

Proletarian

Organ of the International Communist Party

WHAT DISTINGUISHES OUR PARTY: The political continuity which goes from Marx and Engels to Lenin, to the foundation of the Communist International and the Communist Party of Italy; the class struggle of the Communist Left against the degeneration of the International, the struggle against the theory of "socialism in one country" and the Stalinist counter-revolution; the rejection of all popular fronts and national resistance blocs; the struggle against the principles and practice of bourgeois democracy, against interclassism and political and trade-union class collaboration, against any form of opportunism and nationalism; the difficult task of restoring the Marxist doctrine and the revolutionary organ par excellence - the class party - closely linked with the working class, and its daily struggle in opposition to capitalism and bourgeois oppression; the struggle against personal and electoral politics, against any form of indifferentism, of tailism, of movementism or the adventurist practice of "armed struggle"; the support of any proletarian struggle which breaks with social peace and rejects the discipline of interclassist collaborationism; the support of all efforts towards proletarian class reorganisation on the basis of economic associationism, with the perspective of a large scale resumption of the class struggle, proletarian internationalism and the revolutionary anticapitalist struggle.

Nr 22

February 2025

**Supplement to
"le prolétaire" Nr. 555
£1/US \$1,5/CAD \$1,5/€1,5**

Summary

- Trump's election and the U.S. working class
- Lessons from the strike at Canada Post
- Canada. Quebec Premier attacks immigrant proletarians, drawing inspiration from French policy
- Syria : the tyrant is gone, the bourgeois and imperialist order remains
- South Africa : Capitalism orchestrated a massacre in an abandoned gold mine
- A victory for democracy in South Korea?

The Middle East : Israel, the armed arm of US imperialism, wages war against all those who oppose Washington's global power interests, in whose shadow Israel's regional power interests emerge

For more than a century, the Middle East region has been a *stormy zone* in which the conflicting interests of the world's most powerful imperialisms are concentrated, not only because of its vast oil reserves, but also because of the strategic trade route linking the Indian Ocean to the Mediterranean via the Red Sea-Suez Canal, not to mention the Persian Gulf.

The inter-imperialist contrasts lead to commercial and diplomatic conflicts and wars in which the countries of the region are inevitably drawn, where the recent development of capitalism has been characterised by extreme violence, by which the imperialists and the ruling local clans have had and have the aim of imposing their own specific interests on the population; for this purpose they preserved old and backward political and religious superstructures which

(Continued on page 15)

In Trump's America, the historical goals of the proletariat do not change

In the last period, the world situation has been marked by two wars – in Ukraine and in Israel/Palestine – directly affecting the interests of the major imperialist powers, by economic-political confrontations with inevitable military extensions throughout the Middle East – Lebanon, Syria, Iran, Yemen –, by growing tensions on strategic maritime routes – Baltic, Black Sea, Red Sea, Persian Gulf, the Indo-Pacific, South China Sea and the surrounding areas – by the countries of sub-Saharan Africa in permanent turmoil, where influences and alliances are being redrawn against a backdrop of guerrilla warfare, where the former Western colonial powers are increasingly being ejected from the territories they once dominated, and where

Eastern imperialisms are penetrating with ever greater audacity.

This world situation reveals once again what Marxism has always predicted: competition between the great imperialist states, eager for economic territories and new markets for their commodities and capital, not only increases their antagonism, but pushes them ever further towards generalized war; it then will be a question of redrawing a new imperialist world order in which the powers that currently dominate the world – the United States of America and China, with the second and third-ranks imperialist powers in tow – will strive to dominate their adversary in

(Continued on page 2)

Russia-Ukraine War: Imperialist Peace on the Horizon...

It is not known when the Russian-Ukrainian war will end to make way for a peace – that can only be *imperialist*, that is, a peace that does not resolve the deep-seated causes of the conflict that has erupted in Crimea and the Donbas since 2014. A peace that will suspend this particular conflict for a time, but which will not be definitive; it will reshuffle the cards and "local" interests with the prospect of far more decisive contradictions in far wider and more global areas. The imperialist peace is just a period of cease-fire between an armed conflict that has gone silent and an armed conflict that will flare up again. The history of imperialist capitalism has presented nothing but proof that the ruling bourgeoisies of the economically and financially most powerful countries are incapable of eradicat-

ing military conflicts from their future. The will of the ruling bourgeoisies, even of the most powerful ones in the world, has no power over the fundamental laws of capitalism, of which they are a mere political representation, projected into state organisations with the task of defending first and foremost the interests of their own national capitalism, and furthermore the interests of capitalism in general, on which every national capitalism depends. So, apart from whether or not the Ukrainian or Russian bourgeoisie and their individual supporters wish to reach "peace", the fact remains that this war, like any war in the imperialist phase of capitalism, is one of the responses that the bourgeoisie system-

(Continued on page 6)

In Trump's America, the historical goals of the proletariat do not change

(Continuation from page 1)

order to make their interests prevail over the whole planet. It is in this context that the US presidential elections took place, which could determine the fate not only of the West, but of the bourgeois world in general.

Therefore we can only deal with this subject from the point of view of the changing of the guard in the White House sanctioned by Trump's victory on November 6.

Our article on the presidential election (1) highlights an unpleasant reality, but one that must be faced head-on with an understanding of its causes: the arrogance of bourgeois political power must not only be seen in the ways of doing, presenting and speaking of its leading representatives; it must also be seen in relation to the general subjugation into which the proletarian class is plunged in America, and elsewhere.

The more submissive and defeatist the proletariat is, the more the bourgeoisie mocks it, deceives it, scorns it, treats it as something worthless. It is only when proletarians raise their heads, enter into struggle, show their antagonism to the bourgeoisie and their willingness to use force to obtain satisfaction of their immediate demands, that the bourgeoisie says it is ready to "dialogue", to show interest in their demands; then there are no elections where candidates do not declare their determination to satisfy their most pressing demands. According to journalists in the various US media, Trump's election campaign was marked by promises to workers to fight high inflation and competition from non-American products, both to raise the value of wages and to increase domestic production and fight foreign competition in order to defend American jobs.

But back in September 2023, during the strike at the Big Three (Ford, GM and Stellantis), both Biden and Trump intervened to "support" the workers' demands. Biden visited GM strikers in Wayne to say: "*Corporations are making huge profits, and they need to share them with workers. You deserve meaningful raises*", and Trump in Detroit for an election rally, declaring: "*I am here to defend the working class, fight the corrupt political class, protect American jobs and the American dream against foreign products*" (especially

against Chinese production, far more advanced in the electric car sector). The things responsible for workers' miserable living conditions would therefore be superprofits (for Biden), foreign products, especially Chinese (for Trump) (2).

Nothing new under the sun!

When bourgeois politicians argue that workers are right to demand higher wages and greater job security, they are doing their job as hucksters. From the height of their social privileges and billions, it costs them nothing to say a few words in support of the proletarians' basic demands; but none of them thinks of explaining *how* – thanks to their intervention, for which they demand their vote – their general living conditions will improve. They claim that it is only through "economic growth", i.e. increased productivity and victory in competitive wars, that the proletariat's living conditions will improve. Provided, of course, that the impenetrable laws of the market do not get in the way....

Will our "heroes" be able to *bend* the economic laws of capitalism according to which it is the ever-increasing exploitation of wage labor that guarantees capitalist profits and overprofits, and it is the hyper-craziness of mercantile production that creates the increasingly ruthless competition in the international market and causes the economic crises that have been crises of overproduction for more than a century and a half now?

Measures taken by the bourgeois powers to resolve the inherent contradictions of the capitalist mode of production may temporarily alleviate the pressure on the general living conditions of the proletarian masses, but they are and will prove ineffective in the long term. If one sector of the proletariat is better paid, it is because other sectors are less so. Capitalist production is so interconnected in all its sectors and productive processes, and at international level, that its production costs depend on the continually fluctuating average prices of all the different components needed for final production (just think of energy costs) and of the workforce employed, including the costs of storage, conservation, distribution and disposal of unsold quantities.

Only in certain phases of capitalist development has the dominant bourgeoisie of the industrialized countries been able to intervene effectively in fa-

vor of the general living conditions of the proletarian masses. For example, the end of the second world imperialist war coincided with the start of a cycle of strong economic expansion; then, in all the developed countries, both those not ravaged by the war (such as the USA, Canada, Spain, etc.) and those whose priority was reconstruction (most European countries, Japan, Russia, etc.) the bourgeoisies adopted a policy they had never followed during the long period of unlimited classical liberalism: "*a form of self-limitation of capitalism*" that "*leads to a levelling of the extortion of surplus value around an average.*" (3), i.e. "*a new method of planification for running the capitalist economy*".

This policy was certainly not due to the goodwill of capitalists who, after the immense holocaust of the world war, would have decided not to be as ruthlessly hungry for profit and blood as before. In reality, the dominant bourgeoisie had learned its lesson not only from the war that had just ended, but also from all the previous ones, and from the way the proletarian movement had reacted to capitalist exploitation and war – since Europe in 1848, Paris in 1871, Russia in 1917, Germany in 1919. To avoid facing a revolutionary movement from a proletariat which, for its part, had accumulated class communist experience and tradition, and as they divided the world into zones of influence, the post-war bourgeoisies drew from the experience of fascism in Italy and Germany what they needed to consolidate their political power. This consisted in generally applying and institutionalizing the *policy of class collaboration* introduced by fascism, and reinforcing it with the new method of economic planification mentioned above; i.e., with this self-limitation of the extortion of surplus-value around an average which satisfies the needs of the capitalists, while responding in the most generalized way possible to the most pressing needs of the proletarian masses.

The policy of *social shock-absorbers* is exactly in line with this approach. The fact that it was presented and implemented in democratic forms rather than totalitarian and fascist ones, as in the days of Fascist Italy and, in the much more organized form of German National Socialism, undoubtedly helped to bind the broad proletarian masses to the fate of bourgeois economics and politics – all the more so after they had been deceived, disoriented and betrayed by the official communism that had imposed itself under the name of Stalin.

Beyond democracy's smooth talking on infinite freedoms, the development

of capitalism in its imperialist phase works precisely against these freedoms. Economically, it tends to build ever larger and more powerful monopolies, to the point of bending states to their interests; politically, it tends to increase authoritarianism, which is merely the antechamber to open totalitarianism. The state presents itself as the supreme authority above the classes, capable of reconciling the interests of all social strata; in reality, it has always been the instrument for defending not the “rights of everyone”, but the interests of the great economic and financial powers against the rights and interests of all those who have not been absorbed by these great powers. The latest Covid-19 pandemic amply demonstrated this reality, even though it was clothed in democratic and parliamentary forms.

THE BASIC CONDITIONS OF THE PROLETARIAT ARE THE SAME, IN THE USA LIKE EVERYWHERE IN THE WORLD

When the bourgeoisie feels the need to involve the proletarian masses in support of its general interests – for example, during general elections or pre-war tensions – it sets in motion its usual propaganda machine; the main representatives of the various parties vying for government positions spout the classic refrains about defending national production, the family, workers and democratic rights... One of the arguments used to gather votes is to promise workers that their immediate conditions will improve thanks to lower taxes and increased investment in national production, which they claim will improve the living and working conditions of the working masses. This is how the bourgeoisie deals with workers: as a *class for capital*, i.e. a class exclusively for capital and its valorization. As Marx demonstrated, capital is only valorized by wage labor, i.e. by the systematic and ever more intensive exploitation of the working class.

It is obvious that the *immediate* interests of the proletarian class concern their working and living conditions within the capitalist system of production, and they do not go beyond this system. The living conditions of proletarians depend on the wage system that regulates relations between workers and capitalists, and on the working conditions in which they operate. If they do not work, proletarians do not eat. The fact is, there is not enough work created by capitalism for all the proletarians: unemployment, i.e. *the industrial reserve army*, is an inescapable reality of capitalism. This industrial reserve army is at

the disposal of capital and can only weigh on the proletarian class as a whole by developing what is inevitable in a mercantile framework: competition with active proletarians. Unemployed labor power is a low-cost commodity, but also a commodity that does not always find an outlet on its specific market, the labor market. As with all commodities without a market outlet, the fate of this *labor power-commodity* is the same as that of all others: sale or trash.

Every city has its suburbs, every suburb has its slums; the more capitalism develops, the more cities spread out and the more they divide into a small central part – rich and affluent, full of stores and luxury establishments, also full of headquarters of major industries and banks – a larger part for the so-called middle class, the petty bourgeoisie, and an even larger part – peripheral, degraded and underserved – for the proletariat and sub-proletariat. Naturally, the economic disorder that characterizes capitalism, with its growths, crises and recessions, is also reflected in the layout of cities: they change ever more frequently, either by acquiring new transport lines, or by making use of certain spaces and land obtained by emptying entire neighborhoods to make way for new buildings and that manner, getting a grip on land rents. From this point of view, American cities have shown the world what “progress” in modern cities is all about: the differentiation between “residential” neighborhoods, the so-called cities with their skyscrapers, and the luxury buildings housing big banks, stock exchanges and multinational corporations; working-class neighborhoods, right up to the extreme suburbs where the immigrant, impoverished, unemployed and marginalized masses are concentrated, neighborhoods notoriously forgotten by public institutions, with the exception of police forces.

Given the proletariat’s total dependence on capital, the workplace is of utmost importance to every proletarian. The proletarian sells his labor power to the capitalist in exchange for a wage; if he does not sell it, he receives nothing and falls into marginalization.

Today, proletarians’ distance from the struggles and class tradition of the past has made them completely forget what the European and American proletarians of the 19th century and the first half of the 20th century had acquired. The direct implantation of capitalism in America, without having to pass through the long historical phase of feudalism, paved the way for the emergence in the young American proletariat of social elements that took decades to manifest in Europe: in particu-

lar, the emergence of a workers’ aristocracy coexisting with the masses of indiscriminately immigrant and migrant workers, multinational and multiracial workers, tendentially unified by their immediate living and working conditions, beyond their differences of origin. From the start, proletarian union organization tended to take on the characteristics of a violent and potentially revolutionary antagonism; this is shown by the history of the Western Federation of Miners and above all the Industrial Workers of the World (IWW, the *Wobblies*). Between 1905 and 1920, they represented much more than an economic defense association, a revolutionary syndicalism tending towards class solidarity, “workers’ power” and the Big Union for workers’ emancipation; they did not want to confine themselves to defense against the effects of capitalism on workers’ lives, but they also wanted to embark on the road to emancipation from capital (4).

Despite its distance from the revolutionary experiences of European communism and particularly from bolshevism, the IWW made contact in 1919 through Big Bill, its principal representative at the time, with the Communist International as soon as it was formed. The very foundations on which the IWW was organized favored what could have been the Wobblies’ future political leap towards revolutionary communism. This leap did not happen, mainly because of the absence of proletarian revolution in Europe and the degeneration of the Communist International a

(Continued on page 4)

PARTY’S PRESS

- «**Proletarian**» - (*Supplement in english to “le prolétaire”*) - **Price per copy** : £ 1 / € 1,5 / USA \$ 1,5 / CDN \$ 1,5 / CHF 3.
- «**Communist Program**» - (*Theoretical review in English*) - **Price per copy** : £ 2 / € 3 / USA \$ 3 / CDN \$ 3 / CHF 8
- «**il comunista**» - (*bimonthly in Italian*) - **Price per copy** : £ 2 / € 2 / CHF 6.
- «**Quaderni de “il comunista”**» (*Theoretical review in Italian*) - **Price per copy** : £ 4 / € 8 / USA \$ 8 / CDN \$ 8 / CHF 10
- «**le prolétaire**» - (*bimonthly in French*) - **Price per copy** : £ 1,5 / € 1,5 / USA \$ 1,5 / CDN \$ 1,5 / CHF 3.
- «**programme communiste**» - (*Theoretical review in French*) - **Price per copy** : £ 3 / € 4 / CHF 8 . Latin America: US \$ 2 / USA \$ 4 / CDN \$ 4.
- «**el programa comunista**» - **Price per copy** : £ 2 / € 3 / CHF 8 / Latin America: US \$ 1,5 / USA \$ 3 / CDN \$ 3.
- «**el proletario**» - **Price per copy** : € 1,5 / CHF 3 / £ 1,5. Latin America: US \$ 1,5 / USA \$ 2 / CDN \$ 2.

In Trump's America, the historical goals of the proletariat do not change

(Continuation from page 3)

few years later. And it is also because of this failed political development of the American worker's movement, and the counter-revolution that succeeded in defeating the communist revolution in Russia and internationally, that the already present and interclassist AFL union ended up taking over, setting the American proletariat back for decades from the terrain of classist struggle to that of interclassism and collaborationism with the capitalists.

