1945 in the others. In each country as the popular masses, mobilized by the conscious and organized communist movement (COCM),^[1] in addition to demanding improvements (through strikes, demonstrations, protests, etc.) make use of the institutions of bourgeois democracy, the bourgeoisie must stifle their initiative and divert their education, replacing the clergy or combining with it. Then, the bourgeoisie develops a regime of preventive counter-revolution that replace bourgeois democracy, habitually disguising itself as bourgeois

democracy, that is, cloaking itself in the institutions of democracy that the bourgeoisie had enforced to its advantage.

With preventive counter-revolution (PCR), the bourgeoisie seeks to avoid coming to a head-on confrontation with the mobilized and organized popular masses. An effective PCR regime prevents the bourgeoisie's oppression of the proletariat and the rest of the popular masses and their opposition from escalating into civil war. In the PCR regime, the bourgeoisie combines five lines of action (five pillars that jointly hold up every PCR regime).

1. The first pillar consists of maintaining the political and generally cultural backwardness of the popular masses and divert them from the class struggle. To this end the bourgeoisie actively spreads among the masses a culture of evasion from reality, promotes theories, movements and occupations that divert the attention, interest and activity of the popular masses from class antagonisms and focuses them on triviality (diversion), makes confusion and intoxication with reactionary theories and fake news. In short, the bourgeoisie prevents the growth of political consciousness with a special articulated system of cultural operations. In this field, the bourgeoisie revalued and reclaimed the role of religions and churches, primarily that of the Catholic Church, but it could not limit itself to them, because a part of the masses inevitably escaped their grasp. It is the pillar of the PCR that the bourgeoisie developed on a large scale in the period of black and unrestrained reaction following the dissolution of the USSR, when on the other hand, given the development of the second general crisis due to absolute overproduction of capital, it had to limit the second, third and fourth pillar, avoiding large-scale use of repression.

2. The second pillar consists of satisfying the demands for improvement that the popular masses make with increasing force; of giving everyone the hope of being able to have a decent life and nurturing this hope with some practical results, of enveloping every worker in a web of financial constraints (mortgages, instalments, liens, bills, taxes, rents,

etc.) that put him at every moment in danger of individually losing everything or, anyway, much of his social status if he fails to meet the deadlines set for him. If the popular masses won time and money in the claim struggles against the bourgeoisie, the latter had to direct them to use money for the satisfaction of their "animal needs": therefore, it had to multiply and has multiplied the means and forms of satisfaction of such "needs" so that the popular masses running out of time and money they have.

3. The third pillar consists of developing channels for the participation of the popular masses in the political struggle of the bourgeoisie in a subordinate position, following its parties and representatives. The participation of the popular masses in the political struggle of the bourgeoisie is a fundamental ingredient of PCR. The division of powers, representative assemblies, political elections and the struggle between various parties (multi-party system) are essential aspects of PCR regimes. The bourgeoisie must make the masses perceive as theirs the state that actually belongs to the imperialist bourgeoisie itself. Everyone who wants to participate in political life must be allowed to participate. The bourgeoisie, however, places and must place the implicit condition that everyone plays along with the game and the rules of the ruling class: everyone doesn't go beyond its social order. Despite this implicit condition, the bourgeoisie is nevertheless immediately forced to divide its political activity more sharply into two camps. One is a public (open) camp, to which the popular masses are admitted (this is the "theatre of bourgeois politics"). Another is a secret camp, reserved for insiders. Implicitly respecting this division and conforming to it becomes a prerequisite of every "responsible" politician. However, any implicit rule is obviously a weak point in the new power mechanism.

4. The fourth pillar consists of keeping the popular masses and particularly the workers in a state of powerlessness; preventing them from organizing (without organizing himself, a proletarian is devoid of any social force: he has no ability to influence the

guidance and course of social life); providing the masses with organizations headed by men trusted by the bourgeoisie (organizations that the bourgeoisie built to divert the masses from class organizations, mobilizing and supporting priests, policemen, akin: “regime” organizations (“organizzazioni gialle” in Italian), such as, in Italy, the CISL,^[2] ACLI,^[3] UIL,^[4] headed by venal, corruptible, ambitious, individualistic men; preventing workers from forming organizations autonomous from the bourgeoisie in their structure and guidance.

5. The fifth pillar consists of repressing communists as selectively as possible. It consists in preventing at all costs the communists from succeeding, from multiplying their strength by organizing themselves into a party, from elaborating and assimilating a correct conception of the world, method of knowledge and work, and strategy, from carrying out an effective activity, from recruiting and assert their hegemony in the working class. The pillars consists also of bribing and co-opting the communists, of breaking and eliminating those who do not let themselves be bribed and co-opted.

In a nutshell, with preventive counter-revolution the bourgeoisie seeks to prevent the creation of the subjective conditions for socialist revolution: a certain level of consciousness and a certain degree of organization of the working class and popular masses, both consciousness and organization autonomous from the bourgeoisie. Or at least it seeks to prevent the consciousness and organization of the working class, proletariat and popular masses from growing beyond a certain level. With preventive counter-revolution the bourgeoisie compete with the communists, contends with them for the ground of the consciousness and organization of the masses, and uses to this end all the power of the society it leads. As long as the bourgeoisie overtakes the communists, its domination is maintained and its political order safeguarded.

Which of the two contenders will win? It is up to the communists to exploit the superiority of their conception of the world and method of work, their

identification with the strategic and overall interests of the masses, the weaknesses of the preventive counter-revolution and the bourgeoisie in general. So on this side, the success of the preventive counter-revolution is by no means a priori guaranteed. All the policies and measures that the bourgeoisie puts in place are double-edged weapons. Its fraudulent cultural policy strips all authority and “eternal truth” of credibility while simultaneously producing means of communication and aggregation. Its “regime” organizations can be turned against it, particularly when their results do not correspond to promises. Repression and the struggle against repression arouse solidarity and introduce to the political struggle. The more autonomous the participation of the masses in political struggle becomes, the more it forces the bourgeoisie to create political drama, in order to conceal real politics: in short, it makes it more difficult for the bourgeoisie to manage its state. The welfare the bourgeoisie can accord to the masses depends on the general performance of its affairs and the resignation of the oppressed people to exploitation. Ultimately, it is up to us communists to learn how to use the policies and measures of preventive counter-revolution for the benefit of the cause of the emancipation of the workers and popular masses from the bourgeoisie.

The next part of the article will be published in the upcoming issue of the magazine.

Notes

[1] The conscious and organized communist movement is the sum of parties and organizations that propose the march towards communism as their goal, with their respective heritage of conceptions, analyses, lines and methods to realize their goal, with a set of relations and corresponding division of tasks (mass organizations and communist party).

[2] Italian Confederation of Trades Unions.

[3] Christian Associations of Italian Workers.

[4] Italian Union of Labour.

How the left failed Syria

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

Trade union and antiwar leaders in Britain facilitated the destruction of the middle east's longest-surviving sovereign territory

The following paper was delivered to a meeting organised by the Alba Granada North Africa organisation in Tunis. The meeting was held to mark the 79th anniversary of the founding of the Syrian Arab Republic in April 1946.

Very few workers in the west are aware of the fact that Syria had maintained a sovereign and anti-imperialist government for nearly eight decades in the teeth of imperialist opposition and constant attempts to bring it down. Despite having to contend with zionist armies on its doorstep, a zionist occupation on its territory, and zionist spies and saboteurs infiltrating its society, the Syrian Arab Republic refused to normalise with zionist Israel and remained a steadfast friend to the cause of Palestine liberation and a reliable base for Palestinian resistance movements.