It is this situation, totally unfavorable to class struggle, that the American proletariat must overcome if it wants to not only defend itself on the immediate economic terrain, but act on the more general anti-capitalist political terrain – the only terrain on which it can wage the struggle for its emancipation from capitalism; the only terrain on which it can cease to be a *class for capital*, and assume its historical characteristic of a **class for itself**, a revolutionary class.

The American bourgeoisie has not directly matured from centuries of class domination and international domination that the English or French bourgeoisie can brag about ; but its very youthful constitution as a ruling class, after triumphing over the colonizing English bourgeoisie and then being victorious in the American Civil War against the retrograde, slave-owning South, enabled it both to exploit to the full extent the immense mineral and natural resources of its vast territory and to push ahead a forcible technical and scientific development of national industry so as to be able to attack competition on the international market with numerous advantages.

American capitalism thus simultaneously expressed the bourgeois tendency towards interclassism, by seeking to consolidate ties with the worker's aristocracy, and a social pacifism riding on the plurinational and multiracial wave of the "we are all Americans"; and the opposite tendency towards violent antagonism with the working masses, based on national and racial discriminations, subjecting them to conditions of misery and precariousness – with the exception of the most educated professional strata, better paid and enjoying privileges and advantages to make them feel members not of the working class but of the middle class.

In reality, as demonstrated over the

years by the great struggles in the sectors of the automobile, construction, transport, airport, etc. which have almost unexpectedly shaken the equilibria founded on persistent collaboration between classes, what the American proletariat lacked, and what it still lacks, is the classist and revolutionary experience that the European proletariat, by contrast, has had. The serious historical problem facing the American proletariat class consists in Marxism's difficulty of penetrating – and therefore of the revolutionary maturation of the workers' movement – which the European proletarian movement has experienced in the past. Through the insurrections of 1848, the Paris Commune of 1871, the Russian revolution of October 1917 and the revolutionary attempts of the 1920s, the proletariat of Europe was able to physically experience the historical value of class struggle carried through to the end, right up to the seizure and exercise of power, the historical value of the socialist proletarian revolution to which it can relate after all its defeats. And this historical circumstance gives European communists the task of *importing* Marxism even into the ranks of the American proletariat.

The American proletarian movement has historically evolved in the shadow of the political development of the young bourgeois class; it assimilated in a very short time the socially and nationally dominant bourgeois ideological vision according to which being American, beyond one's social condition, nationality or race of origin, was an internationally recognized "quality" enjoyed by bourgeois and proletarians alike, something they both could be proud of. Of course, this did not mean that there was not a fierce racism on the part of dominant whites against the black, yellow or Chicano populations – and this racism still persists. Racism is an integral part of the American white bourgeoisie's ideology of economic, social and cultural domination, even in a democratic environment. But the social antagonism between the exploited (the proletarians) and the exploiters (the bourgeois) is stronger than democratic ideology, because it is based on material and historical class conditions that no ideology can eradicate. This in no way detracts from the fact that the establishment of modern capitalism in a vast virgin territory like America was a very special historical condition; it facilitated the use of the proletariat (doubly dominated when it is black, even after being "freed" from slavery): through *its* labor – that is, through the exploitation of its labor power – it helped to make

America ideologically and materially as *great* as capital made it economically. A perfect synthesis of why the bourgeoisie considers the proletariat exclusively as a *class for capital*.

The struggles of the American proletariat have been marked by a very high level of social conflictuality; but they have never succeeded in generating political avant-gardes, if not at the level of the combative syndicalism of the Wobblies or the anarchists; they have never found a response in terms of the formation of a class political party. Such an answer can only be found through the penetration of Marxism into the workers' movement, i.e. the theory of communist revolution, the only path to proletarian emancipation from capitalism. Such an objective is fundamental, not only for the American proletariat, but for the world proletariat, because capitalism can never be definitively defeated until its strongest and most historically resistant imperialist pole, the United States of America, is mortally wounded.

This historic task of the revolutionary struggle of the American proletariat, complemented by the revolutionary struggle in Europe, is a decisive step on the road to the emancipation of the proletariat worldwide.

At the time of the first imperialist world war, the fate of the communist proletarian revolution was linked to the revolution in Europe. After the second imperialist world war, it is inevitably linked to the proletarian revolution in America. It is to achieve this goal that communists of the past and the present have had to work, and must continue to work, without forgetting that the first step towards world proletarian revolution is the class struggle that proletarians must unleash in every country against their own bourgeoisie.

December 2024

(1) See « Trump's Election and the American Working Class » in this issue.

(2) See « Has the American Working Class Awakened? », in *Proletarian* n° 20,

(3) "Force, Violence and Dictatorship in Class Struggle (Part III)", in *Communist Program*, n° 3, May 1977, p.31. Available on our website: https://pcint.org/40_pdf/270_Communist_Program/CP_03-w.pdf

(4) On the history of the IWW and the magnificent struggles of the American proletariat, see : « The Autobiography of Big Bill Haywood », https://archive.org/details/autobiography_ofb0000vari_x3q5

Trump's election and the U.S. working class

While opinion polls were predicting Kamala Harris' victory, and in any case a close score, former president Donald Trump was nonetheless largely re-elected for a second term after his defeat in 2020; not only did he win the largest number of "electors" elected in the various states, but he also gathered on his name the largest number of votes nationally – the first time for a Republican president since George Bush in 2004: 50.1% of the vote to Kamala Harris's 48.3%, while when he won in 2016, he garnered just 45% of the vote (to Hillary Clinton's 48.2%). While the percentage of abstainers was higher than in the last presidential election (36% vs. 34% in 2020, the lowest rate in decades, and 40% in 2016) he garnered more than 2,000,000 additional votes, while the Democratic candidate lost more than 8 million.

Suffrage analyses show that abstention increased in places that had voted predominantly Democratic in 2020; the percentage of voters for Kamala Harris fell among whites as well as blacks and Latinos, among men as well as women (in equal proportions); she increased her score over Joe Biden's only among voters over 65 and those with the highest incomes (over \$100,000 a year) (1).

These few figures show that the Democratic candidate's electoral defeat is not primarily due to racist or misogynist prejudice.

Neither the verbal outrages and fake news of candidate Trump and his supporters, nor the calls to vote for Harris in the name of defending democracy against a "fascist" convicted by the courts, nor the pronouncements of showbiz stars, nor the declarations of leading economists on the good health of the American economy, have succeeded in mobilizing voters comparable to that which resulted in Joe Biden's victory in 2020. For millions of Biden voters, especially among the less privileged, disillusionment and discontent dominate: over the past 4 years, inequalities have grown; the poorest, the proletarians, have become poorer, and even sectors of the middle classes have been hit by inflation unseen at this level for some 40 years: only capitalists and stock market investors have seen their gains increase, sometimes spectacularly.

Elections are always a highly distorted reflection of the state of mind of the population in general, and of proletarians in particular, since the democratic system has been perfected over the decades to intoxicate the exploited, reduced to the state of voters gorged on propaganda. The electoral circus, richly en-

dowed (it is calculated that nearly 16 billion dollars were spent by the various parties for this year's electoral cycle, a record) (2), has as its primary function to divert the aspirations, frustrations and discontent of the electorate onto the harmless terrain for the bourgeois order of competition between different parties and candidates in the service of the capitalists (when these candidates are not themselves billionaires like Trump - the candidate supposedly opposed to the elites and the establishment!). As Lenin said, quoting Marx: the "*essence of capitalist democracy*" is that the "*oppressed are allowed once every few years to decide which particular representatives of the oppressing class shall represent and repress them in parliament!*" (3).

This proletarian discontent, which can be traced back to electoral ups and downs, is manifested on the real terrain of class relations by a renewal of workers' combativeness. The most recent example is the 7-week strike by over 30,000 Boeing workers, who twice refused to accept the agreements reached between management and the IAM union. According to official statistics, which only record strikes involving more than 1,000 workers, in 2023 (the latest figures available) more than 450,000 proletarians went on strike, a number not seen for several years (4).

Trump's election represents the accession to the presidency of an adversary of the proletarians; but Biden-Harris and the Democratic Party have demonstrated, if that were still necessary, that they are in no way, as ultra-opportunist union leaders like to present them, "friends of labor"; they have not hesitated to break strikes like that of the railway workers, to intervene to put an end to others like at Boeing, or to deport more undocumented immigrants than Trump. Those who, despite the Democrats' criminal policies abroad (Israel...) and anti-worker policies at home, call on proletarians to support them in the name of the "lesser evil" or the "defense of democracy", are in fact the proletariat's most insidious adversaries. To defend themselves against the capitalists and their state, proletarians can only rely on their own class struggle; they must reject not only the nationalist, racist and xenophobic tendencies spread mainly (but not exclusively) by right-wing and far-right currents: they must also break with all the false "friends" who bind them to the deadly class collaboration with the capitalists, in which their interests are sacrificed to those of

the company or the national economy.

The period ahead will inevitably be marked by redoubled attacks on American proletarians, not because of the evil will of a Donald Trump, but because US's economic difficulties and worsening inter-imperialist tensions demand it. Like their comrades in other countries, American proletarians will have to re-discover the path of independent class struggle and organization to face up to this; but they will also have to reconstitute their **internationalist and international class party**: by no means an easy or quick task, but an indispensable one if the battles ahead for the working class are to be directed towards the revolutionary overthrow of capitalism.

November, 18th 2024

(1) <https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2024/11/12/what-numbers-actually-say-about-2024-election/>

(2) <https://www.opensecrets.org/2024-presidential-race>

(3) See Lenin, "The State and Revolution" ch.5 <https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1917/staterev/ch05.htm>

(4) <https://www.bls.gov/wsp/>

«Communist program» No. 10 (Settembre 2024)

Summary

- Ukraine. A War that Continues to Pave the Way for Future Wars in Europe and the World
- From the Spiral of Incessant Massacres that Have Accompanied the History of the Middle East for the Last Hundred Years, the Way Out is not by Nationalism, but by the Struggle for Proletarian and Communist Revolution
- Some Reference Points on the "Palestinian Question"
- Theses on the Historical Task, Action and Structure of the World Communist Party, Based on Positions that Have Been the Historical Patrimony of the Communist Left for over Half a Century. (Theses of Naples, 1965) - Supplementary Theses on the Historical Task, Action and Structure of the World Communist Party. (Milan 1966)
- *Who We Are and What We Want:*
 - *On the Track of the Great Marxist Tradition*
 - *For the Restoration of the Revolutionary Marxist Theory*
 - *Reconstitution of the Communist Party on a Worldwide Scale*

One copy: 3 € / £ 2 / 8 CHF / US and Cdn \$ 3 / Latin America US\$ 1,5

Russia-Ukraine War: Imperialist Peace on the Horizon...

(Continuation from page 1)

atically opts for when faced with a deep economic crisis. As Marx and Engels' *Manifesto* states, the means the bourgeoisie uses to overcome its economic crises – which are crises of overproduction in which ever greater quantities of goods, means of production and wage labour forces are destroyed – is to *exploit more thoroughly* the old markets for ever greater and more varied quantities of produced goods, and to conquest new ones. It is the fall in the average rate of profit of capital that systematically puts capitalism in crisis and prevents it from developing without limit and peacefully. If in certain areas of the world the bourgeois states coexist in peace – for example, in Europe from the division of Germany into two until the collapse of the USSR – other areas of the world suffer the consequences of the severe pressure exerted by the conflicting imperialist interests of this or that power, of this or that power bloc.

With the various phases of war that hit the republics of the former Yugoslavia in the first five years of the 1990s, a period of systematic instability of peace in Europe began. It is no coincidence that the wars in Yugoslavia coincided with the collapse of the USSR and the reunification of the two Germanies. This reunification, which was in a sense a difficult morsel to digest, not only for Russia but also for the United States, marked a turning point in the European – and therefore also in the world – arena; this in the sense that Germany, as an industrial power reborn after its defeat in the second imperialist war, tended to regain in Europe and in the world the role that had been denied to it by both the United States and Russia precisely because of its defeat in the second world war. Germany, however, has always had a very ambiguous relationship with Russia: economically, Russia has always been an important supplier of raw materials for Germany and a market for its own industrial production (all the more so when the Russian empire dominated the countries of Eastern Europe); politically, however, it was an adversary against which it was twice pitted in world wars. After the collapse of the USSR, and the inevitable extrication of the Eastern European countries from Moscow's grasp only to fall into the clutches of US and Western European imperialism, Germany has remained

subject to US military domination through NATO; it is well known that military domination is the most important means of political domination. In contrast, Russia, for essentially economic, commercial and financial reasons, could not and generally cannot do without very close relations with Germany; and it is because of this common interest that since the 1990s Russia has become the main supplier of natural gas and oil to Germany and, through it, to Europe (gas from which Italy, which has become the second European importer after Germany, has benefited greatly). Could the United States have allowed a relationship to be cemented between Germany – and therefore, whether we want to admit it or not, also between Europe – and Russia that would have constituted a non-negligible obstacle in anticipation of a clash of imperialist interests with Russia?

NATO and US dollars thus became the means by which the privileged relationship that existed between Russia and Germany was to be broken. It is no coincidence that 1999 marked NATO's advance across Eastern Europe, starting with Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic, and then, between 2004 and 2020, continuing with the integration of all the Eastern European countries, including the Balkan countries of Albania, Croatia, Montenegro and Northern Macedonia, and, as we know, now reaching out for Ukraine and Georgia. Today, following the entry of Finland and Sweden into NATO, Russia finds itself not only surrounded but actually besieged along its western borders.

The war that Ukraine and Russia have been waging against each other, indirectly since 2014, directly since 2022, has certainly had among its objectives joining or not joining NATO, but not only that. That Ukraine was waging war against Russia primarily for the benefit of the United States, and secondarily for the benefit of Western Europe, was clear from the very beginning: that is, from the moment that in April 2022, roughly two months after the invasion by Russian troops, Zelensky's Ukraine was ready to negotiate with Moscow to end the conflict, the focal point of which was Crimea and the Russian-speaking areas of the Donbas (1). It was the United States and Britain who persuaded Zelensky to accept an armed confrontation with the Russians, a confrontation for which they guaranteed him financial, political

and military support throughout the war. The objective of the US, led by Biden, and of Europe following London and Washington, was to weaken Russia economically, and thus politically, to such an extent that it would be forced to accede to the terms the western powers would naturally impose.

The move was certainly risky given Russia's military strength, but Ukrainian pride and the interest of Ukrainian bourgeois factions linked to the US and Western Europe played in favour of continuing the war, all the more so because of the constant assurances of support for Ukraine "until victory". It was clear from the beginning that the Western powers would not send their own troops to Ukraine to support the Kyiv army, given the numerical strength of the Russian troops deployed on the battlefield, but the promise was support in billions of dollars and euros and in armaments from all NATO members. This was not excluding that the Americans and British would send their specialists to Ukraine to train Ukrainian soldiers to operate the supplied weaponry and their intelligence officers.

From 24 February 2022, when the Russian invasion of Ukraine began, to today, 19 November 2024, a thousand days of war, bombing, massacres, displacement, poverty, hunger and cold have passed for millions of Ukrainians; and for tens of thousands of Russian soldiers it has been no better: they too are prisoners of the war into which they have been thrown, and in which the practice of desertion and bribery has become rampant even among them in an attempt to avoid being sent to the front, so much so that Putin's government has been pushed into sending soldiers to Ukraine from the Asian regions of Russia, and even North Korean soldiers, whom Kim Jong Un has generously offered as cannon fodder.

The terrifying mass of illusions and false hopes with which the NATO powers pushed millions of Ukrainians to endure destruction and massacres collapsed horribly a few months ago, when the Ukrainian "counter-offensive" was supposed to push Russian troops back across the border. The desertions on the Ukrainian side, the martial law, the pressure by the Zelenskyy government on European countries where millions of Ukrainians fleeing the massive bombing of their towns and villages have found refuge, to send these people back to Ukraine where they would become cannon fodder, all testify to a very different reality from that promoted by the Western and Ukrainian bourgeoisie. And not only that; the war that perhaps only Moscow initially assumed would be

short-lived, and which later turned out to be much more difficult and longer, both because of the strong resistance of the Ukrainian army and because of the strong financial and arms support of the Western powers, starting with the US, demonstrated that it was not at all a far-sighted policy.

The objective of breaking Russia economically and isolating it internationally has not been achieved and will not be achieved by continuing the war for another 1000 days even if the West wanted to. The fourteen economic sanctions plans with which the Western powers have tried to break Russia have not produced the expected result: have they weakened it economically? Yes, mainly because it could not accumulate billions of dollars in profits from exports of gas, oil, food supplies, advanced technology, etc. as it did before the war, and because its capital deposited in Western banks was frozen. However, these sanctions have had a particularly negative impact on the economies of the Western European countries, which have had to bear the brunt of the rise in the price of energy supplies, which are the basis for the industrial fabric of all countries. But see who benefited? The United States, of course – thanks to liquefied natural gas, for example, which is much more expensive than the natural gas supplied by Russia – and secondly Norway, which has suddenly become the first and irreplaceable supplier of natural gas to several European countries, despite the gradual reduction in fossil fuel consumption...

Which European country has suffered the most from this war and sanctions against Russia? It is Germany, which has already experienced a significant decline in economic dynamism in the second decade of the new century compared to the previous decade, and which – like most advanced capitalist countries – has suffered a further slowdown with the Covid-19 pandemic, temporarily entering into positive figures in the post-pandemic period only at the beginning of 2022, but falling back into recession from the end of 2022. It is evident that higher energy costs and an inflation rate of +8.7% have contributed decisively to the recession. And 2023 was no better, as German GDP fell by 0.3% and GDP growth for 2024 is essentially similarly negative. This situation certainly does not help further efforts to support Ukraine in its war against Russia, which is increasingly taking the form of a **war of attrition** in which Russia resists and defends itself much better than Ukraine. On the other hand, German “aid” to Kyiv has already been dramati-

cally reduced in 2023. If Germany – a strong economy that has itself acted as a positive driving force for the European economy and for other national economies over the last 30 years – is in crisis, as it is, this crisis will inevitably be transmitted to the whole of Europe over time. And the crisis means rising costs of living, rising unemployment, cuts in social safety nets, increased competition among proletarians, increased social tensions. And who knows, perhaps the German proletariat will wake up from the long slumber into which it has fallen for decades...

After 24 February 2022, Germany could not stand in a position “equidistant” from Russia and Ukraine. Its commitments as a NATO member and pressure from most other EU countries, the US and the UK have pushed it to side with Ukraine against Russia, even though it had established superb economic and political relations with it for years. It is evident that Germany has acted against its national interests in this war. It even had to endure the destruction of the Nord Stream gas pipeline – a pipeline that carried Russian natural gas across the Baltic Sea to Germany and from there to Europe; this destruction was initially even attributed to the Russians (?!), but later turned out to be the work of the Ukrainian secret services and the Americans and the British certainly knew about. This has added to the serious damage that Germany is suffering in connection with the lucrative commercial relations it had with Russia before 24 February 2022; it is certainly something that the German bourgeoisie will not easily forget and that will be added to the humiliation to which it has been subjected since the end of the Second World War and which has been softened in part, but only in part, by the reunification of the country after the fall of the Berlin Wall, the thirty-fifth anniversary of which is being celebrated these very days.

THE DESPERATE UKRAINIAN INVASION ACROSS THE BORDER

On 6 August, Zelenskyy’s military ground incursion into Russia’s Kursk region, north of Belgorod and bordering Ukraine’s Sumy region, surprised Russia with a very risky action, even though it took place in a region that is not crucial to the Russian-Ukrainian conflict. At this time Russian troops were slowly but steadily continuing to conquer square kilometres in the Donbas, and winter was approaching in Ukraine, which is seriously affected in energy supplies necessary not only for

production but also for heating homes; this invasion was thus intended to boost the morale of Ukrainian troops by way of “hitting the Russians on home soil” in the hope that it could later use the occupied territories in the Kursk region as a bargaining chip in negotiations over Russian-occupied territories in the Donbas.

That Ukraine has no chance of winning this war – apart from Zelenskyy’s boasting about a counter-offensive leading to “victory” – is a fact that has been obvious for some time. And it is certainly not the tons of weapons and billions of dollars and euros that Western imperialisms have paid and are still paying out to the Zelenskyy government that would provide a decisive turning point for Ukraine. It is becoming increasingly clear that in the face of Russia’s objectives on Ukrainian territory (to re-occupy Crimea and the Russian-speaking areas of the Donbas), Ukraine’s goals of restoring full sovereignty over the entire state territory equivalent to what was the second Soviet republic of the former USSR (including Crimea and Sevastopol) were and are far from being realised. The tensions between the Kyiv government and the majority Russian-speaking population of Crimea and the Russian-speaking population of Donetsk and Luhansk, inevitably escalated into clashes between Russian nationalists and Ukrainian nationalists (one against the other, purposefully instigated by Kyiv and Moscow), so that the autonomy of Donetsk and Luhansk promised by Kyiv and ratified by the Minsk agreements was never implemented.

The Minsk agreements (I and II) were promoted by Hollande for France and Merkel for Germany, who intended to play the role of “peacemakers” to allow the best possible flourishing of business activities of the two countries and to demonstrate to Putin’s Russia (who has been in power since 1999) that they had a determining influence in easing the tensions that were growing throughout Eastern Europe. But it should be recalled that they were, in fact, a mockery, as both Kyiv and Moscow continued to act in a way that continued to inflame nationalism on both sides. The armed clashes between Donbass pro-Russian separatist militias and the Ukrainian military forces and army were a pretext for Russia to send troops ‘in defence’ of the Russian-speaking population; but the real aim was to reclaim Crimea and the Donbass. Leaving aside the Ukrainian and Western propaganda accusing Russia of seeking to restore

(Continued on page 8)

Russia-Ukraine War: Imperialist Peace on the Horizon...

(Continuation from page 7)

the old tsarist empire, starting with Ukraine, which has not yet joined either NATO or the European Union, the fact remains that – like all imperialism – Russian imperialism covets economic territories, a population of wage workers to enslave, and mineral and agricultural wealth, which is certainly not lacking in Ukraine. And there is nothing easier than to use the leverage of nationalism, exacerbated on both sides, to turn political and economic confrontation into the politics of war. On the other hand, it is obvious that this war was wanted and prepared by Russian imperialism, as well as by European and American imperialists.

BUT WHAT WILL BE THE END OF THIS WAR?

All the “peace plans” drawn up and put forward by the various world governments, including Ukraine, have been nothing but systematic initiatives to deceive, first of all, the Ukrainian and Russian proletarians, who are being systematically massacred on the war fronts and in the cities, and the proletarians of Europe and America into accepting the worsening living conditions that this war entails for them too; these “peace plans” turned into piles of paper doomed to gather dust and be quickly forgotten (2). They were all based on the assumption that Ukraine – financially, politically and militarily supported by the Western powers – could ‘win’ the stake of regaining the territories occupied by the Russians, putting Russia in serious trouble even with the economic and financial sanctions that the West was announcing at machine-gun speed. However, after two and a half years of war, the situation on the ground demonstrates that all this propaganda was just a giant house of cards: the reality was hundreds of thousands of dead and wounded on both sides (3), the destruction of many towns, factories and infrastructure, the flight of millions of Ukrainian families to Western European countries and the gradual consolidation of Russia’s military occupation not only of Crimea but of almost the entire Donbas.

Despite these facts, Zelenskyy, anticipating future negotiations with Russia, announced his “Victory Plan” (4) in his evening speech on 18 September: “All the provisions, all the main points,

the necessary annexes with the details of the plan have been defined. Everything has been worked out. The most important thing now is the determination to implement it. [...] There is and can be no alternative to peace, no freezing of the war or other manipulations that would simply take Russian aggression to the next stage, we need reliable and lasting security for Ukraine and thus for the whole of Europe. That is what we are working for.”

This “plan for victory” includes: immediate membership of Ukraine in NATO and deployment of modern defence systems in Ukraine, use of long-range weapons on Russian territory, support and continuation of military operations in Russia’s Kursk region, refusal to create “buffer zones” in Ukraine, replacement of US troops in Europe with Ukrainian troops, and other points that are kept secret for now. It was this “plan” that Zelenskyy presented to both candidates for the US presidency and to the UN assembly in the hope that if Trump became the winner of the election (which he did), he would embrace it in continuity with the Biden administration’s existing support.

THE WAR IS LOST FOR UKRAINE

And while Zelenskyy was still babbling about the future victory, present-day British and American military experts emphasise the impossibility of victory over Russia, and the need to work towards an end to the war and a post-war period in which it will be in the West’s interest to find an agreement with Russia that is not extremely damaging to Ukraine. It is clear that, even in future negotiations, it will be the Americans who will dictate the terms that Ukraine will have to accept, blindly supported by the British, while the EU will have to feign complacency in the face of adversity.

Trump’s reaction did not take long. He accused Zelenskyy of being responsible for the war with Russia: *he should never have allowed this war to start. That it is a lost war* (5), and he accuses Biden of having provoked it. And he suggests that Ukraine may have to cede some of its territory to Russia in order to reach a peace agreement. This suggestion is sharply contested by Zelenskyy, who, especially towards the Ukrainian population and its soldiers who are instead experiencing the worst

moments of the war, repeats with a raised voice: *the territorial integrity of Ukraine is non-negotiable* (6). But even from the UK, which along with Washington was instrumental in knocking down the negotiations in April 2022 (the real instigators of the war against Russia), comes a warning.

Frank Ledwidge, an officer and advisor to the British mission in Afghanistan in 2007–2008 and in Libya during and after the war in 2011–2012, has always been an advocate of Ukrainian and Western interests since the beginning of the Russian-Ukrainian war, believing that Western weaponry supplied to the Ukrainian army outweighed Russian troops. But as early as May 2023, when asked: “Does the West really want Ukraine to win the war?” He replied: “If so, it must increase military support”. In September 2023, he warned: “Time is running out for a Ukrainian counter-offensive. Its allies will be decisive for what happens next”. But a year later, on September 24, 2024, he published this comment in *The Conversation* magazine: “Ukraine cannot defeat Russia. The best the West can do is to help Kyiv plan a secure post-war future!” (7).

In this case, planning for the post-war period does not mean planning for success, but for the defeat of Ukraine, and therefore of the West. It is a flight to safety, given that the war for Kyiv is lost, and before the same embarrassment occurs as in Afghanistan, Iraq, Libya. The credibility of the American superpower would be further weakened by this, and many countries in the so-called «global South» would join China and Russia via BRICS. It is unlikely that Western governments would not have learned at least some lessons from their defeats in the disastrous wars in Afghanistan, Iraq and Libya. In the case of the Russo-Ukrainian war, it has become increasingly apparent how the attempt, particularly by the US and Britain, to significantly weaken Russia and thereby force it to accept a subordinate role not only in Europe but also in the world has failed, if not completely, at least in part; what has been achieved is the massacre of hundreds of thousands of Ukrainians and the destruction of half the country. The United States has so far spent \$85 billion in financial aid and weapons on the war in Ukraine, while the European Union has spent \$118 billion (roughly equivalent to the annual European budget). This is not, of course, donated money, but long-term loans, for which Ukraine will pay dearly not only today, but especially tomorrow, through political and economic and financial subordination to Euro-

American capital. In fact, the much-touted “national sovereignty” went to pot the day after the collapse of the USSR and Ukraine’s declaration of independence: first owing to Moscow’s influence, then Washington’s.

The motives of the most powerful imperialisms have nothing to do with the welfare of weaker countries, with democracy and humanity, with the defence of ‘national sovereignty’ and ‘rights’; they have much more pragmatic and cynical reasons: to extend and strengthen their domination over as many countries and markets as possible, and to face the inevitable clashes with opposing imperialisms by all available means, political, economic, financial and, not least, military, with a view, if the opportunity arises, as in this case, to compel other nations to wage factual war.

But even if, as in Afghanistan, Iraq or Libya and other parts of the world, the imperialists who waged the war do not directly gain the expected benefit and walk away disgraced, it does not change the fact that they still achieve an important (but usually hidden) result: the fact that the proletariat of the countries involved in their wars does not revolt against the established capitalist and imperialist order, does not organize itself on class terrain, does not go over to confront the bourgeoisie of its own country by the class struggle, on the only revolutionary terrain, transforming the imperialist war into civil war for the conquest of political power. Whether the war against the enemy state or states is won or lost, the fact remains that if the proletariats of the belligerent countries do not rise up against their own ruling bourgeoisie, but take part in the war, even out of conviction, as was the case in the 1939–1945 war, be it on the Nazi-fascist side or on the “anti-fascist” side, the bourgeoisie wins on the international scale and builds its post-war, its imperialist peace on this class victory.

WHAT WILL CHANGE WITH TRUMP IN THE WHITE HOUSE?

Many hypotheses have emerged and are emerging with respect to Trump’s electoral victory in the US presidential election. In his election campaign, which has already begun since the mass attack on the Capitol in January 2021, Trump, boasting that America has not gone to war with anyone during his presidency, announced that “within 24 hours” the war between Russia and Ukraine would be over. Beyond the bluster talk characteristic of a smug figure like Trump, it must be said that personal relations with Putin may also play a role

in the context of this war. But it is obvious that the international interests of US imperialism far outweigh the personal relations between the heads of the White House and the Kremlin. In the background, however, one can see the difference between the bourgeois factions that supported Biden and the war in Ukraine and the bourgeois factions that support Trump. The latter have a priority interest in halting Chinese expansionism and preventing the strengthening of the anti-Western alliance between China and Russia, which would create many headaches for America and Western Europe. According to Trump, the war between Russia and Ukraine may not have broken out, but he has not said how and has not made it clear how he intends to end it.

One thing is certain, however: the real enemy, present and future, of the United States is not Russia, but China. And Washington’s real problem is to ensure that China and Russia do not join forces. This outcome, according to Biden, could have been achieved by the economic and financial weakening of Russia through the war in Ukraine, for which the European countries compacted and submitted to/accepted the US-British dictate imposing sanctions on Moscow and bringing Ukraine into NATO. Such an outcome would weaken Russia so much that it would no longer represent a “reliable” ally for China, thus distancing Moscow from Beijing and bringing it closer to the West again. On the other hand, it was clear that, apart from former Prime Minister Medvedev’s outbursts about using the atomic bomb against the West if the war in Ukraine turned into a NATO war against Russia, the real interest of the Western powers in the context of the Russia-Ukraine war was never to wage war against Russia. One only has to look at the arms stockpiles in the United States, the United Kingdom and the EU countries, starting with Germany and France, to realise that none of these powers is currently prepared for a third world war. But that does not mean that they – as are Russia, China and even ‘peaceful’ India – are not preparing for a world war.

In fact, the Russo-Ukrainian war has served far more than the wars in Afghanistan, Iraq or Libya to test the military, political and organisational capabilities of the various protagonists on the real war field. Though it has in a sense emptied the Western arsenals, it has also provided an opportunity to get rid of old and outdated weaponry, to test new generation weaponry, to field and test unmanned aircraft – the famous drones – and to test on the

battlefield the resilience of ground troops in a war that has rapidly turned into a war of attrition, a trench warfare, proving that it is on the ground that war is ultimately won or lost.

With Trump in the White House, aside from his unpredictability, a number of issues are coming back to the fore that are decisive for the future of the imperialist powers. The question of Europe, i.e. of the attempts at political and military cementation that EU member states would or could implement, and the interest on the US side in keeping Europe in general subordinate to Washington’s policy. The question of Germany, which in a united or non-united Europe, is and always will be of great importance. The question of Russia, i.e. whether this power will become a weak or strong link in the Western bloc led by the United States or in the Eastern bloc led by China. The question of NATO, that is to say, the question of a military organisation that will or will not hold up in the face of the escalating contrasts between the various imperialist powers, contrasts that will inevitably lead to the disintegration of the current alliances and their regroupment. The question of the Middle East, where economic, financial, political and military contrasts are concentrated, which can at any moment turn into an occasion for war, both for the local and for the world order – as is already happening in the case of Israel’s activities not only against the Palestinians, but also against all the forces and all the countries under the influence of Iran, that ‘enemy at the doorstep’. The question of the Indo-Pacific, a region which will have an ever greater weight in the relations and contrasts between all the imperialist powers, and which is likely to acquire the importance that the Atlantic had in the last century. The question of Africa, a continent brimming with natural wealth, coveted by the advanced capitalisms, and in which China and Russia have been asserting themselves for some time now, acquiring for themselves territories formerly under the influence of the old colonial powers, and for which the United States has not formulated a major investment and intervention plan; on the contrary, with the first Trump administration and then with the Biden administration, it has substantially reduced its economic and diplomatic engagement on the continent. The protectionist policy that will characterise the Trump administration, in line with its election promises, will likely tend to keep Africa increasingly mar-

(Continued on page 10)

Russia-Ukraine War: Imperialist Peace on the Horizon...

(Continuation from page 9)

ginalised from US priorities.

And finally, domestic questions in the United States, for which Trump, in an effort to win the votes of the working class and middle class, has pushed hard for the need to improve their living conditions by fighting inflation, i.e. the rising cost of living, and by increasing tariffs against imports from abroad (especially from Germany, Europe in general and China).