The fall of the Syrian Arab Republic in December 2024 came as a huge and very unwelcome shock to progressive people all over the world.^[1]

For workers in the imperialist countries, there are some very important lessons that must be learned from this event. The hard truth is that the people of Syria—and elsewhere—could have been spared what they are now enduring if our working-class movements had been doing their job for the last 20 years.

We allowed ourselves to be sidelined and disempowered. We allowed a leadership tied hand and foot to the interests of the imperialist ruling class to prevent us from organising ourselves to carry out genuine, rather than tokenistic, antiwar work.

Treachery of the antiwar leadership

In Britain, the self-appointed leadership of the trade union and antiwar movement knows this full well. Back in 2009, my party took a motion to Stop the War's national conference. In those days, the antiwar movement was still large and vibrant, with many active local branches. The assembled delegates overwhelmingly endorsed the motion that we presented, which called for the instigation of a campaign of mass non-cooperation with the British war machine—which at that time was focusing its efforts on Iraq and Afghanistan.

That resolution required Stop the War to “do all in its power to promote a movement of industrial, political and military non-cooperation with all of imperialism's aggressive war preparations and activities among British working people”. The steering committee was instructed “to campaign vigorously among trade unions to encourage them to adopt a practical policy ... [of refusing] to support illegal wars or occupations directly or indirectly”.^[2]

On the day that their members voted that motion through, Stop the War's leaders raised no objections. They did not dare to openly express their hostility to such a line at a time when antiwar sentiment was running so high. This was, after all, a time when many workers were realising just how badly they had been lied to when the war in Iraq was being launched. They wanted to do something to end the bloodshed, and they approved the proposals our party put forward.

So in classic bureaucratic, social-democratic fashion, the leadership allowed the resolution to be passed and then quietly shelved it. Its contents were never mentioned again in public, and the policy that had been agreed upon was never implemented.

This took place in April 2009. In 2010, our party reminded the organisation that it had taken this

position, and that it must be implemented. Again, the conference overwhelmingly endorsed a motion that instructed Stop the War's leaders to launch "a full campaign inside the unions to draw attention to British, US and Israeli war crimes, with the aim of passing in each of them, and then at the TUC, motions condemning those crimes and calling on workers to refuse to cooperate in their commission, whether it be by making or moving munitions or other equipment, writing or broadcasting propaganda, or helping in any other way to smooth the path of the war machine".^[3]

This second resolution was also shelved and ignored. When we consider that the original position had been taken two years before the launch of the dirty war on Syria and the criminal destruction and invasion of Libya, we can appreciate fully the treachery of the antiwar movement's leadership and the role they played in facilitating these terrible crimes.

During that period, far from implementing non-cooperation as a policy, which would have included refusing to cooperate in the spreading of war propaganda, the Trotskyites, Labourites and revisionists who dominate our movement continued to help the imperialists in preparing their next round of illegal aggressions.

Reinforcing imperialist narratives

As the ruling class was preparing for its wars against Libya and Syria, Stop the War meetings were dominated by Trotskyists who repeatedly proclaimed the advent of a 'people's revolution' in both countries. They told British antiwar activists that 'people's councils' were being formed, giving the totally false impression that a mass movement to topple unpopular 'dictatorships' was in motion.

Over recent decades, workers in the west have heard such lies repeated about many different countries, all of whom just happened to be targets of imperialism (Yugoslavia and Iran, for example). Every time, this assertion turned out to be a lie—but how many of those who heard the lie ever found out the truth? Certainly, no Trotskyite organisation has corrected

itself or apologised for misleading the people. They assume our memories are short and simply transfer their big lie to a new theatre of operations.

Each time, they act in consort with a western media demonisation campaign that aims to galvanise support for a new war and to demobilise working-class antiwar sentiment. The imperialists know that aggressive war is not supported by the masses, so they aim to present their aggression as being somehow in support of the local people. This is why we are subjected to such hysterical campaigns to demonise the leadership of every country that imperialism wants to bring down.

In the west, the Trotskyites and 'official' working-class and antiwar leaders play their part in reinforcing this hysteria by claiming to have knowledge of an allegedly 'mass', 'working-class' opposition to the targeted government. Very often, they are more hysterical even than the rabid warmongers in denouncing the supposed 'crimes' of the governments (always referred to as 'dictatorships') being targeted (as, for example, in the cases of Zimbabwe's President Mugabe, Libya's Colonel Gaddafi or Russia's President Putin). The result is that whatever 'antiwar' slogans they later produce are purely tokenistic: a bit of pacifist handwringing about the 'nasty violence' that is being used to achieve an aim that they have fundamentally endorsed.

In the case of Syria, Stop the War's leaders left it to their allied Trotskyites to dominate the floor of meetings and tell lies about what was happening in the country. In the case of Libya, they were much more blatant. Just when the British people were being inundated with lies about Libya and Colonel Gaddafi by politicians and media, the StW leadership responded not by exposing these lies but by organising a picket outside the Libyan embassy to protest Gaddafi's supposed "crimes against his people"^[4]

And when my party criticised and exposed this war-enabling activity by our supposedly antiwar leaders, which was carried out just as Nato's blitzkrieg was being prepared and the imperialist propaganda

campaign was reaching fever pitch, we were promptly expelled from the organisation (by a leadership that had never been elected and according to no official rulebook).

Excluding anti-imperialists from the controlled ‘antiwar’ movement

So the only organisation that had proposed a genuine antiwar policy, which the membership would have been happy to carry out if given decent leadership, was expelled from the official antiwar movement—just as imperialism was launching two more illegal, aggressive wars. Wars that the antiwar movement did absolutely nothing to prevent or oppose.

It is worth noting that the chair of the Stop the War coalition at that time was Jeremy Corbyn, who would later be held up to British working people as the great hope for their salvation from austerity and war.^[5] Corbyn personally presided over the next annual conference of Stop the War, at which he refused to allow our party members even one minute to speak against their expulsion from the floor.

The protest against Gaddafi’s government was the sum total of national activity by Britain’s ‘antiwar’ movement in relation to the criminal war on Libya. Likewise on Syria, for the first two years that the war raged, Stop the War acted as if nothing was happening at all, and studiously avoided mentioning the conflict. It was not until a parliamentary vote was held in 2013 to decide on launching a direct (as opposed to proxy) intervention that they took part in some lobbying of MPs. No mass movement was mobilised at any point to use British working-class power to prevent or stop the war.

And no effort was made to expose the lies being told about Bashar al-Assad’s government or to explain the role of British and US imperialism in creating and directing the various proxy forces that were working together to carve up and destroy Syria—from the army of mercenary jihadi invaders to the Kurdish separatists and the Zionist bombers. Quite the reverse, many of those involved in Stop the War described the invading jihadists and terrorist gangs

as the cutting edge of a “working-class, progressive revolution against a dictatorship”.

These details are not recounted for sectarian point-scoring purposes, but to illustrate a vital point: the working class in an imperialist country has very real power to prevent its ruling class from engaging in aggressive war abroad. But this power remains untapped if we are not conscious of it, and if we do not explicitly organise ourselves to harness it.