The other aspect of the problem concerns immigration, towards which the Trump White House will adopt a much more directly repressive policy than Biden; the announced large-scale *deportation* of hundreds of thousands of illegal immigrants, which was one of the main themes of his election campaign, will most likely be severely curbed, since the US economy – like that of any other country – needs to exploit large layers of proletarians illegally residing on US territory whose price of labour is considerably cheaper compared to that of resident proletarians: firstly, because they are blackmailable not only economically, but also socially, and secondly because they are used as a weapon to put pressure on the price of labour of regularly employed and unionised proletarians.

For America, as for Europe or China, the coming years do not appear to be years of economic expansion, but years in which the fight against the overproduction crisis will be even tougher than before. The long-awaited *growth*, which is increasingly indicated to be more or less around zero compared with the previous year... will not be the common denominator of the most advanced economies; what is more, it will be the concern of all the advanced economies, and will force the ruling bourgeoisie to put more and more pressure on the proletarian class to extract more and more surplus value from its labour, and to fight foreign competition by all means, including military ones. And since social tensions will tend to increase, war will become a *permanent* reality not only in areas outside Europe or North America, but also within them. The various bourgeois factions will be forced to fight against each other in order to overwhelm the rival interests; that does not mean that there will be a war of all against all, but that just as monopolies, trusts, multinationals have developed in the economic field, so the blocs

under the aegis of the prevailing imperialism are developing and will develop in the political-military field.

One bloc, which the media has taken to calling “Western” and which was formed since the onset of the Second World War around imperialist England and France, has grown been taking shape under US domination. The other imperialist bloc, which opposed it, was formed around Hitler’s Germany and Hirohito’s Japan; the Mussolini’s Italy, which always was an unreliable partner, proved it once again when the war turned in favour of the Allies. Another bloc was the Stalinized Soviet Union.

These three blocs fought each other, first in the field of political and economic rivalry, then directly in the military field; with Russia’s move away from an agreement with Germany to an agreement with the United States, after Germany suddenly attacked it, it was effectively reduced to two opposing blocs. It is not excluded that this will not be repeated in a future world war conflict, quite possibly not in the same form. And it is with this latter prospect in mind that Trump’s America may be seeking a future switch of sides: it would, in fact, be far more advantageous for America to confront China by having Russia on its side than to face China and Russia in a solid enemy bloc.

AFTER THE IMPERIALIST WAR, THE IMPERIALIST PEACE

The imperialist peace that Trump says he is striving for in the Russia-Ukraine war could go in this direction: to lure Russia into the Western sphere of influence with the aim of withdrawing it from China’s sphere of influence. Of course, to pull Russia towards the West, given its inevitable lust for economic territories that drove it to war with Ukraine, and given that the war is going in Russia’s favour and against the oft-proclaimed Ukrainian and Western “victory”, the armed conflict must be brought to an end in order for negotiations to begin. For peace negotiations to have a chance of success, and since neither the US nor Europe, let alone Russia and China, are interested in an all-out war today, only those pieces of Ukraine that Russia has already annexed are at stake: Crimea and part of the Donbas.

We are entering the third year of the war, and the West is the most bogged down and without a winning way out;

the Americans, the British and the Germans admit this more or less openly. Ukraine has, in fact, played a minor role in all this from the very beginning; its illusion was that it might one day sit at the table of the powerful as an equal, given the hundreds of thousands of dead on the scales and the considerable amount of the country that will have to be reconstructed to the benefit of the Euro-American capitalists who have already set about dividing the cake. There is nothing better than reconstructing a ruined country to give breath to the capitalist economy.

So what happens next is more about *how* than *when* to end this war. It is obvious that it will be the Americans and the Russians who will dictate the terms; they are the ones who must find common ground, and this can only be to the detriment of Ukraine; the only thing for it to do will be to “rejoice” once again in its “independence”, “territorial sovereignty” and in its economic and “peaceful” economic revival on a truncated territory compared to 1991.

It could probably end up like the 1953 war between North and South Korea, when a red line was drawn that neither side was allowed to cross; more likely, however, it will resemble a split that will be continually explosive and that will neither be accepted in the Donbass by Ukrainians nor by the Russian-speaking population, and which the Russians might treat like the Israelis treat the Palestinian territories. A Russian-Ukrainian peace will be a war truce rather than a period of peaceful development for both countries.

THE CLASS STRUGGLE OF THE PROLETARIAT IS MISSING

No agreement between ruling and imperialist bourgeoisies has brought or is bringing benefits to populations dragged into conflicts between states, let alone the peace and prosperity hypocritically touted as the fruit of the good will of the rulers. Only the class struggle of the proletariat of the countries going to war and transnational proletarian solidarity have a chance of stopping the imperialist war and turning it into the only war with which real peace can be achieved: the civil war, the class war of the proletariat against its own bourgeoisie and against the bourgeoisies of the other warring countries. The proletarian revolution in Russia in October 1917, in the midst of the world imperialist war, proved precisely by proletarian class struggle and civil war against the war-mongering classes at home, by the suc-

(Continued on page 15)

— Canada —

Lessons from the strike at Canada Post

After a month-long walkout, the Canadian government decided to break the strike of Canada Post workers. It was a relatively massive movement, since all 55,000 proletarians working at the post office nationwide – from Halifax on the east coast to Vancouver on the west coast – were on a general strike: with a few exceptions, mail completely stopped being delivered. Looking back on this month-long strike may be of interest to combative proletarians around the world, because, firstly, this strike is fully in line with a certain revival of workers' struggles in North America and, secondly, certain political lessons can already be drawn from the struggle of Canada Post's proletarians.

MEDIA BLUDGEONING: THE DOMINANT IDEOLOGY AT WORK

From the beginning, the postal workers' struggle was met by a ruling class united in its determination to crush the workers on strike and reject their demands. The media, in particular, carried out a grandiose ideological work in favor of the bourgeoisie. Indeed, the general media coverage of the strike portrayed the striking proletarians as privileged, rich, spoiled babies who would beg the state for even more whims, whims whose financial burden would ultimately fall on the shoulders of that mysterious, intangible being - mysterious and intangible because abstractly positioned outside the fundamental conflict between classes: the taxpayer.

We were treated to a clever ideological reversal of social reality by bourgeois propaganda. Since at least the 2008 crisis, and even more concretely since the Covid-19 pandemic, the living and working conditions of all proletarians - including Canada Post workers - have been deteriorating on all fronts (increased pace of work, longer working day, widespread use of "flexible" working hours, real wage cuts, inflation, etc.). In other words, while the working class as a whole is drastically impoverished and loses the few reserves it could possibly have had at its disposal, the media have targeted a particular sector of the proletariat that has courageously decided to initiate the struggle to defend itself against capitalist exploitation, the very exploitation that is causing the constant deterioration of their living conditions.

These workers, who have set out to confront the bourgeoisie and its state using the proletariat's "natural" weapon – the strike – *at a time when the bourgeoisie's profits have never been so high*, are referred to by the media and politicians as privileged and spoiled children, holding society hostage and hindering its smooth running. But, in the end, the function of the media is to con-

ceal the true enemy of the proletarians – the bourgeoisie – and to propose a fantasized enemy: the supposedly lazy, supposedly overpaid, supposedly parasitic worker who refuses to tighten his belt for the good of the Nation. In brief, a worker whom all sane sectors of the nation – labour aristocracy, petit-bourgeois and big bourgeoisie – unanimously condemn and fight.

In short, the media are advocating national unity against the proletarian struggles, a national unity that is even more vital to prepare as international imperialist rivalries intensify and the danger of war shows more concretely its face. In other words, the bourgeoisie is seeking to subdue all proletarians that are fighting to defend their exclusive class interests and thus put them back on the "right path" of defending the imperialist homeland.

This ideological reversal of social reality is also expressed in the various crocodile tears shed for the supposed collateral victims of the strike. Weeping tears are being shed because the post office strike is allegedly hampering the various Christian charities in their good works for the needy on Christmas Eve. "They are such egoists, these Canada Post workers who prevent good people from giving money to the poor!", say the good Christians in unison. Behind this staggering hypocrisy, it must be reiterated that charity solves in no way the problem of poverty; it gives a clear conscience to the philanthropic bourgeoisie, who can then continue its exploitation of proletarians – the real material root of poverty – with a clear head.

Obviously, for the good Christian souls, action against poverty is a laudable goal, except – precisely – when proletarians decide to join forces and fight collectively to halt their impoverishment, as the postal workers did. The media also mourn the fate of the poor petit-bourgeois (owners of small and medium-sized enterprises, SME) who see their businesses slow down because of the strike. These "selfish"

Canada Post workers are hindering them in their pursuit of the common goal of every petit-bourgeois: to one day become part of the big bourgeoisie, and to enrich themselves indefinitely from exploited proletarian labor.

There are two political observations to be made about this bourgeois media bludgeoning. Firstly, it reveals the hypocrisy of the ruling class, which shout from the rooftops that Canada Post is an archaic, loss-making enterprise, i.e. that it will no longer be of any economic use, and that we should therefore massively restructure this industrial sector full of "lazy" (read combative) workers. Of course, the same people who cry about the obsolescence of the post office service are also the same ones who complain that the worker's strike is hampering the smooth running of the national economy. If they are no longer of any use, then how is it that the strike by these workers bothers the bourgeoisie so much? In reality, behind the managerial rhetoric criticizing Canada Post's archaic operations, there is a full-scale attack on the working conditions of postal workers. Proletarians in struggle must become more clearly aware of the fact that the profits of the ruling class and their working conditions are inversely proportional: the more capitalist profits increase, the more the living and working conditions of the proletariat deteriorate.

Second observation: the ideal strike for the ruling class is a strike that does not disturb, a strike that in no way hinders the smooth running of capitalist society, in short, a strike that is not a strike at all. This is exactly why union collaborationism – labour lieutenants of the capitalist class, as Lenin correctly described opportunism (1) – has made a business out of harmless symbolic processions: isolated strikes, rotating strikes, scattered days of action, walk-outs outside normal working hours – all sanctified moments of supposed escalation of leverage tactics.

The function of such means of action, which are antithetical to all forms of proletarian struggle, is well known to all proletarians who courageously enter the fight. The aim is to dissipate workers' anger and combativeness in order to protect social peace, what union collaborationism shamefully calls social dialogue. But a real strike, the proletariat's historic weapon for de-

(Continued on page 12)

— Canada —

Lessons from the strike at Canada Post

(Continuation from page 11)

fending its working conditions, is precisely a strike that disturbs as much as possible, to oppose the bourgeoisie with the most vigorous balance of power possible. In this sense, by using the weapon of the general strike, just as some teachers in Quebec did at the end of 2023 (2), the postal workers' strike, despite its certain shortcomings and its trial and error linked more to decades of union class collaboration than to a lack of militant generosity on the part of proletarians, shows the way for future struggles by all sectors of the proletariat throughout the world.

CRACKDOWN

One could have thought that the government would have moved quickly to enact special law right at the start of the strike, proclaiming Canada Post workers as “essential workers” and thus violently taking away the workers their right to strike. However, unlike the last postal strikes in 2011 and 2018, which were quickly outlawed by the governments of the time, the current ruling class opted for a different strategy in the first instance. Canada Post management used the legal gray zone between two collective bargaining agreements to lay off several workers in retaliation for the strike. Obviously, the victims of these politically motivated layoffs were the newly-hired workers, the precarious, the part-timers, in short, the workers at the very bottom of the company ladder.

Management's aim was none other than to create divisions among the strikers in order to weaken the strike. By attacking only the “little newcomers”, it was hoped to foster an aristocratic mindset among the older, more senior workers, which would disassociate them from their younger class brothers, reflexes of the “we do not give a damn about the young kids, what matters is only us, the fully-fledged employees” type. At the same time, they were hoping to get the younger, more energetic and most likely more combative workers off the picket lines. In cases like this, we must not hesitate to concretely put forward the solidarity and unity between all proletarians, regardless of status, which is an absolute necessity for the struggle. We must unconditionally challenge all lay-

offs, we must keep in touch with dismissed workers by inviting them to continue picketing, and we must avoid all forms of discrimination against those younger in age and seniority, including in our own ranks.

Although it lasted longer, the strike of 2024 was finally suppressed by the cleaver of a special law, just as it was in 2011, just as it was in 2018. Indeed, postal workers were obliged by the state to return to work after their one-month strike, and they effectively are not allowed to strike again until May 2025. This date is not insignificant: the government is aiming to kill two birds with one stone. By breaking a month-long strike today, the government has succeeded in demolishing the militant momentum and the economic balance of power that the workers on strike had managed to build. By formally restoring the right to strike in May 2025, the government knows full well that summer and the vacation season will soon be upon us, creating a situation that is hardly conducive to a resumption of worker mobilization. It has to be said that, for the time being, the government is winning all the way.

But it's worth taking a brief step aside here to consider a fundamental difference between the current strike movement at Canada Post and those that immediately preceded it. During the strikes of 2011 and 2018, workers' legitimate demands regarding their living and working conditions were partially invisibilized by the struggle to defend Canada Post as a universal public service. This was obviously a trap for proletarians working at the post office, since the political orientation put forward by union collaborationism, relayed politically by the reformist left, was the defense of the supposedly more progressive and fairer nationalized public capitalist enterprise. In other words, postal workers were being instrumentalized out of the legitimate and exclusive defence of their working conditions and pushed into the interclassist defence of the rights of Canada Post users. In other words, postal workers were being ordered to jump on the bandwagon of the national capitalist economy in its “welfare state” form.

The demand for the defense of public services is a trap for workers in that it chains proletarians in struggle to the

altar of “national well-being”, which is nothing more than the overall interest of the bourgeoisie in promoting the smooth running of capitalist society. Proletarians in struggle must never follow union leaderships when they try to bend over backwards to win media favour and avoid upsetting users of other workplaces. Proletarians in struggle must not look for solidarity in the interclassist multitude of public opinion; they will not find it there. True solidarity must be sought among other workers in struggle, as well as among those who are suffering and feel the need to fight without necessarily being able to enter the struggle immediately.

Rejecting the terrain of the defense of public service and fighting exclusively for the defense of working conditions represents, compared to the strikes of 2011 and 2018, a notable political advance for Canada Post workers, one that highlights the very relative but real resurgence of working class combativity in North America. It is also a political lesson that points the way for all struggling proletarians around the world, especially those in the public and parapublic sectors who are the most likely to face this kind of bourgeois blackmailing.

THE BOURGEOISIE'S GOAL: CREATE COMPETITION BETWEEN PROLETARIANS IN ORDER TO INCREASE EXPLOITATION.

The current labour dispute is emblematic of the unanimous desire of all of the bourgeoisie to bring workers to heel and make them pay the price of the current economic crisis. In concrete terms, Canada Post intends to generalize flexible working hours, multiply the number of precarious statuses for newly-hired workers, inaugurate weekend work, increase work rates, lower real wages, etc., with the aim of making the public service more profitable. But Canada Post's determination to impose such restructuring of working conditions did not come out of nowhere. In bourgeois circles, one is always inspired by the “best” of the competition, valuing innovation and new entrepreneurial practices. The yardstick for measuring bourgeois success is invariably the amount of profit made. It has to be said that in the parcel delivery market, companies like Amazon are the most successful.

This company, the figurehead of hi-tech capitalism, dynamism, innovation and a host of other antiquated bourgeois values, is nonetheless renowned for the bestial exploitation it inflicts on its work-

ers in its gigantic warehouses - imposing absolutely infernal cadences - as well as on its workers on the roads, who work hours worthy of the 19th century. Let us reiterate once again the intrinsic link between profits and working conditions: Amazon makes humongous profits precisely because its workers are hyperexploited.

Canada Post management's attack on its workers can not be understood in isolation from the fierce competition between different bourgeois fractions in the parcel delivery market. In fact, what Canada Post is seeking to do is put proletarians in various production and distribution sectors in direct competition with each other. The bourgeoisie deems that the Post Office is not profitable enough, so it must draw inspiration from the best in competition to increase profits. To achieve this objective, the exploitation of postal workers simply has to be increased, by imposing measures that drastically deteriorate their working conditions.

DEMANDS AND MEANS OF STRUGGLE

The post office workers have every right to take up the fight against these bosses' attacks on their working conditions, which are designed to boost capitalist profits. They are not fighting to protect some supposed caste privilege, or because they consider themselves superior and more important than other workers, such as those at Amazon. They went on strike because they know instinctively that an attack on a particular sector of the proletariat is always an attack on the proletariat as a whole. And the proletarian riposte against the bourgeoisie can only come from a massive and united as possible strike.

Does the bourgeoisie want to pit the workers of Canada Post and Amazon against each other to worsen conditions for the proletariat as a whole? The fight-back must be organized in solidarity with proletarians in direct competition, such as those at Canada Post and Amazon, but even more so with other sectors in struggle (daycare workers, hotel industry, etc.) or potentially in struggle in the near future. Once again, the preferred means of defending working conditions and expressing solidarity with other proletarians is, of course, the strike: with no advance notice, no predetermined duration and including all workers in a workplace. Above all, we must seek solidarity with proletarians in other workplaces - no matter which ones - and avoid seeking the approval of overly bourgeois and paralyzing public opinion.

"The struggle for immediate demands (...) is a permanent terrain for rallying proletarian forces, for class practice, education and organization" (3) to then envisage a broader political struggle against the bourgeoisie and its state. Contrary to the various ultra-left deviations that deny the possibility of struggles for demands in the imperialist era, or that consider them all inherently counter-revolutionary, there is no contradiction between the legitimate struggles for demands of the proletariat on the one hand, and the ultimate goal of communism on the other (4). Fighting for demands can be the school of communism that Marx and Engels were talking about back in the day, provided, of course, that we put forward truly proletarian demands that will strengthen our ranks and permanently challenge on the immediate demands terrain the forces of union collaborationism, which will nip all struggles in the bud and galvanize the strength of the enemy class instead.

One of the best ways the unions currently use to blunt and dissipate struggles is to drag workers into the bourgeoisie's favorite terrain, i.e. legal and juridical terrain. This is exactly what the Canadian Union of Postal Workers (CUPW) is doing. Faced with the formal abrogation of its members' right to strike, the union intends to challenge the legality of this measure before various courts and other commissions set up by and for the bourgeoisie. This is the road to defeat, since even if the bourgeois courts were to recognize the illegal and repressive nature of the present special law, it would take the bureaucracy months, if not years, to pass judgment. Workers' anger will have long since fully dissipated.

In the best of all possible worlds, Canada Post workers should have rejected the special law and continued their strike, despite its now "illegal" nature. Obviously, the context, the level of combativity and the reality of militant forces did not allow for this option. So it is up to the postal workers to take advantage of the "truce" that has been forcibly imposed on them to refuse union demoralization on the legal front, and to continue the collective mobilization and rallying of militant energies in order to continue their strike movement at a later date.

Just as we must avoid the legal terrain, since it only dissipates workers' energy and fighting spirit, we must equally reject the terrain of *social dialogue* claimed by the unions and left-wing parties. Behind this "good-sounding" formula (which one is not in favor of dialogue - social dialogue, moreover!) lies

the ideological myth of a common destiny between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, a very stubborn myth stipulating that if the former prospers, the latter will necessarily reap the rewards; all that is needed then is to agree, through constructive and positive dialogue, on the terms of sharing prosperity. In other words, behind social dialogue lies *class collaboration*. This banner, which is proudly displayed by the unions fully integrated into the state, aims first of all to conceal the fact that the bourgeoisie prospers precisely thanks to the exploitation of the proletariat; the proletariat must not expect any benefits from bourgeois prosperity, as it will only result in sacrifice, suffering, pain and poverty. Then this myth aims to immediately extinguish any sparks of class conflict, i.e., to harness any proletarians with the slightest inclination to protest to the chariot of national concord.

Proletarians in struggle must rediscover the historical thread of class demands if they want to resume the efficient path of class struggle, and thus perhaps win a few economic concessions that will undoubtedly provide temporary relief in the current difficult social context. These class demands are quite simple: real wage increases, drastic reduction in the length of the working day, fixed working hours, equal status for all proletarians (regardless of age, sex, race, nationality, seniority, etc.), refusal of imposed part-time work, refusal of weekend and night work (with absolute exceptions), major reduction in work rates, rehiring of workers dismissed for strike action, etc.

Not only these demands are an immediate balm for the many workers' wounds caused by capitalist exploitation, but they enable the proletariat to regain its collective strength and unite around unitary economic demands. It is on this political terrain, with methods and demands that are truly class-based, that the International Communist Party intends to participate actively "in all of the struggles of the working class, including those arising from partial and limited interests, in order to encourage their development, but constantly highlighting their connection with the final revolutionary objectives and presenting the conquests of the class struggle as a bridge of passage to the indispensable struggles to come (...)" (5) for the destruction of this inhuman system and for the creation of a society without exploitation, without social classes, without money and without the state, a communist society. ●

— Canada —

Quebec Premier attacks immigrant proletarians, drawing inspiration from French policy

Premier François Legault's recent visit to France in early October was an opportunity for Quebec's provincial government to get in tune with the French state when it comes to immigration policies. Indeed, the various French governments of the past have a long history of enacting repressive policies against foreign workers. The latest "Darmanin law" adds a particularly racist and anti-worker layer, as it is the culmination of particularly aggressive attacks by the bourgeoisie targeting the most exploited, precarious and dominated sections of the proletariat (1).

This is the context in which Legault draws his reactionary political inspiration in France. In Quebec, as in France, the problem would be, as certain sectors of the Quebec and French bourgeoisies sing the same song, immigration on a too massive scale. And Legault intones: "*I heard Emmanuel Macron say last week that the French were feeling pushed around by immigration. I feel exactly the same way about Quebecers* (2)."

The Quebec government is using immigration to titillate Quebecers' already sensitive nationalist and chauvinist fiber. Playing on the fact that within Canada, francophones have historically had a position of relative inferiority to anglophones, immigration is becoming, in the eyes of the Conservatives of the Coalition Avenir Québec (CAQ) - the party currently in power - an existential danger for the Quebec nation. Legault's statement during his visit to France is aimed directly at the Canadian federal government, accusing it of deliberately flooding Quebec with immigrants. The Legault government is positioning itself as the victim within Canada, playing the xenophobic card of Quebecers' "identity insecurity". In other words, the federal government would deliberately send too many immigrants who are foreign to Western culture (and therefore a danger to civilization in general) and who don't speak French (and therefore a danger to the Quebec nation in particular), in order to further reduce the weight of francophones within Quebec and Canada. Once again, immigrants become the scapegoats for the quarrels between Canadian and Quebecois chauvinism.

What is Legault proposing? Quite simply, to deport half of the 160,000 or so asylum seekers currently on Quebec

soil to other Canadian provinces. Similarly, Legault intends to draw inspiration from French anti-immigration laws by asking "*Ottawa to set up waiting zones for asylum seekers as it is done in France* (...) (3)". In other words, Legault is asking the federal government to set up the kind of detention centers that the bourgeoisie euphemistically and cynically calls "waiting zones" - which, by the way, are nothing more than prisons - in which irregular migrant proletarians are locked up until they can be deported, a practice now commonplace in France and elsewhere in Europe.

In short, the Legault government wants to put forward a frankly reactionary and racist policy, aimed directly at undermining the potential unity of the working class and its struggles, by using immigrant populations as a convenient political scarecrow. Indeed, "[b]y attacking the immigrant part of the proletariat in particular, the bourgeoisie is attacking the proletariat as a whole (4)." In other words, when the Quebec government carries out specific attacks on migrant and undocumented workers, it does so to kill two birds with one stone: firstly, to attack the living and working conditions of immigrant proletarians in order to further increase the exploitation of those who are able to stay, and to drastically weaken the existence of those who are expelled; secondly, to hitch Quebec workers to the wagon of national concord and class collaboration, by making them believe that immigrants are the source of their socio-economic difficulties.

Proletarians must reject this chauvinist blackmailing imposed by the Quebec bourgeoisie, which aims to divide them in order to attack them more effectively; they form a single international class - whatever their ethnic, religious or national origin - whose defense of living and working conditions imperatively requires the solidarity of **all** proletarians against their direct bosses in the workplace first of all, but even more so against the national bourgeoisie as a whole from a more general point of view. The struggle against all immigration controls is therefore a struggle that must mobilize all proletarians, not because it would be a moral duty to "claim timeless, democratic and humanitarian ideals such as 'freedom', 'equality', 'right', but because it is an internationalist re-

quirement intrinsic to the class struggle "to unite the proletarian ranks, notably by making native workers understand the necessity, for the very needs of the struggle of the entire working class, of rejecting any situation of privilege, any discrimination and any maneuver of division on the part of the bourgeoisie (5)"

Against immigration control, against chauvinist policies,

Against discrimination and evictions,

For the freedom of movement for migrant workers!

Against class collaboration and national unity!

For the unification of all proletarians, for the exclusive defense of proletarian interests!

October, 20th 2024 ●

(1) See our text "Class struggle against the immigration law and all attacks against workers!", 18 Jan 2024.

(2) <https://www.ledevoir.com/politique/quebec/821007/reçu-premier-ministre-francais-matignon-legault-discute-i> *Our translation.*

(3) <https://ici.radio-canada.ca/nouvelle/2109456/francois-legault-france-matignon-immigration-barnier>. *Our translation.*

(4) "Proletarian solidarity against immigration control", *Le Prolétaire* brochure no. 12, January 1980, https://pcint.org/40_pdf/18_publication-pdf/FR/12_contre-controle-immigration.pdf, p. 15. (in French)

(5) *Ibid.*, p. 18.

Lessons from the strike at Canada Post

(Continuation from page 13)

Notes:

(1) Lenin, *The Tasks of the Third International*, <https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1919/jul/14.htm>

(2) See « Grève dans la Fonction Publique au Québec » in *Le Prolétaire*, # 552, février-mars-avril 2024, p. 19-20.

(3) *Pour des méthodes et des revendications de classe – Orientations pratiques d'action syndicale*, Paris, Brochure Le Prolétaire # 16, 1981, p. 4.

(4) "Theses on the Tactics of the Communist Party of Italy (Rome theses -1922)", in *Communist Program*, # 8, February 2022, p. 20.

(5) "Theses Project Presented by the Left to the Third Congress of the Communist Party of Italy (Lyon Theses - 1926)", in *Communist Program*, # 9, May 2023, p. 30.

Russia-Ukraine War: Imperialist Peace on the Horizon...

(Continuation from page 10)

successful conquest of political power, that it could impose peace on the “enemy” even at the cost of territorial loss; a peace which, on the other hand, had to be strenuously defended against the constant attacks of the imperialist armies, calling on the proletarians of all countries to revolution in their own countries.

The present historical situation, with decade after decade of wars being waged in all corners of the world, is quite different from that in which the European and Russian proletariat fought on revolutionary terrain against their ruling bourgeoisies in the first two decades of the last century. The Russian, European and world proletariat, betrayed in those years by Social-Democratic and Stalinist opportunism, was systematically subordinated to the interests of its national bourgeoisies – be they fascist, democratic or falsely “socialist”. It accepted even the supreme sacrifices as every war requires under the illusion that it could access the general well-being by virtue of the greatness and economic strength of the “fatherland”. After the carnage of the Second World War, benefiting from the crumbs that the most powerful imperialists decided to bestow on them to satisfy their most urgent needs, the proletarians of the most developed capitalist countries, no longer had the strength to reconnect with the great class and revolutionary traditions of previous proletarian generations. Constantly confirmed in the illusion of the peaceful development of democracy and enjoying the benefits of all sorts of social shock absorbers, generation after generation they got used to not only and not so much thinking like the bourgeoisie and petty bourgeoisie, but also having the same ambition to build individual future on their personal careers; they got used to regard proletarians from other industries, other enterprises, other nationalities, as competitors against whom the same means have to be applied as those used by capitalists and the bourgeoisie in general in the competitive struggle against their opponents and other bourgeoisies. Not only has the sense of belonging to the same class been obliterated and buried by decades of inter-class collaborationism, but the proletarian solidarity that once united proletarians of all conditions and nationalities has been completely lost. The millions of proletarians bombed and maimed in the bourgeois

wars seem to belong to other worlds; they are shut up between the four walls of their homes, carefully guarding their individual interests. Nothing worse could happen to the international proletarian class, before which all the governments of the world trembled in the 1920s.

But the war, with its horrors and disastrous consequences for the daily life of the proletarians, will mercilessly gnaw at their apathy and impel them to react for the sake of mere survival. Their vanguards will have to re-find the connection with the class struggle of the last century, and it cannot be ruled out that this will not happen thanks to the young proletariat from the East or Africa.

November 15th 2024 ●

(1) The Donbass region can be found written with either two final s's or one; with the two final s's it is the translation of the name into Russian, with a final s it is the translation of the

name into Ukrainian. It simply means *Donetskyi basin* (lit. ‘basin of the Donets’, i.e. the river that flows through the region).

(2) On this subject see *Guerra russo-ucraina. Sono i piani di guerra, non di «pace», al centro degli interessi dell'imperialismo mondiale, sempre più immerso in contrasti irrisolvibili se non con la guerra* (*Il comunista*, No. 178, June–August 2023).

(3) Last September, the *Wall Street Journal* wrote that, as of 2022, the number of Ukrainians and Russians killed and wounded in the war, which has been going on for two and a half years, had reached approximately one million people; this is an estimate, as neither Moscow nor Kiev provide precise information. <https://www.rainews.it/maraton/2024/09/kubilius-nuovo-commissario-ue-alla-difesa-mosca-e-una-minaccia-aumentare-le-spese-militari-59d309f5-1bd9-453e-939e-07380f72827b.html>. September 18th 2024.

(4) *Ibid*, 18.09.2024.

(5) See <https://www.panorama.it/news/dal-mondo/trump-accusa-Zelensky-guerra-ucraina>, October 18th, 2024.

(6) *Ibid*.

(7) See *il Fatto Quotidiano*, October 27, 2024.

The Middle East : Israel, the armed arm of US imperialism, wages war against all those who oppose Washington's global power interests, in whose shadow Israel's regional power interests emerge

(Continuation from page 1)

have bowed to the inexorable advance of capitalism and have thus become, in fact, the pillars on which the new bourgeois classes rest to exert their power and control over the dominated population. The strength of the Middle Eastern bourgeois classes depends to a large extent on the control they are able to exert over their own population, and, given the extremely contradictory but inexorable progress of capitalism, over the relatively young, but, potentially uncontrollable proletariat, whose survival, given its rural origins was destroyed not only by violent capitalist expropriation but also by the concentration of increasingly conflicting imperialist interests in those territories. The history of the transformation of the Palestinian peasant masses into proletarian masses, a people without reserves and without country, expresses the

sharpest culmination of the process of the social development of capitalism in the Middle East; this development could not and cannot fail to bring about permanent armed conflicts and wars of now these local bourgeoisies and then other local ones, in which temporary truces and temporary frontiers, temporary *orders* are constantly challenged, and which from being *local* increasingly take on a *world* dimension. Wars and truces that the imperialist powers themselves – representing, through their financial, political and military interventions, the main agents of chaos in the Middle East – are no longer able, like the sorcerer, to control.

We will not discuss here the long history of wars and so-called peace agreements that have marked the last the Israeli siege, with food, hospitals and, to some extent, employment oppor-

(Continued on page 16)

**The Middle East :
Israel, the armed arm
of US imperialism,
wages war against all
those who oppose
Washington's global
power interests, in
whose shadow Israel's
regional power
interests emerge**

(Continuation from page 15)

tunities. The more than 42 000 civilians who have been killed by the bombing, the thousands of wounded and sick, the population constantly being moved from one place to another in this strip of land that has become a huge concentration camp, exposed to hunger and every kind of disease because of the lack of minimal medical care, since almost all the hospitals have been destroyed, as well as the schools and, in general, all the buildings in which in addition to the many civilians, Hamas militiamen could also take refuge, indicate nothing other than that Israel intends to bring its 'final solution' to an end: reduce the surviving population of Gaza to the point where it agrees to submit completely to Jewish rule even on its own soil, and then proceed also against the population of the West Bank. It is not for nothing that the Netanyahu government has ignored the pressure from Biden and the grumbling Europeans for a ceasefire, to allow the passage of trucks carrying aid to the civilian population, to limit itself only to strikes against Hamas militias and not against the civilian population, and to negotiate the return home of hostages still in Hamas hands. Netanyahu had already asserted Israel's goals unequivocally in his speech to the UN on 22 September 2023— just days before Hamas invaded southern Israel: to extend Israeli territory from the Jordan River to the Mediterranean (in the prospect of a 'new Middle East'), encompassing the West Bank and Gaza, East Jerusalem and the Golan Heights, as the starting point for a new 'peace' project (3).

**THE USA AS THE INSTIGATOR,
ISRAEL AS THE KILLER**

While the bombing of Gaza continued and Egypt closed its borders with Gaza to prevent any Palestinian from escaping the bombing by taking refuge in Egyptian territory, Israel was preparing to invade southern Lebanon to destroy Hezbollah's military bases; at the same time, Israel's threat to strike military and nuclear bases in Iran — as a

major supporter of Hamas, Hezbollah and the Yemeni Houthis allied against Tel Aviv — has made the White House considerably alarmed, which wishes anything but for the outbreak of war with Iran to set the entire Middle East on fire at this delicate time of the presidential election.