Learning from our history

To our great shame, the last time the working class successfully organised against a British war intervention was over a century ago. On 10 May 1920, inspired by communist leader Harry Pollitt and the communist-led ‘Hands Off Russia’ campaign, the dockers and stevedores of London refused to load arms and ammunition onto a ship called the Jolly George, giving such a lead to the whole working class that it went on to defeat the British bourgeoisie’s planned invasion of revolutionary Russia.

The working-class campaign against the invasion included mass protests in Trafalgar Square, but it achieved victory because workers collectively refused to participate in the invasion—not just as soldiers but also as facilitators, as aiders and abettors. Not only did a very shaken British government back down, but it was quick to also grant some pension and unemployment concessions to a working class whose militance was posing a direct threat to the stability of British capitalist rule.^[6]

This history is unknown to the vast majority of British people. It is deliberately buried not only by the ruling class but also by the social-democratic leadership of the organised working class. These misleaders have blood on their hands from every war waged by British imperialism without meaningful British working-class opposition. In the case of Syria, they are palpably guilty, having enthusiastically endorsed lies about the Assad government and failed to mobilise meaningfully against the war.

From the beginning of the war my own party put forward two slogans: “Victory to Syria” and “No

cooperation with the war effort”. One of many leaflets we distributed in 2012 outlined the real reasons for the war as follows: “Syria’s government ... is ‘guilty’ of the high crime of following anti-imperialist policies that seek to deliver economic and democratic gains to the Syrian, Arab and middle-eastern peoples.

“The imperialists, faced with the deepest ever economic and social crisis of capitalism, and with the prospect of losing some of their all-important footholds in the middle east, want to grab [Syrian and Iranian] resources. They also want to destroy the dangerous examples of independence that those countries set—and to try to establish new territorial bases from which to carry on controlling the region.

“Nato’s dictators want to install governments that will reverse progressive gains in Syria and Iran, such as free education and healthcare, nationalised oil and mineral wealth, and food and housing subsidies. Most importantly, they want to put an end to their independent and anti-imperialist foreign policies, particularly their principled refusal to compromise with Israeli zionism.

“In Syria, they want to overturn a secular and inclusive state and replace the present national-unity government with a politics rooted in confessional divisions. In this way, they hope to break the unity of the Syrian workers and divert their energies into religious and ethnic conflicts.”^[7]

What might have happened if this understanding had been spread by the whole of the trade union and antiwar movement to the British working class 15 years ago? How much suffering could have been spared not only in the middle east but also at home if the workers had been organised to resist the endless onslaughts of crisis-ridden imperialism?

The treachery of the antiwar movement’s official leadership allowed the British ruling class to play its vital role in directing a proxy jihadi army against Syria with impunity. It left the British working class ignorant of the ways in which the imperialists were destroying that country’s economy and steadily undermining its social fabric through a combination of vicious sanctions, endless bombing campaigns,

territorial occupation and the seizure of some of its most important oilfields and wheat-growing areas.

Today, the working class of Britain is more demoralised and less organised than ever before. And at the same time as ever-larger numbers are being plunged into abject poverty with no meaningful resistance, we see the longstanding plans of the imperialists to balkanise Syria also coming to fruition.

Workers should take careful note of who joined the imperialist cheering over the fall of President Assad and the destruction of the secular, sovereign, anti-imperialist and anti-zionist Syrian Arab Republic. They have shown their true colours, and their allegiance to imperialism has been clearly revealed. The antiwar, anti-imperialist and anti-capitalist movements will get nowhere until we learn to recognise such enemies within our ranks and eject them.

Linking our struggles

We owe this to our brothers and sisters in Syria and all the other countries ravaged by imperialist war, and we owe it to ourselves. For as VI Lenin pointed out (also in 1920): “The revolutionary movement in the advanced countries would in fact be nothing but a sheer fraud if, in their struggle against capital, the workers of Europe and America were not closely and completely united with the hundreds upon hundreds of millions of ‘colonial’ slaves, who are oppressed by that capital.”^[8]

We need a programme and a strategy against war that recognises the intimate connection between the struggle of the workers in the imperialist countries and the struggle of the masses in the oppressed countries. We need to understand that imperialism’s strength comes from its ability to draw superprofits from colonial and neocolonial territories, and to use a portion of those profits to buy social peace at home. We need to recognise that the struggle to rid humanity of this parasitic and bloodthirsty system must be fought on both fronts, and that neither can be fully victorious without concerted action by the other.

In the imperialist countries, this means refusing any longer to be sidelined; refusing to accept the false idea that we are mere bystanders to world events. It means organising to deliver meaningful solidarity to those who are targeted by our common exploiters overseas. By effecting such organisation, we will also begin to create the forces necessary for taking charge of our own society and finally overthrowing the senile rule of British finance capital at home.

In considering all this, it is worth noting that the overall trajectory for imperialism is the same as it was before it achieved what I have no doubt will turn out to be a temporary victory. It is true that this has been achieved through the most dirty and brutal means and is having horrific consequences for the Syrian people. But this does not by any means signify the end of the struggle, either for Syria or for us. Our shared struggle continues.

We expect, and are already seeing, that the struggle of the people of the middle east will be redoubled in the face of this reverse, and we in the imperialist heartlands must likewise learn to organise ourselves so that we can play our essential part in bringing about the final victory of the struggle against imperialist domination of the globe.

Reverses are bound to happen in the course of a long struggle such as ours, but no such reverse can alter the fact that imperialism is weak and rotten at its core. The system has become so utterly parasitic that it can no longer even organise itself efficiently to fight its own wars. It remains incapable of escaping the contradictions of capitalist economics and the deep global capitalist crisis of overproduction—a crisis that is impelling the imperialist bloc's reckless drive towards all-out global war against Russia and China.

The launch of the Al-Aqsa Flood operation by a resistance movement that the zionists thought they had successfully neutralised, and the course of the genocidal war against Gaza over the last year and a half, have shown clearly that while the imperialist camp can do tremendous damage to people and places, the real balance of forces in the

region has shifted substantially in favour of the Axis of Resistance. The imperialists and all their proxies combined have been unable to defeat even one of the Palestinian, Lebanese or Yemeni resistance movements.

Quite the reverse. Without the full support of the entire Nato bloc, Israel would have been destroyed by the combined actions of these forces. The imperialists have likewise been unable to wage an open war against Iran. Despite the defeat suffered in Syria, this steady shift in favour of the resistance remains fundamentally unaltered.

Meanwhile in the imperialist countries, the outrage of large numbers of workers at the genocidal war being waged on Gaza, and their disgust at their own governments' complicity, has led to an outpouring of rage on the streets that the imperialists have been unable to contain via the usual 'antiwar' control mechanisms. The official 'Palestine solidarity leadership' did not mobilise those people onto the streets, and it is not able to demobilise them either, despite its best efforts.

While relatively few workers in Britain yet understand the role that was formerly played by Syria in the Axis of Resistance, the growing anti-zionist consciousness that is developing in Britain is creating a genuinely anti-imperialist core at the heart of the Palestine solidarity movement. Since this is not under the direction of the social-democratic controlled 'opposition', the state is having to become increasingly repressive in response—further undermining its claims to be either 'democratic' or 'representative'.^[10]

Our own party members are among the many who have been targeted under public order laws (for supposed "antisemitism") and anti-terror laws (for "support for a proscribed organisation— Hamas").^{[11][12]} This began under the Rishi Sunak's Tory government and has continued under Keir Starmer's Labour one. Labour's role as unconditional supporter of zionism and the Gaza genocide has exposed not only the party's leadership but all the 'left' Labourites, Trotskyites and revisionist 'communists'

who endlessly repeat the mantra that Labour is the party of the working class and that voting Labour is the only route to meaningful change for working-class people in Britain.