However, Israel's actions also correspond — since Washington has replaced London and Paris in the domination of the region— to the fundamental interests of the United States, even if they have failed to pursue them in recent years in accordance with the timetable given by their plans for world domination and international relations. There is no doubt that if Israel did not rely on the financial, political and military support of the United States, it would not be able to act as the regional power feared by all countries in the Middle East region, and it would not be able to pursue an unlimited oppressive and racist policy against Palestinians and Arab population in the territory of Palestine. Unumpteenth example is given by the war waged in Gaza not so much against Hamas, but against the Palestinian population as such, in which the armaments and specialist support provided to Israel have played and continue to play a decisive role. On the subject of US arms supplies, *Il Fatto Quotidiano* of 22 October 2024 writes: "Bombs and munitions (including ten thousand of the infamous highly explosive Mk-80 series warheads) directly used in Gaza, which Brown University estimates at \$17.9 billion (unlike Ukraine, the White House does not publicly quantify the aid provided to its Israeli ally). The United States has also deployed 42,000 Marines and dozens of naval ships and aircraft carriers in the region to deter Iran and repel attacks by its proxies against ships in the Red Sea or against Israel". This is not to diminish Israel's full responsibility for the massacres of the population in Gaza, but it is clear that the Israelis are fulfilling the role of killers of the US, even for their own specific interests; they did the dirty work that the White House has kept away from and which it has disguised with its statements about "two nations, two states", about "humanitarian corridors" to be provided for the systematically bombed population, about negotiations for the return of hostages, about "plans" for the post-war period after the war "against Hamas is over", etc. etc. But it is not just about artillery and bombs. Intelligence is increasingly becoming a decisive factor in modern warfare. After the 7 October 2023 massacre by Hamas, "the Pentagon", writes *il Fatto Quotidiano*, quoted again, "discreetly dispatched several dozen special forces soldiers (...). A few days later, a group of agents arrived directly

from Langley, Virginia, headquarters of the CIA". It is Biden himself who admits to the direct US involvement in the Israeli-Palestinian war: "Shortly after the October 7 massacres, I ordered special operations personnel and our intelligence professionals to work hand in hand with their Israeli counterparts to help locate and track down Sinwar and other Hamas leaders hiding in Gaza" (quoted from *il Fatto Quotidiano*). In fact, US intelligence specialists have worked all over the war theatre, both to locate the hideouts of Hamas leaders, not only in Gaza, but also in Tehran and Damascus and Hezbollah hideouts in Lebanon, as well as mapping tunnels using super-modern drones and specialised radars for underground scanning. In the *quid pro quo* characteristic of bourgeois exchanges, it seems that the Americans have so far given more to Israel than Israel has given to the Americans; most recently this relates to the initiative that Tel Aviv is preparing to strike Iran's military, oil and nuclear bases, something that the White House does not want presently because it is not prepared to face up to a war in the Middle East, which would certainly involve Russia and China, undermining relations with many of the Arab countries in the Middle East and North Africa, with the BRICS countries and with some European countries that do not fully identify with the White House's policy, such as Hungary, but also France and Spain.

As is so often the case with killers, Israel, in an attempt to push through its Greater Israel plan, has gone on a tear from the instigator the USA; part of this plan is the war in Lebanon against the Hezbollah militias, which in reality, as in Gaza, is a war against the entire civilian population of Lebanon and Beirut, through which Israel intends to occupy the southern part of Lebanon, which stretches from the Litani River to the current border with Israel. It was with this aim in mind that the the *Israel Defense Forces* (IDF) attacked the UNIFIL (UN Interim Force in Lebanon) (4) peacekeepers posts on the UN-mandated Israeli-Lebanese border (the "Blue Line") with the aim of preventing a military clash between the armies of the two countries in respect of mutual 'territorial sovereignty', disarming Hezbollah militias and assisting the civilian population in the area. As we know, the presence of the UNIFIL blue helmets has neither prevented the Hezbollah militias from continuing to arm themselves and launch rockets at Israeli towns near the border, nor has it prevented Israel from responding not only with ground troops but also, as it has done recently, with air strikes. It is clear that the 'peace missions' proclaimed by the world bourgeoisies assembled in the UN have never

been and will never be able to truly ensure peace in territories where political and military contrasts are always ready to flare up again (just think of the massacre of Bosnian Muslims in Srebrenica in Bosnia and Herzegovina by Bosnian Serbs during the war in the former Yugoslavia under the supervision of the Dutch blue helmets whose job was to protect them). Peace has never been in the DNA of any country's ruling bourgeois class: it is a temporary truce between armed clashes and wars that also take place far from states that flaunt "peace missions" all over the world.

The war that Israel has extended to Lebanon is not entirely in line with current American interests, although Israel might succeed in doing the same with Hezbollah after it defeated Hamas, which would largely neutralise the militias that Iran uses to keep Tel Aviv under constant pressure. As already mentioned, the White House has no intention of launching a war against Iran and plunging the entire Middle East into a state of ferocious violence. Too many economic and political interests would be undermined at a time when the situation does not allow Washington, moreover under the weight of the presidential election, a sufficient degree of control to defend its interests in the region. To a certain extent, however, this situation – which it would be wrong to interpret as the White House having got out of hand – reveals a certain weakness of the United States vis-à-vis its vassal/ally, which, in a region as strategically important as the Middle East, claims a freer hand in pursuing its specific interests. It is now apparent that the United States, while remaining the world's leading imperialist power, is no longer able to be, as it once was, decisively present financially and militarily in all the "stormy areas" of the world and to enforce to its exclusive benefit the actions of its allies: in fact, the US increasingly needs them to maintain its position as the world's leading player, but it cannot but grant to them a certain 'freedom of action', even though this 'freedom of action' may cost it much more than expected, not only in financial and economic terms, but also politically and diplomatically. And here it is worth recalling how Moshe Dayan, the "hero of the Six-Day War", interpreted the relationship that binds Israel to the United States: "*The Americans provide us with money, weapons and advice. We accept money, weapons and refuse advice*" (5).

THE UNITED STATES AND ISRAEL ARE IN GOOD COMPANY...

There are other major players to keep in mind.

China, as regarding the "Ukrainian

question", maintains an ambiguous position on Israeli moves, even though it had and still has an official position in favour of the "national rights of the Palestinian people". It has never made any secret of its great economic and political interest in the Middle East, the stability of which would enable it to strengthen economic and commercial ties with the various countries in the region; it is the largest buyer of oil from Iran and Saudi Arabia, to which it has committed itself to normalising their relations by pushing through the agreement signed by Tehran and Riyadh in Beijing on 10 March 2023. An agreement through which Riyadh intended to strengthen its political and military role in an increasingly unstable Middle East, while Tehran sought to return to an official role in relations between countries in the region. However, the deal, it seems, will not have an easy life given the war situation that Israel has unleashed against Gaza and Lebanon, highlighting the conflicting interests of the two regional powers; in fact, Tehran supports the Yemeni Houthis, who attack US merchant ships in the Red Sea and the Gulf of Aden in solidarity with the Palestinians, while Riyadh supports the government in Sana'a and continues to cooperate with the US, which for its part has engaged in a real naval battle against the Houthis. China, which Riyadh has called on to intervene to ease growing tensions with Tehran, reiterates in the UN Security Council the need to end Houthi attacks in the Red Sea at the same time as an end to Israeli bombardment of Gaza. The sheer wish...

Russia has seen a general decline in the world's attention to the war in Ukraine since Israel unleashed a general war on Gaza and now on Lebanon (even Zelensky has noticed this), but as early as October 2023 it was emphasising that "*every war today is in Russia's favour*", claiming that wars had now become the norm: "*Look, everybody is at war: Azerbaijan invaded Armenia and conquered Karabakh, Hamas attacked Israel, and Russia is solving its problems in Ukraine (...). We have entered the age of instability, and we have to get used to it*" (6). In practice, Moscow is saying that local conflicts will not be resolved any time soon and that there will always be war in one part of the world or another, in which, incidentally, the imperialist powers will inevitably become increasingly involved. But the reality of local wars, as we have repeatedly demonstrated in our press, has been present since the end of the Second World War, and the imperialist powers have rarely stayed out of them, on the contrary, they have often been their cause.

Russia has no interest in getting involved in the war between Israel and

the Palestinians, from which it has stayed away for decades; it has limited itself to "condemning" the Hamas attack of 7 October 2023 and criticising Israeli attacks in Gaza, while calling for a ceasefire since last November, as have all the other powers not directly involved in this war (Brazil, India, etc.). What Moscow is directly concerned about are its only Mediterranean military bases in Syria, the Hmeimim air base and the naval base at Tartous, and its increasingly close relations with Iran, with which there is a very strong trade exchange, particularly in military supplies. The close relations with Iran have, of course, damaged the relations, albeit mutually contradictory, that Moscow has had with Israel, especially after Israel began systematically bombing Gaza and recently expanded its military operations to southern Lebanon with its repeat invasion on 30 September this year.

As for some of the European powers, most recently the UK and Germany (7), they, after stressing that they stand by Israel and its "right to exist and to self-defence", and then making hackneyed speeches about Israel's "exaggerated military response" to the attack it experienced, about the need to get humanitarian aid to the civilian population of Gaza, and thus the need for a ceasefire to come to the aid of the civilian population being bombed, severely reduced the supply of weaponry to Israel (8), and concertedly warned Netanyahu not to expand the war even into Lebanon, let alone the entire Middle East. We have seen the force of this warning... the war has spread and arms and funds are still coming to Israel thanks to the United States.

As for France, it also hypocritically stressed "Israel's right to self-defence"

(Continued on page 18)

To Our Readers

Due to lack of space we are not able to publish in "Proletarian" all our English-language statements. Interested readers can find them under the "Statements" section of our website: <https://www.pcint.org>

CORRESPONDENCE

France: Programme, 15 Cours du Palais, 07000 Privas / **Italy:** Ed. Int., Via Comasina 81, 20161 Milano / **Spain:** Apdo. Correos 27023, 28080 Madrid / **Switzerland:** Please write to the address in France.

Registration number to the "commission paritaire de presse": 52926. Managing Editor: Dessus. **Payments:** by checks or international money, **order to:** Dessus. Printed on our press.

**The Middle East :
Israel, the armed arm
of US imperialism,
wages war against all
those who oppose
Washington's global
power interests, in
whose shadow Israel's
regional power
interests emerge**

(Continuation from page 17)

and thus the need to supply it with weapons; but after Israel shelled UNIFIL peacekeepers' positions in Lebanon to move a few kilometres to allow Tel Aviv troops to advance on the ground to fight Hezbollah militias, it announced on 5 October, through the mouth of President Macron in an interview on the radio station France Inter (while pro-Palestinian demonstrations were taking place in Paris, as throughout Europe), that it would stop the supply of weaponry: "Stop supplying Israel with the weapons it uses against Gaza. Terrorism is not fought by sacrificing civilians", but then the Elysee Palace was forced to clarify that Paris continues to supply "components necessary for the defence of Israel" (9).

And what about the Italian government of Meloni? Total compliance with the positions of Israel, which is considered a permanent victim of Arab and Islamic terrorism and therefore has every justification for a decisive military response against Hamas and its leaders (regardless of which country they take refuge in), especially in Gaza, and against the Hezbollah militias that continue to fire rockets and launch drones at Israel from Lebanon. There was, of course, no shortage of statements about the civilian victims of the bombing in Gaza and then in Lebanon; but these statements have the same bitter taste as those used for the migrants who are fleeing wars, oppression, torture and suffering and are crossing the sea in boats to the Italian shores, and who have been left to drown by the hundreds by the state precisely because it has not come to their aid; behind these statements there is genuine satisfaction that the 'enemies', whether Hamas and Hezbollah terrorists or immigrants driven by despair to Italian shores, are seriously affected. Of course, there was no lack of surprise that Israeli missiles were not only aimed at Hezbollah and the Lebanese, but also at Italian UNIFIL military posts: "this is unacceptable!" were Meloni's "harshes" words to Tel Aviv..., then everything continues as Tel Aviv wishes. It only takes a

few words from Foreign Minister Tajani to understand how much they care about the lives of Palestinian, Lebanese, Syrian civilians. At the "G7 Development" summit (10), held in Pescara from 22 to 24 October, which Tajani chaired, he gave the usual hypocritical hackneyed speech to the representatives of the imperialist interests present at the meeting, to which representatives of Israel, Lebanon and the Palestinian Authority were also invited: "We reiterate our position on the ceasefire, but the topic of the meeting is humanitarian aid. We are focusing our attention on [laying] the first piece in the mosaic to build peace"; and, after announcing an Italian aid programme of €25 million for Gaza, Lebanon and the Gaza reconstruction project (compared to the billion Italy has so far given to Ukraine for the war against Russia, these are crumbs), he underlines that "we will also have to think about organising a conference, as is the case with the reconstruction of Ukraine, to do the same for Gaza, but also for Lebanon and for those parts of northern Israel that have been hit". This is the real objective of every bourgeoisie: to prepare for the reconstruction of the areas and countries destroyed by the war that the ruling bourgeoisies themselves unleashed.

**DESTROY, MASSACRE,
DESTROY... ONE WAY OR
ANOTHER, IT WILL BE
RECONSTRUCTED, AND THE
MASSACRES WILL BE
FORGOTTEN...**

Bourgeois war always means destruction and massacres. Once the historical epoch of the national revolutions, through which the bourgeoisie brought about real progress in society, has passed, the bourgeoisie in every country has become warmongering, as Marx and Engels's *Manifesto* of 1848 confirms: *the bourgeoisie finds itself involved in a constant battle. At first with the aristocracy; later on, with those portions of the bourgeoisie itself, whose interests have become antagonistic to the progress of industry; at all time with the bourgeoisie of foreign countries.* We can only say that to the battle of the bourgeoisie against those portions of the bourgeoisie itself whose interests have become antagonistic to the progress of industry, we can add the battle with those portions of the bourgeoisie itself whose interests have become antagonistic to the interests of finance capitalism, which has developed precisely thanks to the development of the progress of industry.

As in the case of Ukraine, it is these gentlemen who rub their hands over the drawing up of billion-dollar plans for the reconstruction of what they have de-

stroyed. But the interest in Gaza and Lebanon, disguised as a humanitarian stance to deceive the local population and the domestic electorate, is not only in arms deals for a war that will inevitably last a long time, in testing all kinds of technologically super-modern weapons in the prospect of a world war and in testing the reliability and solidity of allies on both sides, but also in securing for the near future the large undersea natural gas deposits off Gaza and Lebanon. For any imperialist power, control of energy resources is of vital importance and is increasingly becoming a sufficient reason to wage war. Needless to say, Israel – in its vision of Greater Israel, which, according to the Hebrew Bible, stretches from the Mediterranean to the Euphrates, that is to say, comprising Palestine, Lebanon, Syria and Iraq – regards these deposits as its 'property', just as Turkey regards the deposits found off Cyprus. The transition from fossil fuels to renewable energy is going to take decades and decades, but capitalism cannot wait; while telling people that it is working on an energy transition and that it is fighting global warming, it is spending billions on oil and gas exploration and extraction, proving that it is a mode of production oriented towards the destruction of natural and social life on the planet.

**IT WILL BE THE
REVOLUTIONARY STRUGGLE
OF THE PROLETARIAT THAT
WILL BREAK OFF THE
BOURGEOIS WARS AND
OVERTHROW ITS POLITICAL
POWER**

How to put an end to this mode of production which only guarantees ever higher level of pollution and ever more widespread massacres?

Capitalism, in its unbridled and uncontrolled development, has nevertheless created the objective historical conditions for the next historical leap: it has given birth to associated labour in industry and wage labour – i.e. the class of the proletariat, the workers with no country, with no reserves – which, in comparison with previous modes of production, has meant a very powerful revolutionary advance in the development of social life, but which, in comparison with the general necessities of social life and well-being for all mankind, is at the same time an obstacle to any real human progress. The cyclical and war crisis into which bourgeois society plunges is proof of this. Yet, it is precisely the class of those with no reserves, with no country, the international class of the proletariat with its life-and-death struggle, that has the historical task that the bourgeois class had between 1600 and

1800: i.e., to revolutionise the whole of society from top to bottom.

Only that the new society that will emerge from the revolution of the proletariat will no longer have the task of permanently creating a ruling class and dominated classes, will no longer be based on the oppression of the great majority of human beings by a small minority of big capitalists, and will no longer have to manage social life through money, commodity production, production and reproduction of the class of workers subject to the dictatorship of capital. It will take advantage of the great industrial progress to direct it in principle towards satisfying the needs of social life and the well-being of all mankind, based on intelligent planning for the utilisation of natural and human resources in accordance with the laws of nature of which Man is a part.

Marxists call this society of the future **communism**, but to get there will require the complete overthrow of the present bourgeois power of the imperialist powers of the most powerful countries. Capitalism cannot be reformed, there is no capitalism with a human face: there is capitalism with its oppression, its inequalities, its wars, which still persists on the premise of crushing the proletariat into misery and despair. But it is precisely this misery, this despair, that the proletariat will at some point realise and will no longer tolerate because it will see no other way out but to blow up all the balances and imbalances of bourgeois society, certain that the new society which it will set in motion under the leadership of its class party, will truly represent the future not only of the proletariat, but of the whole of social Man, who will no longer be classified according to labour categorisation, since all will simply be workers – no longer wage labourers, no longer dependent on mercantile production and capital.

October, 23d 2024 ●

(1) On this subject, see the recent publication of the Reprint “Il comunista”, No. 19, “*Medio Oriente ‘questione palestinese’ e marxismo*”, dedicated to the Middle East and the Palestinian question.

(2) Cf. <http://www.ispionline.it/it/publicazione/usa-cina-russia-e-gli-altri-come-si-schiera-il-mondo-nella-guerra-hamas-israele-151114>.

(3) Cf. <https://www.fiammanirenstein.com/articoli/il-discorso-si-netanyahu-all-onu-tutto-nerl-campo-della-pace-5048.htm> (in *il Giornale*, 23 September 2023); and <https://www.valigiablu.it/relazioni-netanyahu-hamas/>, 28 November 2023

(4) Latest news: according to the *Financial Times*, as reported in *il Fatto Quotidiano* of 23.10.2024, it is suspected that the Israeli army “used white phosphorus, an incendiary chemical, close enough to injure 15 peacekeepers”, after having seen a report “drawn up by a country that supplies UNIFIL with troops”; this country is said to be Ghana, which has troops stationed next to a UNIFIL post entrusted to Italy.

(5) Cf. *La notte di Israele*, Limes, Italian geopolitical magazine, September 2024, p. 15.

(6) Cf. <https://www.asianews.it/notizie-it/La-Russia-tra-Israele-e-Palestina-59353.html>

(7) A few days after the start of the

war in Gaza, Chancellor Scholz declared, “Germany now has only one place, and that is alongside Israel. Germany’s history and the responsibility it bore in connection with the Holocaust oblige us to maintain Israel’s security and existence”. <https://it.euronews.com/2024/02/16/la-germania-puo-essere-imparziale-sulla-guerra-a-gaza>

(8) Cf. <https://it.indideover.com/war/after-GreatBritain-also-Germany-decides-no-more-weapons-at-Israel.html>, 19 September 2024.

(9) Cf. *il Fatto Quotidiano*, 6 October 2024.

(10) Cf. <https://askanews.it/2024/10/22/new-aires-and-reconstruction-the-Italian-road-to-gaza-andthe-libanon/>.

Syria: the tyrant is gone, the bourgeois and imperialist order remains

The flight of Bashar al-Assad, who has taken refuge in Moscow with his family, was greeted in Syria’s main cities by enthusiastic crowds cheering the fall of this bloody figure whose regime is responsible for their suffering and misery.

The Assads, father and son, maintained their so-called “progressive” power with an iron fist, never backing down from the most brutal repression, even before the civil war broke out. The civil war was accompanied by terrible destruction caused by the army, and it claimed almost 600,000 victims in 13 years. Of a population estimated at around 23 million, over 13 million were forced to flee their homes to seek refuge in other regions or abroad - 7 million, including 4 million in Turkey, 1 million in Lebanon, 1 million in Europe, etc. - 100 to 200,000 were imprisoned in the regime’s infamous jails, where they were subjected to ill-treatment, torture, rape and where summary executions were frequent. It’s easy to understand the almost general jubilation, with the exception of the privileged classes, at the fall of such a regime...

On the wave of the “Arab Springs”, large-scale movements for “democratic change” broke out in Syria in 2011. But the peaceful protest against the regime was violently and bloodily repressed by the police and security forces (the sinister Mukhabrats), resulting in over 2,500 deaths in 6 months. Despite the savagery of the repression, the Syrian authorities were unable to defeat an opposition that had reacted by forming armed groups. With the rebels advancing as far as the Damascus suburbs, the regime was in increasing difficulty; but it was saved by the intervention of the

Russian air force, Lebanese Hezbollah militias and the Iranian Revolutionary Guards. For their part, the rebel forces divided into rival “brigades”, often supported and armed by foreign countries (Turkey, Saudi Arabia, Qatar, USA), while the traditional opposition parties, united in the Syrian National Council, had demonstrated their complete impotence. Among the rebel groups, “jihadist” elements gained increasing prominence, particularly those that would go on to form the “Islamic State” (ISIS), which by summer 2014 had spread across much of Iraq and Syria. An International Coalition was then set up under the aegis of the United States to combat ISIS in Syria and Iraq. Comprising Arab and European countries, this coalition was joined the following year (2015) by Turkey after its attempts to reach an agreement with the Islamic State failed, while Russia and Iran claimed to be fighting the latter by supporting the Damascus government.

While the Coalition’s military actions in Syria consisted mainly of aerial bombardments, nearly 2,000 American soldiers and dozens of French and British commandos were present on the ground to support Kurdish fighting forces (Syrian Democratic Forces, SDF). Under the impact of these combined attacks ISIS gradually retreated until, in October 2017, it lost almost all its last strongholds in northern Syria and in particular its “capital”, Rakka, conquered by the SDF. For their part, the fading rebel brigades agreed to sign a ceasefire with Damascus; but talks organized in Astana (Kazakhstan) by Russia with the participation of Turkey and Iran be-

(Continued on page 20)

Syria: the tyrant is gone, the bourgeois and imperialist order remains

(Continuation from page 19)

tween the government and 9 rebel organizations failed to produce an agreement, and fighting continued into 2018 (with Western bombing after a chemical attack on the last rebel zone on the outskirts of Damascus). The rebels were now only concentrated in the Idlib region in northwestern Syria. Finally, in December 2018, the Trump administration announced the withdrawal of American troops, with the exception of a contingent of around a thousand soldiers in the oil-producing regions. In 2020, the Syrian army, backed by Russian aircraft, attempted to reconquer Idlib province, causing hundreds of thousands of inhabitants to flee and provoking clashes with Turkish troops before a ceasefire froze the situation. Since then, fighting had virtually ceased in the country, with Damascus controlling around 70% of Syria, the SDF 20%, and the rest being under the domination of Turkish-linked groups and Islamist rebels.

This rapid review of the main stages of the civil war shows the decisive role played by imperialist states, large and small, in the evolution of the Syrian crisis. The presence of an authentically proletarian force, i.e. a genuine revolutionary communist party (unlike the so-called Syrian “communist” party, whose various fractions were subservient to the government), would have made it possible to try to give a class orientation to the revolt by uniting the disinherited masses against not just one man or one clan, but against the capitalist system itself; its absence left the field open to popular and democratic petty-bourgeois orientations corresponding to the inter-class nature of the rebellion; these led to the rallying of religious and reactionary bourgeois forces, inevitably in search of foreign sponsors to resist the regime’s violence and carve out a fiefdom for themselves based on “ethnic”, clan or religious divisions.

Foreign intervention did not cease with the rebel blitzkrieg that led to the overthrow of power in Damascus. Syria, which occupies a strategic position in the Middle East, has always been, and still is, at the crossroads of the interests and rivalries of great and not-so-great powers.

The Erdogan government has made no secret of its support for the rebels, which include groups directly linked to the Turkish state grouped under the umbrella of the “Syrian National Army” (SNA). Fighting took place between the

SNA and the Kurdish SDF, with the aim of creating a “buffer zone” under the control of the Turkish army; the SDF, supported by the US air force, took advantage of the rebel offensive to seize new territories; Israel did not wait before occupying strategic zones on Syrian territory and unleashing an intense bombing campaign to destroy the installations and equipment of the Syrian army, air force and fleet: the aim was to prevent a future regime in Damascus from having the military means to stand up to it; the Americans likewise announced that they had “massively” struck dozens of targets in the center of the country the day after Assad’s fall, officially to prevent the return of ISIS; and finally, the Russians contacted the rebel leaders they had been bombing a few days before, in an attempt to save their bases in Syria, which are of great importance to them, including for their operations in Africa...

The government’s rapid and unexpected downfall can be explained by the fact that its Russian, Iranian and Lebanese allies were no longer in a position to provide significant support: Russia was occupied by the war in Ukraine, Hezbollah by the war in Lebanon, and Israeli bombardments had seriously weakened the Iranian military presence in Syria. Left to face the rebels alone, the Syrian army was no longer able to provide serious military resistance: poorly fed, poorly paid, demoralized and sometimes forcibly conscripted, the soldiers had no desire to die in defense of the regime.

The main force among the victorious rebels is Hayat Tahrir al-Sham (HTS), a group that emerged from the Al-Nusra Front, one of the most powerful jihadist organizations, initially linked to the Islamic State, before fighting it and joining Al-Qaeda (the organization founded by Bin Laden), from which it finally split in 2016. Founded in 2017 by the merger of the Al-Nusra Front with other Islamist organizations, HTS, which had not been invited to the Astana negotiations because it was considered too radical, would become the dominant organization in Idlib province, where it would set up a quasi-state institution, the “Syrian Salvation Government”, responsible for administering the region. The Western press gave the SSG credit for not being as brutal as the Islamic State, nor for committing exactions against minorities like the Syrian National Army: in fact, the SSG behaved like a classic reactionary bourgeois govern-

ment based on the Islamic religion and not hesitating to repress its opponents.

As soon as he arrived in Damascus, HTS showed that he intended to promote a government of the same type for Syria. He made contact with the Prime Minister of the Bashar al-Assad government, which he had been fighting until now, assured that he did not want to touch the regime’s structures (apart from the security bodies) and appointed members of the SSG as prime ministers and ministers of a provisional “transitional government”.

The country’s economic situation is catastrophic: according to the World Bank, GDP has fallen by over 80% since 2010, with industrial and agricultural production collapsing (only exports of the locally-produced drug captagon were flourishing, exceeding all legal exports); inflation was, according to official figures, over 120%; unemployment was estimated at over 60%, and even 90% among young people. As a result, 95% of the population was living below the poverty line...

In these conditions, any bourgeois power in Damascus has no other solution to get the economy moving again than to rely on the regime’s still standing structures to extort surplus value from the proletarians while imposing fear of authority, and attract foreign investment by demonstrating its ability to maintain order. The media talk a lot about a “peaceful transition”, the establishment of genuine democracy in Syria, etc., but the future will inevitably be one of exploitation, violence and repression.

Proletarians don’t need a mendacious democracy that leaves bourgeois domination intact; they need to destroy the dictatorial power structures of the al-Assad clan and the entire bourgeois state from top to bottom, in order to establish their own dictatorship, which is essential if capitalism is to be uprooted. This requires the emergence and development of the class struggle, and the formation of a **class, communist and international party** to lead this struggle right up to the revolution and after its victory. Unfortunately, such a perspective is not immediate. The fears expressed by imperialism about the “chaos” that the fall of the al-Assad regime in Damascus could bring, or the rallying to the rebels of many government forces, including from the Ba’ath party which has ruled the country for 60 years, testify to the compactness of the counter-revolutionary and anti-proletarian front, despite the armed clashes that have pitted them against each other. Paraphrasing what Marx wrote at the time of the Paris Commune, we can say that all these groups, parties and governments are united against the proletariat; they do not intend to leave any space for the emergence of movements

South Africa : Capitalism orchestrated a massacre in an abandoned gold mine, 87 killed, 248 suffered from starvation

South African capitalism has reached another stage in its brutality: an abandoned gold mine near Stilfontein has witnessed capitalist barbarity. The government of the African National Congress (ANC), through which the capitalist regime has passed into the hands of black political elites since 1994, as the loyal organ of South African capitalism, orchestrated and directed the starvation and death of the desperate human beings found in the abandoned mine: 87 killed, 248 emaciated almost to death.

Their crime? The struggle for survival in a social reality where poverty and unemployment (about 30%, around 60% for youths) is a daily reality. This massacre in Stilfontein truthfully demonstrates the continuity of oppression and barbarism from apartheid (South Africa's policy of racial segregation applied until the 1990s) to capitalism led by the black bourgeoisie.

This massacre is merely the latest episode in the history of systematic oppression and violence against the workers and impoverished masses in South Africa. During the apartheid era, the labour force of coloured workers was ruthlessly exploited to fuel the mining industry and line the pockets with profits of the white bourgeoisie, which consolidated its domination through policies of racial segregation and violence. The end of apartheid did not bring prosperity and liberation to the non-privileged non-white masses, but a new reconfiguration of exploitative structures built on the same foundations. After the end of

apartheid, under the ANC, the mining industry was dealt a severe blow: some 6000 mines were closed, South Africa fell from first place in gold production to eleventh place, and mining continued to decline...; local communities were driven to illegal and dangerous mining for their survival.

These illegal miners, the so-called Zama zamas, aptly named "risk takers", are a product of the decline of the mining sector; they risk their lives, many of them migrants from neighbouring countries, with improvised means, in abandoned shafts to extract the gold that, with other raw materials in which South Africa is rich, once powered South Africa's economic machine. The driving impulse behind these Zama zamas is sheer desperation for their survival, not the greed and opulence associated with gold - a desperation born of the reality of a capitalist society where their living conditions, and those of their families, are neglected and left to utter ruin.

In 2023, the ANC government launched Operation Vala Umgothi ("Close the Hole"), a militarized campaign to crack down on illegal mining. The Stilfontein mine became the site of this campaign from August 2024. Security forces blockaded the mine and, as part of an elaborate plan, tried to starve them out by cutting off their food and water supplies. The miners trapped underground have struggled for months to live in unimaginably horrific conditions in the face of death.

The police claim that the miners refused to come to the surface for fear of reported arrest is cruelly distorted. Survivors' testimonies reveal a different aspect of the story: many were too weak to climb out by improvised means, while others were actively prevented by members of the organized criminal groups controlling mining in these mines.

When the government was forced to act on court orders - after long court battles, it was allowed to deliver small amounts of food and water in November and December - its response was insensitive and flippant. Rescue operations could have begun months earlier; the final operation, begun on 13 January 2025, took just three days. By that time, 87 people had already lost their lives - a massacre caused not by bullets but by organized starvation and

callousness.

The ANC narrative portrays the Zama zamas as criminals who are robbing the national economy: it is reported that in 2024 alone, illegal mining cost the South African economy \$3.2 billion (€3 billion). But the reality, as always, is far more complex. Illegal mining is indeed organized - but this organization is a much larger framework within which the miners themselves are exploited. Criminal syndicates operate according to clearly defined functions: they exploit workers and get gold onto world markets through illegal channels. These groups are not 'isolated' gangs, but highly organized networks with roots in local communities, and more importantly, they are linked to the police, the (local) authorities.

The same police officers who blockaded the Stilfontein mine are accused of criminal conspiracy and taking bribes to allow the criminal groups to operate unhindered. The local authorities also often turn a blind eye. This 'organization' mirrors capitalism itself: hierarchical, exploitative and cruel. The miners at the bottom of this pyramid bear the full brunt of its violence.

The horror in Stilfontein echoes the 2012 massacre in Marikana (1), where 36 striking (not illegal!) miners were shot dead by the police. The murderous methods may differ, but the basic dynamic remains the same: the role of the state as the collective organ of capitalist interests. In both cases, workers struggling to survive met brutal repression.

The ANC-led state has added a new dimension to the event: xenophobic rhetoric. It has chosen migrants from neighbouring countries as scapegoats, and by denigrating them it seeks to divide the working and poor masses and to obscure the common exploitation and oppression they all face. This divisive strategy serves only one purpose: to strengthen the power of the state, of capital, and to weaken the possibility of a social explosion of the masses.

The ANC, once a symbol of the struggle against apartheid, is now in a position of governance in a deeply unequal society. ANC leaders, many of whom have become rich through the mining industry, are parasites on the shoulders of the working class. People like Cyril Ramaphosa, once a union leader for the National Union of Mineworkers (NUM) and the Congress of South African Trade Unions (COSATU) and now a mining magnate, are the epitome of this. Their wealth has been made from the sweat and blood of the workers they criminalize in this post-apartheid era.

Syria ...

(Continuation from page 20)

challenging the bourgeois order. The current euphoria cannot hide the reality for long: Syrian proletarians face enemies just as implacable as the Assad clan, and they will have to fight against them, foot to foot, without letting democratic illusions or religious, community or national divisions stop them.

The tyrant has been overthrown, but what remains is the bourgeois and imperialist order, which must be overthrown in union with proletarians of all countries!

South Africa ...