We have no doubt that the forces of resistance in Syria and across the region are going to continue their century-long struggle for liberation and sovereignty. And we are determined to do our part in educating as many workers as possible with a genuinely anti-imperialist understanding, re-establishing a Marxist-Leninist leadership that is able to give clear guidance in the rebuilding of a revolutionary movement in Britain.

Given the blood price that is demanded of humanity for every year that this decaying, parasitic system remains in place, it is simply not acceptable to wait passively for better times. It is our bounden duty to work now, and work together, so that the defeat of Anglo-American imperialism is brought about sooner rather than later.

*Death to imperialism! Death to zionism!
Victory to the Axis of Resistance!
No cooperation with imperialist war!*

Notes

[1] 'The sad downfall of the Syrian government' by H Brar, Lalkar, January 2025.

[2] J Brar, The Drive to War Against Russia and China, 2017, Appendix, p47.

[3] 'Stop the war says: no cooperation with war crimes', CPGB-ML leaflet, November 2010.

[4] 'Support Libya's resistance; denounce StW treachery', CPGB-ML leaflet, September 2011.

[5] Various authors, The Rise and Fall of Project Corbyn, 2020.

[6] 'Downton Abbey, the Jolly George and Stop the War' by D Lavin, Proletarian, October 2011.

[7] 'Defend Syria and Iran ... Join the axis of resistance!', CPGB-ML leaflet, November 2012.

[8] 'The second congress of the Communist International' by VI Lenin, Kommunishia, August 1920. CW Vol 31, pp270-2.

[9] 'The tasks of communists in the Palestine solidarity movement', thecommunists.org, 5 December 2023.

[10] 'Role of the Labour government, and the workers' necessary

response' by J Brar, thecommunists.org, 28 October 2024.

[11] 'Anti-zionism is not racism! Join our protest today!', CPGB-ML statement, 26 November 2023.

[12] 'British terrorist state persecutes communists on 'anti-terror' pretext', thecommunists.org, 19 January 2024.

On the Relationship Between Imperialism and Fascism in the 21st Century

Dimitrios Patelis | Revolutionary Unification (Greece)

Speech delivered at the Second International Anti-Fascist Forum in Moscow, 23 April 2025. Session No. 1: “Fascism—A Product of Imperialism, a Weapon of Exploitation and Violence”

Dear comrades,

Let me begin by commemorating the birth anniversary of the brilliant leader of the international revolutionary movement, Vladimir Ilyich Lenin. I also congratulate the Communist Party of the Russian Federation (CPRF) for the highly productive initiative of organising this forum.

The topic of the relationship between imperialism and fascism is extremely relevant today. Without the specification and development of revolutionary theory, it is impossible to identify the nature of today’s imperialism and the fascism it produces in a concrete and dialectical historical way.

To briefly summarise, the role of Lenin’s brilliant political economy in the development of Marxism needs little emphasis here. Building on Marx’s creative achievements in *Capital*, Lenin showed that from the early 20th century onwards—during the monopoly stage of capitalism—the exploitation of the working class by the financial oligarchy of global imperialist capital takes place not only within individual nations, but on a worldwide scale.

Thus, Lenin did not arbitrarily identify the “rentier states” which serve as the headquarters of the major monopolies and of financial capital and, today, of the huge multi-branch transnational monopoly groups and corporations. These states, together with such corporations, extract monopoly super-profits from the whole world, on a regional and global scale.

With his discoveries, Lenin’s aim was not to reject

the Marxist-Leninist theory of class struggle under imperialism, but rather to develop and concretise it, showing that the matter of the revolution is fundamentally linked to the study of this global dimension of exploitation. It is this, and the resulting uneven development that underpins his concept of the “weakest link” and clarifies the possibility and inevitability of the global revolutionary process—in contrast to the dogmatism and opportunism of the representatives of the Second International.

Lenin stressed the need to identify where the focal points of intertwined internal and external global contradictions arise, where it is easiest to break the weakest link of the global imperialist system. Thus, Lenin connects anti-imperialism with class struggle not superficially but essentially and internally.

Why do I mention this? Because by invoking a metaphysical notion of supposed “pure class struggle,” many today focus on individual nations while ignoring this primary, overarching dimension of class exploitation worldwide. Anti-imperialism is not a rejection of the class approach—it is the class approach of our time.

The imperialists collectively sought to destroy the first workers’ and peasants’ state, the Soviet Union. They and their proxies/accomplices—the Russian counterrevolutionaries—sought to destroy, dismember and completely colonise the young Soviet revolutionary state. Even Greece took part in this intervention, with its bourgeois government sending some 24,000 soldiers and officers under French command. Even after their crushing defeat, the imperialists never abandoned their anti-Soviet plans.

In World War II, the imperialist powers had the

“luxury” of dividing into two camps due to the irreconcilable inter-imperialist contradictions. Thanks to the brilliant foreign policy of the Soviet Union however, a rift was driven between them. Of course, we know what kind of allies they were—even those who joined the anti-fascist coalition against the axis of the Anti-Comintern Pact...

World War III, dear comrades and friends is not a concern of the future. We have been witnessing it for a long time.

When more than 80 countries are involved in the Syrian theatre of war alone, and when more than 55 countries are officially involved in the Ukrainian conflict, can this be called a regional conflict?

And let us not harbour any illusions about the possibility of a ceasefire or a “backroom deal” or anything else that would supposedly restore peace and turn everything back to normal. This war will not end until the fundamental contradictions that caused it are resolved, one way or another.

These contradictions are linked to a seismic shift in the global balance of power, particularly since the late 20th century, following the counterrevolution and capitalist restoration in the USSR and other early socialist states in Europe.

Contrary to what the parrots of imperialist propaganda claim, socialism has by no means disappeared forever. On the contrary, there are socialist countries that are triumphantly developing and progressing.

This has led to a radical change in the global balance of power. Imperialism is no longer what it used to be. It is considerably weakened and has lost ground. Precisely because of this existential threat, the imperialist powers—despite acute internal contradictions—no longer have the “luxury” of dividing into two camps. The revolutionary movement must recognise this fact and make the most of it by reorganising its strategy and tactics accordingly.

As a result of this existential danger for imperialism,

the present imperialist axis, led by the USA and including the G7, the European Union, NATO and other satellites, was created and is developing its aggressive activity. It is this axis of aggression that opposes the forces of socialism and anti-imperialism today.

If imperialism at the beginning of the 20th century was primarily defined by the export of capital—limited to the sphere of circulation and capital markets—today it has taken on a different form, content and scale. Capitalism now deploys productive technological processes on a planetary scale.

Transnational monopoly groups organise and carry out production in different countries, exploiting so-called comparative advantages (geography, natural resources, labour costs, transport routes, environmental regulations, supply chains, etc.) in global production. These groups maintain their headquarters and R&D departments in the imperialist metropolises, while relocating the most labour-intensive, energy-intensive and polluting processes to the global South and East.

Thus, since the last quarter of the 20th century, imperialism has entered a new stage, intensifying these tendencies—especially after the counterrevolution and capitalist restoration in the USSR and other early socialist states in Europe.

By harnessing the inherent potential of these trends within the framework of scientific, long-term socialist planning of developing its productive forces, China has triumphed in becoming the world’s largest economy and the leading socialist superpower of the 21st century.