(Continuation from page 21)

The Minister of Mineral Resources, Gwede Mantashe, also a former union leader and also a former top official of the South African Communist Party (SACP), commented callously on the Stilfontein tragedy when he likened miners to people voluntarily taking risks by lying down on the tracks. Such statements demonstrate the true role of government: serving not the people but capital.

As has already been said, the massacres at Stilfontein or Marikana are not isolated incidents, but external manifestations of the systemic violence inherent in capitalism. The fate of the miners points to the broader conditions of the South African working class: soaring unemployment, pervasive poverty, an exploitative informal economy, and the insurmountable reality of the unequal status of the coloured masses inherited from white colonialism and apartheid.

The ANC has never projected an

overcoming of the capitalist regime: as early as 1964, Nelson Mandela himself demonstrated that it was a reconfiguration of the superstructure: 'At no time in its history has the ANC ever advocated a revolutionary change in the economic structure of the country, nor [...] has it ever condemned capitalist society'. The working and poor masses could never expect the ANC to resolve their living and social situation; the Black Economic Empowerment programme was effectively aimed at one thing: the establishment of a black bourgeois elite.

In this cycle of violence, the working class cannot rely on the ANC, nor on the SACP, nor on the class collaborationist NUM/COSATU unions; this trinity perpetuates its oppression. The only way forward is to organize outside the framework of class collaboration, independently of the state, its institutions and the false friends of the working and poor masses who continue to offer them the illusion of prosperity under black capital; by the very reason for the existence of migrant workers across borders, international solidarity is necessary, but

the struggle in South Africa reflects the exploitation faced by workers around the world.

These and other massacres are grim reminders of the inhumanity of capitalism. But they are also calls to arms. Workers in South Africa - and around the world - must unite to eradicate the structures of the capitalist regime that perpetuate their suffering; they must be joined by the impoverished masses because only the modern proletariat, the class of waged workers, is called and capable of revolutionary struggle to end cycles of exploitation and build a society in which human life is more valuable than profit.

Let the bloodshed in Stilfontein fuel the explosion of the class struggle!

Proletarians of all countries, unite!

January, 27th 2025 ●

(1) See Proletarian, No. 9, Winter 2012-2013; and https://www.pcint.org/07_TP/009/009-massacre.htm

A victory for democracy in South Korea?

At 11 p.m. on December 3, President Yoon Suk-Yeol declared martial law during a televised address, which he said was necessary to protect South Korea "from the threat of North Korean communist forces, to eradicate the despicable pro-North Korean anti-state forces that are plundering the freedom and happiness of our people, and to protect the free constitutional order" (...) "the opposition party [the Democratic Party - editor's note] has paralyzed the government, for the purposes of impeachment, special investigations and to protect its leader from prosecution". This was the first time martial law had been declared since 1980 and the subsequent Gwangju massacre...

The decree on the state of emergency issued shortly afterwards stipulated a ban on all political activity, the dissolution of the National Assembly and local councils, control of the media by the army, a ban on meetings, demonstrations and strikes, the possibility of arrests and searches without warrants, and so on. A list of people to be arrested had been drawn up, including not only Democratic Party officials, but also certain leaders of the PPP (People's Power Party, the ruling party) who were critical of the President, cer-

tain Supreme Court judges, and so on. The special forces responsible for assassinating North Korean officials in the event of war had been mobilized: it seems that the plan was to assassinate several key figures and blame the crimes on North Korea...

But the deputies, who had managed to meet during the night despite the army blockade, voted unanimously (190 present out of 300) against the state of emergency, and the president finally backed down: a few hours later, he announced the lifting of martial law and the withdrawal of the army. The next day, the Minister of Defense resigned (he was arrested a little later and attempted suicide in prison), and impeachment proceedings were launched against the President. Tens of thousands of people demonstrated to demand that Yoo step down.

The international media could then rejoice that Korean democracy had worked well and demonstrated its ability to resist the irrational and desperate initiative of a president who had "lost his mind".

However, Yoon Suk-Yeol's "unexpected" attempt at a self-coup was anything but a whim; if it was carried out in a haphazard fashion, it had probably been planned for several months, at

least since July according to military officials.

Yoon Suk-Yeol, a former prosecutor renowned for his uncompromising condemnation of corruption, including among the highest political and economic figures, was nominated as the PPP's candidate in the May 2022 presidential elections on a platform that included promises of deregulation, a tougher policy towards North Korea, closer ties with the United States and reactionary measures such as the abolition of the Ministry of Gender Equality (despite the fact that the country has the highest wage gap between men and women in the OECD). He was elected by a narrow margin over the Democratic Party (center) candidate; as he did not have a majority in parliament, he had difficulty implementing the anti-proletarian measures demanded by employers.

The PPP had hoped to win the parliamentary elections in the spring of 2024, but suffered a resounding defeat. In July, the KCTU (the country main union) called for a 15-day mobilization (demonstrations, sectoral strikes) against the proposed reforms of labor, pensions and education, and the repression of workers' struggles; what aroused the most anger was the legalization of the 69-hour work week.

The KCTU's action did not stop authoritarian measures against strikes and the media, to which were added **criminal proceedings against** opposition figures. The President vetoed some twen-

ty laws passed by Parliament, while the Democratic Party tried to impeach the judges who were hostile to him, and denounced the corruption of Yoon Suk-Yeol's wife. The vote on the 2025 budget was blocked...

* * *

With a population of 51 million, South Korea ranks among the world's leading economic powers: it is the world's ninth-largest GDP producer, sixth-largest industrial producer, eighth-largest exporter and fifth-largest producer of high-tech products.

This wasn't always the case; after the ravages of the Korean War, until the early 1960s South Korea was an underdeveloped country, poorer than North Korea and largely agricultural: over 60% of the population lived in the countryside, compared with 5% today. Under the military dictatorship of Park Chung-hee (at the head of the country from 1963 to 1979), South Korea underwent rapid industrialization, thanks in particular to funding from the United States, anxious to facilitate the economic development of its protégé in a strategic region facing North Korea and its Russian and Chinese sponsors. The geostrategic situation has been, and remains to this day, a determining factor in South Korea's policies, including its domestic policy, as a result of inter-imperialist confrontations. The Vietnam War (in which 350,000 South Korean soldiers took part) (1) gave the country's economy a boost.

In 1979, Park Chung-hee was assassinated at the headquarters of the South Korean CIA, and another general took his place. To put an end to the anti-dictatorship protests at a time when the country was in the grip of a severe economic crisis, in May 1980 the military government decreed martial law throughout the country; following police and army exactions, a veritable insurrection took control of the southern city of Gwangju, and the movement spread to other towns in the region, as far as the major port of Pusan. But the petty bourgeois democrats at the head of this spontaneous uprising were fundamentally pacifists, and were unable to organize any defense against the army, which went on an orgy of repression, killing between 1,000 and 2,000 people.

Towards the end of the '80s, with economic growth in full swing, the ruling class found itself faced with a situation of rising social tensions and workers' struggles. The death of a student leader under torture triggered a wave of mass demonstrations for democracy in

June 1987. After initial concessions from the military, strikes broke out, mostly spontaneous and therefore illegal, and often fiercely repressed. Starting in large companies, they rapidly spread throughout the country, rising from 276 in 1986 to 3,749 in 1987; hundreds of workers' protest actions (walkouts, strikes, occupations, hostage-takings, demonstrations) were recorded every day during the summer; more than 3,000 new unions were formed that year, whereas until then there had been no independent trade unions. Over a million workers were involved in this wave of strikes. The central demands were higher wages, shorter working hours, improved working conditions and an end to bar-rack discipline in the factories.

As repression proved ineffective, it was high time for the bourgeoisie to "*democratize in order to stabilize*" the country: election of the president by universal suffrage, adoption of a new constitution, and so on. In 1988, the Sixth Republic was officially born. In the years that followed, workers' struggles declined sharply, testifying to the anti-proletarian effectiveness of democracy, which did not eliminate the repression of workers' struggles.

In December 1996, anti-labor laws were passed by parliament on the sly to facilitate lay-offs (at a time when the system of lifetime employment predominated in large companies), authorize the use of scabs during legal strikes, extend the workweek to 56 hours, "flexibilize" working hours, prohibit payment for strike days, and ban the newly-formed KCTU trade union confederation until the year 2000. The unions immediately launched calls for protest strikes, which met with "unexpected" success; within 3 days, more than 300,000 workers went on strike, initially in the metal industry (shipyards, automobile) before being joined by workers in other sectors (hospitals, transport, etc.), despite the fact that the government had declared the strikes illegal.

The movement lasted three weeks, reaching 1.5 million strikers by mid-January, forcing the pro-government FTKU trade union confederation to call for workers to join the movement, before the KCTU first decided that there would only be strikes one day a week and then "suspended" the strikes to facilitate negotiations with the government.

In the end, the results were minimal: the new version of the law, approved by the unions, differed little from the old one. Above all, the KCTU was granted semi-legal status (it was legalized in 1999), as the capitalists saw its role as a safeguard against proletarian anger. Nevertheless, this general strike remains

historically the biggest movement of the young South Korean proletariat: almost 3 million proletarians took part in the struggle.

Thereafter, there was no comparable movement. The so-called "candle revolution" in 2016 which, after weeks of peaceful demonstrations every Saturday by hundreds of thousands of people, saw the impeachment of President Park Geun-hye (daughter of the dictator Park) was a cross-class, politically petty-bourgeois movement caused by Park's corruption (2) and not by her anti-worker policies: banning the teachers' union, raising the retirement age coupled with a pay cut for workers over 56, and so on.

The South Korean working class is confronted with a ruthless bourgeoisie that never ceases to impose harsh conditions of exploitation and repressive measures, whether under democratic or dictatorial rule. Yoon's coup attempt is just another demonstration that the ruling class will not hesitate to use dictatorial means to achieve its ends and crush the proletariat. South Korean proletarians know from experience that democracy is just as anti-proletarian as dictatorship.

But this is not the opinion of the KCTU, which on 4/12 called for an unlimited general strike until Yoon leaves power (a call apparently little heeded). After the parliamentary vote in favor of the president's impeachment, the KCTU lifted its call on 17/12; the statement issued by its president added: "*In the end, democracy won, the workers and*

(Continued on page 24)

E-MAIL

« proletarian@pcint.org »
 « leproletaire@pcint.org »
 « ilcomunista@pcint.org »
 « elprogramacomunista@pcint.org »



WEBSITE OF
THE INTERNATIONAL
COMMUNIST PARTY

[https://
www.pcint.org](https://www.pcint.org)

A victory for democracy in South Korea?

(Continuation from page 23)

citizens won, and the KCTU won. (...) let's dedicate ourselves to fighting for democracy and workers' rights" - this 'struggle' consisting of pushing for Constitutional Court's to validate Yoon's impeachment, etc. (3)! In fact, Yoon has not given up; protected by the Presidential Guard, he was even seeking to mobilize his supporters until he was finally arrested on January 15th.

Democracy will never protect proletarians from the rapacity and repression of capitalists; but those who spread bourgeois lies about the benefits of de-

mocracy and call on proletarians to fight for it will never be able to really organize the struggle to advance workers' emancipation. Breaking with pro-democracy political orientations, refocusing struggles on the exclusive defense of proletarian interests, using classist methods of struggle rather than parliamentary and institutional "struggle", is necessary if proletarians want to be able to defend themselves against the bourgeoisie and its regime, whatever it may be.

This means breaking with all forces advocating class collaboration, and striving to build a class party whose objective is not the **victory** of

democracy, but its **defeat** by proletarian revolution!

January, 15th 2025



(1) They will be guilty of various atrocities, such as massacres of civilians, rape and so on.

(2) She was implicated in a huge corruption scandal involving tens of millions of dollars. She was also found guilty of a whole series of abuses of power, such as the use of the secret services against opponents, and so on. She was sentenced to 24 years in prison, before being pardoned by the next president, a member of the Democratic Party.

(3) <https://www.facebook.com/kctu-eng>, 17/12/24.

PROGRAM OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST PARTY

The International Communist Party is constituted on the basis of the following principles established at Leghorn in 1921 on the foundation of the Communist Party of Italy (Section of the Communist International):

1. In the present capitalist social regime there develops an increasing contradiction between the productive forces and the relations of production, giving rise to the antithesis of interests and to the class struggle between the proletariat and the ruling bourgeoisie.

2. The present day production relations are protected by the power of the bourgeois State, that, whatever the form of representative system and the use of elective democracy, constitutes the organ for the defense of the interests of the capitalist class.

3. The proletariat can neither crush or modify the mechanism of capitalist production relations from which its exploitation derives, without the violent destruction of the bourgeois power.

4. The indispensable organ of the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat is the class party. The Communist Party consists of the most advanced and resolute part of the proletariat; it unites the efforts of the working masses transforming their struggles for group interests and contingent issues into the general struggle for the revolutionary emancipation of the proletariat. It is up to the Party to propagate revolutionary theory among the masses, to organize the material means of action, to lead the working class during its struggle, securing the historical continuity and the international unity of the movement.

5. After it has smashed the power of the capitalist State, the proletariat must completely destroy the old State apparatus in order to organize itself as the ruling class and set up its own dictatorship; meanwhile depriving the bourgeoisie and members of the bourgeois class of all political rights and functions as long as they survive socially, founding the organs of the new regime exclusively on the productive class. Such is the program that the Communist Party sets itself and which characterizes it. It is this party therefore which exclusively represents, organizes and directs the proletarian dictatorship. The requisite defence of the proletarian state against all counter-revolutionary initiatives can only be assured by depriving the bourgeoisie and parties which are enemies of the proletarian dictatorship of all means of agitation and political propaganda and by equipping the proletariat with an armed organization in order to repel all interior and exterior attacks.

6. Only the force of the proletarian State will be able to systematically put into effect the necessary measures for intervening in the relations of the social economy, by means of which the collective administration of production and distribution will take the place of the capitalist system.

7. This transformation of the economy and consequently of the whole social life will lead to the gradual elimination of the necessity for the political State, which will progressively give way to the rational administration of human activities.

* * *

Faced with the situation in the capitalist world and the workers' movement following the Second World War the position of the Party is the following :

8. In the course of the first half of the twentieth century the capitalist social system has been developing, in the economic field, creating monopolistic trusts among the employers, and trying to

control and manage production and exchange according to central plans with State management of whole sectors of production. In the political field, there has been an increase of the police and military potential of the State, with governments adopting a more totalitarian form. All these are neither new sorts of social organizations in transition from capitalism to socialism, nor revivals of pre-bourgeois political regimes. On the contrary, they are definite forms of a more and more direct and exclusive management of power and the State by the most developed forces of capital.

This course excludes the progressive, pacifist interpretations of the evolution of the bourgeois regime, and confirms the Marxist prevision of the concentration and the antagonistic array of class forces. So that the proletariat may confront its enemies' growing potential with strengthened revolutionary energy, it must reject the illusory revival of democratic liberalism and constitutional guarantees. The Party must not even accept this as a means of agitation ; it must finish historically once and for all with the practice of alliances, even for transitory issues, with the bourgeois or petit-bourgeois parties, or with pseudo-workers' parties with a reformist program.

9. The global imperialist wars show that the crisis of disintegration of capitalism is inevitable because it has entered the phase when its expansion, instead of signifying a continual increment of the productive forces, is conditioned by repeated and ever-growing destruction. These wars have caused repeated deep crises in the global workers' organizations because the dominant classes could impose on them military and national solidarity with one or the other of the belligerents. The opposing historical solution for which we fight, is the awakening of the class struggle, leading to civil war, the destruction of all international coalitions by the reconstitution of the International Communist Party as an autonomous force independent of any existing political or military power.

10. The proletarian State, to the extent that its apparatus is an instrument and a weapon of struggle in a historical epoch of transition does not derive its organizational strength from constitutional rules nor from representative schemas whatsoever. The most complete historical example of such a State up to the present is that of the Soviets (workers' councils) which were created during the October 1917 revolution, when the working class armed itself under the leadership of the Bolshevik Party. The Constituent Assembly having been dissolved, they became the exclusive organs of power repelling the attacks by foreign bourgeois governments and, inside the country, stamping out the rebellion of the vanquished classes and of the middle and petit-bourgeois layers and of the opportunist parties which, in the decisive phases, are inevitably allied with the counter-revolution

11. The defense of the proletarian regime against the dangers of degeneration inherent in the failures and possible retreats in the work of economic and social transformation - whose integral realization is inconceivable within the limits of only one country - can only be assured by the constant coordination between the policy the workers' State and the united international struggle, incessant in times of peace as in times of war, of the proletariat of each country against its bourgeoisie and its State and military apparatus. This co-ordination can only be secured by means of the political and programmatic control of the world communist party over the State apparatus where the working class has seized power.