I understand that many may disagree with me because this is a specific form of socialism—one shaped by the unique history of the Chinese people, their long struggle against colonial oppression, the Opium Wars and numerous destructive imperialist interventions involving all the imperialist powers, including Tsarist Russia.

In the context of World War III, the imperialist

axis of aggression is resorting to specific forms of instrumentalising fascism.

I must stress that today there is both the possibility and the necessity of global coordination in the war against fascism. Whereas the fascism of World War II was primarily a product of inter-imperialist rivalries between the great powers—and the imperialist stage at that time allowed these powers independent ambitions and military-industrial complexes (e.g. Germany)—today no such independence is allowed without US approval. Even major imperialist powers like Germany are subordinated to the USA on energy policy, forced to de-industrialise, etc.

Imperialism has a historical record of instrumentalising and deploying various forms of racism and fascism. A striking example is the Zionist entity, an artificial proxy state that serves as a military outpost for Anglo-Saxon imperialism in the region, notorious for its genocide and crimes against humanity. Thus, contemporary fascism is being modified to suit this new stage and is being wielded by imperialism primarily to turn entire protectorate states into battering rams against the enemy—nations and peoples who refuse total submission to imperialist diktat. Hence constructs such as the racist Baltic states, the neo-Nazi regime in Ukraine, Saakashvili's regime in Georgia and so on.

These proxy states are designed to attack not only socialism and anti-imperialism, but even bourgeois regimes that do not fully submit to the US-led imperialist axis.

Why do I mention this? Because today there are various “fifth columns” operating in different countries, including in Russia itself.

And if for more than three decades, certain circles born out of the predatory privatisation have become accustomed to parasitising as a comprador bourgeoisie, selling off natural resources and the fruits of the Soviet people's labour, reducing the country to a raw materials reservoir of imperialism, they have not disappeared. They remain ever ready

for a “backroom deal.”

The bourgeoisie of any capitalist state is not homogeneous. In Russia today there is, on the one hand, a bourgeoisie oriented towards comprador services for global imperialism—especially in banking, finance and resource exports. On the other hand, there is a bourgeoisie linked to real production, industry and the military-industrial complex. The latter, by virtue of its social position, is predisposed to defend Russia's independence and sovereignty to a certain extent.

Imperialism imposed this war. The Russian bourgeoisie entered it in a particular manner and pace only when it became clear that they were facing the fate of Saddam, Milošević and Gaddafi. Under existential threat, they de facto joined the pole of anti-imperialist and socialist forces.

It is against anti-imperialism and socialism that the axis of aggression deploys contemporary forms of fascism and fascisation. Naturally, the most consistent struggle against imperialism and the fascism it spawns—amid crisis and war—can only be waged by progressive forces led by communists. Of course, bourgeois states such as post-Soviet Russia may join the anti-imperialist coalition, but their commitment cannot be guaranteed. We know from historical experience of the way and consistency with which such governments as Churchill's in Britain fought against the anti-Comintern axis.

Before the end of World War II, the British and their colonial troops landed as invaders in Athens, Greece, five months before the end of the war. They mobilised Nazi collaborators and turned them into collaborators of the British and then the Americans. They are the ones who still rule the country today.

In the World Anti-Imperialist Platform, we have three main objectives:

1. To coordinate anti-imperialist forces worldwide into a united front.
2. To combat disorienting ideologies and narratives that undermine the unity of this front.

3. To consolidate consistent communist forces capable of taking on the revolutionary tasks of the 21st century and the coming victorious revolutions.

This is not a distant future, as the preconditions for a new communist society are far more mature today than ever before.

Today, our front's unity is being actively undermined by the bourgeois and by forces of the so-called "left".

The bourgeois tendency manifests itself mainly in quasi-two-party systems, similar to that of the US. On the one side we have rabid neo-liberals rooted in post-modernist ideology, and on the other nationalism and "Trumpism" which seek to revive a Black International. It is no coincidence that Elon Musk collaborates with the AfD and other far-right fascists around the world, nor that he gives the Nazi salute. Trumpists and the Black International are reviving fascist traditions through the so-called "civilisational approach", as comrade D.G. Novikov previously pointed out.

What is this? It is not an enrichment of science or historical materialism, but a replacement of Marxism with a reactionary, irrational ideology. The civilisational approach fragments humanity into isolated, self-contained "civilisations" that are deemed incompatible to each other—a fundamentally racist, imperialist ideology. This is the basis of the geopolitical and geostrategic concepts of Nazism and all fascism. Herein lies the tragicomic fusion of extreme neoliberalism and extreme fascism in figures like Argentina's Milei. Why? Because they are essentially one and the same.

Those who think that the anti-globalists will somehow bludgeon the globalists into peaceful submission are, in the most charitable reading, nursing childish fantasies. This is often the work of agents sowing confusion.

On the other hand, we are witnessing the tragic degradation of the communist movement—the remnants of the Third International. At the forefront of this degradation is, sadly, the Communist Party of

Greece, which is propagating the irrational nonsense of an "imperialist pyramid," according to which all countries are imperialist! But if all are imperialists, then imperialism does not exist—because they equate imperialism with capitalism itself.

This is a gross revision of Lenin's theory. They deliberately confuse the categories "imperialist stage" and "imperialist state", using the similarity of the English words "stage" and "state" to manipulate the uneducated youth. They are systematically dividing the global movement by claiming that wherever monopolies operate, the state is imperialist. So, if you are anti-imperialist or anti-fascist, you are not communists—because the most important thing is to be anti-capitalist.

This left-wing rhetoric masks the real divisive and treacherous practices. They have gone so far as to call World War II an "imperialist war," paving the way for the denial of the socialist character of the Soviet Union. They even oppose Stalin for recognising the modified role of the law of value.

They now claim that the fascist junta perpetrated by the Greek colonels was merely an internal bourgeois dispute, absolving the USA and the CIA of responsibility—even though it was their agents who led the dictatorship.

Long live the international solidarity of the anti-imperialist forces led by the steadfast communists!

Thank you for your attention.

Deepening in Division and Decline, the Defeat of the Imperialist Camp is Inevitable

Stephen Cho | Coordinator of the Korean International Forum

April 30, 2025

This contribution was presented at the Inter-national Peace Conference in Tangier on May 4.

The most important point to understand the background of the Trump's "tariff war" is the "Triffin's Dilemma." As the key reserve currency country, the US has been able to maintain an international trade deficit by intentionally releasing the dollar when necessary, and American people have enjoyed affluence because of this. If this structure is shaken with tariffs now, the dollar's key monetary character will eventually weaken. It's inevitable that the BRICS will stand up against the G7 and the dollar hegemony will be weakened. The dollar hegemony is on the agenda at the BRICS summit in July. If the nuclear monopoly is broken militarily, and the dollar hegemony is broken economically, then the US global hegemony will collapse completely. Without global hegemony, few economists are optimistic that the US can manage its astronomical fiscal deficit and trade deficit or prevent hyperinflation of the dollar.

When the counterrevolution in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe formed a unipolar system centered on the US and the US-Western imperialist monopoly capital exploited huge excess profits on a global scale through "globalization" and neoliberal policies, the admission of China to the WTO in 2001 seemed necessary and did not seem to pose a major risk in the future. Having brought Japan and Germany to their knees with the Plaza Accord in 1985, the US was confident that it could do the same at any time, but it was wrong. China, which had emerged as a G2, threatened the US economic hegemony and formed the BRICS and Shanghai Cooperation Organization with Russia, a military power, to break the unipolar system against the US and West.

The "decoupling" strategy of Trump's first term,

which started in the midst of that crisis, was already too late and not enough. However, the "de-risking" strategy, which was promoted by the Biden administration, bought time for China. The "de-risking" strategy is relatively lukewarm compared to the "decoupling" strategy economically, but it is much more dangerous militarily because it hides a cunning plan to provoke China into a Taiwan war by provoking Taiwan's separation and independence and actually start an East Asian war. China emphasized trade and diplomacy and avoided the Taiwan war with "strategic patience" and did not fall for the imperialist's "new axis of aggressors" tactics.

Trump's second term began with Trump using tariffs, the "most beautiful word in the dictionary", as a lever to shake up the world in which US hegemony is at stake. It is not surprising that the US tries to turn the tables when it is on the edge of global hegemony. It is also not surprising that the US is threatening to impose 25% tariffs on allies en masse or 145% tariffs on China while suspending other countries' tariffs for 90 days. Trump has already revealed his imperialist ambitions against Canada, Greenland, Panama, and even Gaza, and has made anachronistic absurd sophistry and farfetched arguments. In the end, it is just a series of processes that will end in compromising with China and others with the "art of the deal."

We should not overlook that the so-called "Trumpism" of "America First" that prioritizes US national interests to "Make America Great Again" has a "no-war imperialist policy" position. Trump is well aware that the \$16 trillion spent on the Afghan and Iraqi wars is hidden in the \$36 trillion in public debt. It has reached a point where it is no longer possible to hide the fact that the imperialist wars that the US is engaged in are a "jackpot" for the military complex

but a “pile of debt” for the American people, and that the contradiction between military and private capital is only getting deeper.

The economic crisis—including the debt of Western imperialism such as the US—has long crossed the line. Under the conditions that the G7 is falling and the BRICS is rising, imperialism is making its last stand by using NATO as a front before the Shanghai Cooperation Organization becomes stronger. In particular, “NATO’s pacificization,” which is the final version of “NATO’s eastward policy,” has been actively pursued to cause the wars in East Asia and the Western Pacific.

The storm of World War 3, unleashed by the imperialism, is sweeping from Eastern Europe, through West Asia (the Middle East), toward East Asia and the Western Pacific. The war in Ukraine broke out in February 2022, followed by the war in Palestine and West Asia in October 2023. Now, a war in East Asia and the Western Pacific is imminent.

As widely reported, from September to November 2024, under the manipulation of US imperialism, fascist forces in the “Republic of Korea (ROK, South Korea)” frantically provoked a series of localized wars against the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea (DPRK, North Korea). In December, they escalated further by attempting a pro-US self-coup. In short, the imperialist camp sought to decisively provoke and trigger a war in the “ROK” during the period from September to December 2024. A war in the “ROK” would inevitably lead to a war in Taiwan and immediately escalate into a broader conflict across East Asia and the Western Pacific.

Fortunately, all of these war schemes ended in failure—thanks to the DPRK’s “strategic patience” and the December Uprising of the people in the “ROK.” However, fascist forces in the “ROK” continue to plot civil war, and the US imperialists’ war maneuvers against the DPRK are accelerating at a dangerous pace.

The joint US–“ROK” military exercises against the DPRK, which have been breaking annual records, are now joined by Japan and have escalated into full-scale nuclear war drills across multiple domains—air,

land, sea, underwater, space, and cyberspace.

It is an undeniable historical fact that US imperialism entered the southern part of Korea in 1945 as an occupying force, incited a civil war in the South in 1948, fabricated the “ROK” government with the support of its puppet “UN Command,” launched over 2,000 localized military provocations against the DPRK in 1949, and ultimately started the Korean War in 1950.

In this unprecedented era of World War 3, the anti-imperialist camp must recognize the strategic importance of tactical measures that deepen the internal contradictions within the imperialist camp—specifically, the growing conflict between its warmongering and non-warmongering factions. If one acknowledges only the strategic significance of unity within the anti-imperialist front, while failing to recognize the tactical significance of division within the imperialist bloc, one risks missing a crucial opportunity to further isolate the warmongering forces and establish overwhelming superiority for the anti-imperialist movement.

In this regard, the example of the socialist state USSR forming an anti-fascist front with imperialist states such as the US and the UK during World War 2 offers an important historical lesson. To be clear, the anti-imperialist camp cannot form a strategic front with the non-warmongering imperialist forces; however, tactical measures and cooperation aimed at deepening the division between warmongering and non-warmongering factions within the imperialist camp are both possible and necessary.

The Trump administration has expressed its intention to mediate the wars in Ukraine and West Asia by initiating contact with Russia and seeking engagement with Iran. Under current conditions—where the Kyiv regime and its NATO backers are pushing for the lifting of long-range missile restrictions and appear to be targeting critical sites such as the Kursk nuclear power plant, and where Netanyahu’s Zionist forces are frantically pursuing the destruction of Iran’s nuclear facilities—the position of the Trump-led US administration will inevitably exert significant influence on the trajectory

of the wars in Ukraine and West Asia.

The imperialist warmongering forces, which are aggressively driving the course of World War 3, cannot tolerate the countercurrent set in motion by non-warmongering imperialist elements—particularly the Trump administration. This is precisely why we must remain vigilant against the extremely dangerous provocations of the imperialists and their lackeys—the neo-Nazis and Zionists—who are desperate to escalate a decisive war in order to make World War 3 irreversible.

At the same time, it is important to note that there was an attempt to provoke a war in the “ROK” between September and December 2024. As is well known, the wars in the “ROK” and in Taiwan are linked under the 1961 China-DPRK Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation, and Mutual Assistance. According to this treaty, if war breaks out in either the “ROK” or Taiwan due to imperialist aggression, the other front will be automatically activated. Both the DPRK and China have reportedly shared operational plans to respond to such unjust provocations by imperialist forces and their proxies, and if they are compelled to engage in a war of justice, they intend to employ all means and methods to bring it to an end under the “Three-Day War” plan. In March 2025, under the control of the US, Japan’s Self-Defense Forces were reorganized into a “Unified Force,” aiming to treat the Korean Peninsula, Taiwan, and the Philippines as a single theater of operations—preparing for a “Second Greater East Asia War.” However, the plan to transfer operational control of US Forces Japan (USFJ) from the Indo-Pacific Command to the USFJ, thereby expanding and reinforcing into the Unified Force, was halted and left unimplemented due to opposition from the Trump administration.

As the risk of a major war in East Asia—now emerging as the main battlefield of World War 3 due to imperialist warmongers—continues to grow, a new treaty was signed between Russia and the DPRK in June 2024. This treaty established a mutual defense alliance, stipulating automatic military intervention by either side in the event of an invasion by imperialist forces. This alliance was clearly demonstrated when

DPRK troops entered the war in response to the attempted invasion of Russia’s Kursk region by Ukrainian and NATO forces. The strength of the Russo-DPRK alliance was underscored in the report submitted by the Russian Chief of the General Staff to President Putin, which highlighted the DPRK’s contribution to the successful liberation of Kursk. Russia even assessed that the DPRK alone played a greater role than the entire CSTO (Collective Security Treaty Organization). The DPRK’s intervention on the Russian front implies that Russia will likewise intervene if a war breaks out on the Korean Peninsula. With the formation of a “Northeast Asian version of NATO” composed of the US, Japan, and the “ROK”, and completion of the “Pacification” of NATO, the opposing anti-imperialist, anti-NATO front of the DPRK, China, and Russia is being strengthened in parallel. Northeast Asia is now the most volatile hotspot in the world, which will be the main theater of World War 3—where military confrontation between the imperialist camp and the anti-imperialist camp is intensifying, where, in the event of war, the use of tactical nuclear weapons cannot be ruled out.

Imperialism is destined to collapse due to the rapidly intensifying, multidimensional contradictions that are historical and structural in nature. Imperialism is fundamentally doomed by its unsolvable and overlapping contradictions: between imperialism and socialism, imperialism and national liberation states, imperialism and colonized peoples, monopoly capital and the people within imperialist countries, between imperialist powers themselves, and between warmongering and non-warmongering forces within the imperialist camp. The Trump administration’s “tariff war” and non-interventionist policies have intensified internal contradictions within the imperialist camp, further provoking the warmongering forces of imperialism to instigate war provocations more frequently, more aggressively, and more recklessly.

Unlike World War 1, which was an inter-imperialist war, and World War 2, which was an anti-fascist war, World War 3 is an anti-imperialist war. At the forefront of the anti-imperialist camp opposing the imperialist

bloc stands the “Axis of Resistance,” composed of the most advanced nuclear missile powers: the DPRK, the most thoroughly socialist state; China, a socialist country with Chinese characteristics; Russia, a nation with a legacy of socialism; and Iran, a major missile power. These forces are forging unity under the banner of anti-imperialism and increasingly asserting dominance over the imperialist camp.

As the conflict between the warmongering and non-warmongering factions within the imperialist camp intensifies, internal divisions are becoming increasingly severe. In an attempt to suppress the backlash from the non-warmongering imperialist forces, the warmongering faction is now seeking to escalate World War 3 in earnest—either through decisive strikes against members of the “Axis of Resistance” such as Russia and Iran, or by provoking a war in the “ROK” or Taiwan, thereby expanding the conflict into a full-scale war in East Asia and the Western Pacific.

We remain on high alert and firmly prepared, recognizing with utmost vigilance that for the insurrectionist clique—driven to the brink by the failed coup, parliamentary impeachment, and Constitutional Court dismissal—civil war is their only remaining lifeline. Behind them, imperialism is making the war in the “ROK” its top gambit and most expedient card to launch a wider East Asian war and suppress the backlash of the non-warmongering forces within the imperialist camp.

We are fully prepared with the highest vigilance, recognizing that for the insurrectionist clique—facing political death after their failed coup, impeachment by the National Assembly, and dismissal by the Constitutional Court—civil war is their only remaining option. Behind them, US imperialism is maneuvering to provoke a war in the “ROK” as its most critical gambit to ignite a wider East Asian war and as the optimal card to suppress the backlash of the non-warmongering faction within the imperialist camp.

The civil war and the war in the “ROK” provoked by imperialism and fascism will become a turning point for revolution, accelerating the arrival of a new world

without imperialism and fascism—a new society centered on the people. A liberated “ROK,” advancing toward independent reunification together with the DPRK, will proudly stand at the forefront of the anti-imperialist camp, fulfilling the righteous tasks of the era with honor.

As history and current reality have shown, the victory of the anti-imperialist camp—armed with overwhelming superiority in justification, capacity, and strategy—is a matter of scientific certainty, while the defeat of the imperialist camp—mired in deepening division and decline—is inevitable. Under the banner of anti-imperialism and the cause of justice, the united and unyielding struggle of the people of the world will lead to certain final victory.

What Does Imperialism Aim for and How Does It Intend to Achieve It

Stephen Cho | Coordinator of the Korean International Forum

May 26, 2025

The communist movement must always analyze the situation scientifically and establish strategy in a revolutionary manner. Just like a doctor's diagnosis and prescription, it must identify problems through scientific analysis of the situation, and find solutions by establishing revolutionary strategies. The same applies to theories of social revolution based on theories of societal character. Here, theory is none other than strategy and tactics; it is an integrated system of aims, means, and methods. Aims and purpose are always important and take precedence. This is because they define, out of 5W1H, the "what" and "why"—the essential content, necessity, and inevitability. This is often referred to as the "Calculated Move." In that sense, the "Calculated Move" of scientific analysis and revolutionary strategy establishments corresponds to, respectively, the aims of the opposing side (the enemy) and the goals of our side (ourselves). In the context of the ongoing World War 3, the key points of scientific analysis and the establishment of revolutionary strategy, respectively, lie in what the imperialist camp aims for through this war and what the anti-imperialist camp must seek in response.

The storm of World War 3, unleashed by imperialism, is now blowing from Eastern Europe, through West Asia (the Middle East), toward East Asia and the Western Pacific. While it is widely known that imperialism is the root cause of World War 3, what remains less understood is the calculated move of imperialism. Its calculated move—what it is ultimately aiming for—is not victory in World War 3. Such a victory is impossible from the outset. World War 3 is a confrontation between the imperialist and anti-imperialist camps on a global scale, and the

three leading forces of the anti-imperialist camp—DPRK, China, and Russia—are all nuclear missile superpowers. It is absurd to imagine that the US and European imperialist states could achieve victory over these military powers armed with hydrogen bombs and hypersonic missiles. In reality, the war between these countries is being fought in Ukraine and is set to break out in the "Republic of Korea (ROK)" and in Taiwan (Not in their lands). From the beginning, the imperialist camp conceived these wars as proxy wars led by fascist puppets. The war in Ukraine has already unfolded exactly in this manner. The wars in the "ROK" and Taiwan are also being prepared in the same way. Even if the DPRK, China, and Russia use tactical nuclear weapons, this framework will not change. In fact, the DPRK has repeatedly declared its readiness to use tactical nuclear weapons, has drawn up specific operational plans, and has completed actual training. Likewise, China's encirclement exercises around Taiwan in early April were clearly based on the assumption of tactical nuclear deployment. Russia too has repeatedly emphasized its preparedness to use tactical nuclear weapons. Of course, it goes without saying that these developments would only unfold as an act of self-defense, preventive war, or liberation war of the DPRK, China, and Russia—a decisive counterattack if imperialism provokes war against them. But for the US, UK, and France to launch a nuclear attack on the DPRK, China, or Russia would mean mutual assured destruction—each side striking the other's homeland with hydrogen bombs. That, too, is an impossibility.

What are the goals the imperialist bloc is aiming for in World War 3? The strategic goal of the imperialist camp is, in a word, to form a "New Cold War"

through this world war. It is trying to create a new confrontation similar to the past “Cold War” by defining the first tier of the “Axis of Resistance”—the three countries of the DPRK, China, and Russia as well as Iran—the “Axis of New Aggressors” or “Axis of New Evil.” This is due to the worst political and economic crisis in the history of imperialism, not only the collapse of the unipolar system of the US-centered and imperialist world after the counterrevolution in the Soviet Union and the East, and the transition to a multipolar system, but also the rise of the “G2,” the BRICS, and the Shanghai Cooperation Organization, and the new era in which the DPRK has entered the ranks of nuclear and missile powers. In other words, it is an imperialist idea to have half of the cake when it cannot have the whole cake, a Plan B created because Plan A failed, and a desperate measure that was put forward in response to the crisis.

The imperialist camp’s “New Cold War” configuration, the “New Axis of Aggression” and “New Axis of Evil”, is shaped like a “U”. This is a new strategy of encirclement and disintegration that encompasses both the “Ω”-shape of France, Germany, Poland, and Ukraine, which bypassed the Carpathian Mountains in central Europe in line with the “Grand Chessboard” strategy to attack the Soviet Union and Russia, and the “C”-shape of Inner Mongolia, Xinjiang, Tibet, Hong Kong, and Taiwan to disintegrate China. The imperialist camp’s “Indo-Pacific Strategy” has already reached the stage of completion with the strengthening of the Indo-Pacific Command, the formation of the “Asian NATO,” and the completion of “Pacificization of NATO.” The “Asian NATO” was virtually formed at the US Camp David Conference in August 2023, with the leaders of the US, Japan, and “ROK” forming its main pillars, and was strengthened and expanded by the US-led multilateral alliance system and various joint military exercises, such as “Squad” with the Philippines and “AUKUS” with Australia. “Pacificization of NATO” was politically prepared at the Washington NATO Summit in July

2024 and militarily prepared with exercises like “Freedom Edge,” “RIMPAC,” and “Ulchi Freedom Shield” from June to August 2024. This means that NATO’s eastward policy has reached from the North Atlantic to the Pacific Ocean through the Mediterranean, Gulf, and Indian Oceans.

India is a key country for the imperialist camp within this “U-shaped encirclement strategy” that surrounds Russia, the “Axis of Resistance” such as Iran, China, and the DPRK. Initially, in 2001, the imperialists attempted to integrate China into their camp by bringing it into the WTO, but it was defeated by China’s “Tao Guang Yang Hui (Hide your strength, bide your time) and ”Harmonious Rise (Peaceful rise)” strategies. Consequently, their strategy was converted from the “Asia-Pacific Strategy” to the “Indo-Pacific Strategy” without China. Having lost China as the “world’s factory”, their strategy is to include India in the imperialist camp as Plan B. To this end, they created a “Quad” that includes India and held joint military exercises. However, it did not go as the imperialists intended as Modi, who was elected in the new election in India, visited Russia and held a summit with Putin instead of participating in the Washington NATO Summit in July 2024, showing the behavior of a traditional non-aligned country as a founding member of the BRICS. In this context, the recent localized war between Indo and Pakistan over Kashmir, which has fostered a conflict between China and India—China being closely aligned with Pakistan—can hardly be seen as a coincidence, as it served to pull India further toward the Western and imperialist camp. In addition, if Ukraine is referred to as Northwest Asia and West Asia is specifically referred to as Southwest Asia, the Indo-Pakistani war shows that the flow of World War 3 is spreading from Northwest Asia to South Asia through Southwest Asia, and it can also be said that the war in East Asia is imminent under the “U-shaped encirclement strategy” and the “Indo-Pacific strategy.”

In fact, during the fall and winter of 2024, there

were dangerously provocative acts of imperialism and fascism that posed a serious risk of war with the “ROK”. From September to November 2024, the fascist group in the “ROK” launched an unprecedented local war against the DPRK, including an unmanned drone attack on Pyongyang. When this was nullified due to the DPRK’s “strategic patience,” in December 2024, a military coup attempt was made in the “ROK” as an alternative route to provoke war. This too was thwarted by the heroic resistance of the “ROK” people.

After the failure of the military coup in the “ROK”, even conservative media have continued to label the ongoing maneuvers to provoke civil war as a “judicial coup” and a “political coup.” Ahead of the presidential election, there have been warnings of an “election coup”—an attempt to assassinate the leading opposition candidate with overwhelming support. In any case, the “ROK” is in the midst of an impending war, with provocations of local war against the DPRK and plots for internal civil conflict in the “ROK” intersecting—not knowing when the conflict will explode. Fascism in the “ROK” is a clear sign of impending war, and a war initiated by fascists would mean the eve of revolution. In a policy speech at the Supreme People’s Assembly in January 2024, the DPRK declared that if fascists and imperialists start a war, it would respond by turning it into an anti-fascist, anti-imperialist war, and a war of subjugation. In January 2025, without delivering a new policy speech, this stance was reaffirmed. This means that even if reformist candidate Lee Jae-myung is elected and a Trump and Lee Jae-myung administration is established, the DPRK will not return to negotiations like during the previous Trump and Moon Jae-in era. In other words, unless a future Trump administration decides to withdraw US forces from the “ROK”, and a Lee Jae-myung administration abolishes the National Security Law and takes real action to implement past agreements, the DPRK will not return to the negotiation table with the US or the “ROK”.

The imperialist camp is currently divided over World War 3 into warmonger and non-warmonger forces. Donald Trump, representing the non-warmonger imperialist forces, had a sniper’s bullet graze past his ear during the presidential campaign. It occurred precisely in July 2024 when the warmonger imperialist forces completed the political preparations for the “Pacification of NATO” through the Washington NATO Summit and the military preparations through various joint military exercises such as “RIMPAC.” After completing these political and military preparations, they carried out the invasion of Kursk in August, concentrated strikes on Hezbollah in September, and a drone attack on Pyongyang in October. These were the developments right before the US presidential election. Then, immediately after the election, there followed the lifting of restrictions on long-range missiles against Russia in November, and in December, the attempted pro-US self-military coup in the “ROK” and the collapse of the Assad government in Syria. There is no way that such warmonger imperialist forces would quietly watch while US-Russia and US-Iran negotiations proceed after Trump comes to power. The creation of a “Coalition of the Willing” among Western European countries, France’s statement offering a nuclear umbrella, Israel’s concentrated attacks on Gaza, and its threat to strike Iran’s nuclear facilities—these are not coincidences. In particular, attention must be paid to the unprecedented explosion that occurred in Iran’s largest port on the very first day of US-Iran negotiations. Above all, we must pay attention to the outbreak of a localized war between India and Pakistan triggered by the Kashmir conflict that clearly reveals the intention to drive a wedge between India and China and pull India from the anti-imperialist camp toward the imperialist camp. To repeat once again: we cannot afford to be complacent as the direction of war shifts from Northwest Asia through Southwest and South Asia and now points toward East Asia.

East Asia is to become the main theater of World War 3, and the detonator of the war in East Asia is currently the war in the “ROK.” As is now widely known around the world, if the war in the “ROK” breaks out, the war in Taiwan will erupt simultaneously and automatically, which will soon escalate into a broader war in East Asia with Japan and the Philippines joining in, and then into Western Pacific with countries like Australia joining as well. Japan’s Self-Defense Forces established a Unified Operations Command in March 2025, and the Biden administration’s plan to transfer operational control of the US Forces Japan (USFJ) from the Indo-Pacific Command to the USFJ was halted by the Trump administration. Trump reaffirmed a non-belligerent policy through negotiations with Russia and Iran, a recognition of the “DPRK as a nuclear state,” the halt of operational control transfer to USFJ, and a call to cease the localized war between India and Pakistan. For the anti-imperialist camp, the non-warmonger imperialist forces can never be targets of a permanent strategic joint front, nor even of a temporary tactical joint front. However, they can be targets of tactical cooperation. In other words, with them, while agreements or joint declarations through negotiations are impossible, solidarity without agreement or declaration—“silent solidarity”—in striking a common enemy is necessary. This is precisely why the warmonger imperialist forces will resort to a decisive move to suppress the non-warmonger imperialist forces, and the most likely among such moves is the war in the “ROK.” For the warmonger imperialist forces, who are desperate for World War 3 and the war in East Asia, the war in the “ROK” is not a choice but a necessity—the optimal card to suppress the non-warmonger imperialist forces.

Platform



The World Anti-imperialist Platform