

# Palestine: A perspective sheet

The attack (that prolongs today and that we have no way of knowing when its going to end) of the other day deserves a couple of comments. In face of the fact that there's an absence of groups from the proletarian camp in both Israel and Palestine that can give us a clear light over the current events, everything is confusing and all indication we can give from here is enormously limited by it.

But with everything we already know, both from the lessons we have learned from the proletarian movement as well as what we know from the regional situation in general, we can extract a few lessons from the Palestinian question.

The same mystification is brought up to us when Hamas talks in terms of "freedom" and "emancipation" as when Israel talks in terms of "order", ¿Freedom for whom, Order from whom?, for the Palestinian people, and from the Jewish people, respectively. They tell us that, and of course, they are right, but such is a half truth. Here "the people" doesn't exist, classes exist, and emancipation can only be for the proletariat or the bourgeoisie, without half measures. We also know that the logic of the "right to defend itself" of a "people" are no less than the right of the political and national authority that controls the territory in the name of that "people" to liquidate internal opposition (as the struggle with striking proletarians and other "saboteurs" in the name of national unity or in the name of unity in front of the invader are as "national defense" as the same struggle against the invader). Such thing can also be said of the struggle of Hamas and the Palestinians. And it's that every category taken in abstract is a bourgeois category. Even in the same national terms, the freedom of one nation is the right of the State as the general representative of social capital to eliminate any restriction of passage, to facilitate the movement of wage laborers and of commodities.

What Palestinian nationalism calls "revolution" is, in Munis's terms, "the centralization of the exploitation and oppression of the working class in a state of its own." ¿isn't it true that the concentration of capital, and a national "progressive" centralization, while integrating the proletarians of various territories (in these cases, it would imply an increased integration of the Palestinian proletariat in the labor market of the Arabian countries, in an elevated unity) facilitating its organization in that way?.

The integration of the proletarians in a sphere of accumulation by the centralization or reorganization of national capitals goes in the both ways, the separation from, say, the Catalan proletarians from the Spanish national state, would surely mean the internal centralization of its territory and therefore the integration of all Catalan proletarians, and the integration of those proletarians

with the European proletariat through an increased dependence of Catalonia on the European market.

In imperialism, the integration of the proletariat from multiple nations is not in and of itself positive because it is not necessarily the result of the concentration of national capital on a higher scale, but a consequence of its reorganization in a different international market structure. On the contrary, we communists would have to support projects like the European Union or the BRICS, as they imply an increased integration of the proletarians in the involved countries.

It is a common argument among Hamas skeptics to assert that they are "false nationalists", that they are timid in their struggle for the establishment of an independent Palestinian national state, and that they do not have a genuine interest in a democratic revolution. The reader may have already heard of 'democratic tasks,' 'democratic revolution,' and a 'popular and democratic republic' as something distinctive of "socialist tasks", the socialist revolution, and "the socialist republic" more than once, in this and other debates on colonialism and national liberation (perhaps, somewhat strangely, they may have heard it in a conversation with Stalinists about Colombia or Spain, in which case we apologize) The term originates from the theory of the double revolution, as asserted by Marx in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* regarding the German Revolution. This theory explained that:

*"1. In certain countries where pre-capitalist forms obstructed the development of the proletariat and prevented the development of the necessary forms of capital accumulation required for the centralization of production, it was therefore necessary for the bourgeois (often called democratic) revolution to take place before the proletariat could assume socialist construction tasks. (This was the reason why Marx and Engels advocated international support for nationalism in Ireland and Poland.)*

*2. In these countries, the bourgeoisie had proven to be too politically paralyzed to continue carrying out their revolutionary demands and pushing them to the fullest extent. Many of these demands, such as the rights of association and the press, could be used by the proletariat to organize their wage struggles as well as their revolutionary goals. As a result, capitalists often decided to make pacts with the reactionary aristocracies against the workers.*

*3. Since point 1 could not be avoided, and the bourgeoisie was unable to carry it out, the proletariat could win to their side those classes that had an interest in breaking these feudal obstacles, did not immediately feel threatened by the organizing capability of the proletariat, and at the same time, could not form stable pacts with the aristocratic classes: the petty bourgeoisie and the peasantry, who had an interest in agrarian reform, the elimination of feudal taxes, the removal of personal dependency ties, and the elimination of guild privileges in trade organization."*

By winning over these classes through certain concessions, the proletariat would simultaneously be preparing its dictatorship, despite being a young class with limited numbers and not as much strength. They would carry out all the necessary preparatory measures, which were the essential precursor to liberating the communist mode of production. Thus, the alliance with other classes had a material basis upon which it could be built. A whole series of tasks and reforms, in which both the proletariat and the other radical classes had a common interest, could be implemented.

All arguments about national liberation today are derived from point 1. Therefore, it makes little sense to talk about a "democratic revolution" where agrarian reforms, in addition to being unrealizable, have become unnecessary (the proletariat already constitutes the majority of the population and does not need to rely on other much smaller classes, as was the case in the 20th century, even in regions like unoccupied Palestine, where perhaps agricultural technology is less developed). Such reforms are also counterproductive where reforms of 'democratic freedoms' have lost all possibility of realization. (Marx, at his time, cautioned us to be very careful with proposals like land redistribution to win over the peasantry):

*"(...) Where the peasant exists in the mass as private proprietor, where he even forms a more or less considerable majority, as in all states of the west European continent, where he has not disappeared and been replaced by the agricultural wage-labourer, as in England, the following cases apply: either he hinders each workers' revolution, makes a wreck of it, as he has formerly done in France, or the proletariat (for the peasant proprietor does not belong to the proletariat, and even where his condition is proletarian, he believes himself not to) must as government take measures through which the peasant finds his condition immediately improved, so as to win him for the revolution; measures which will at least provide the possibility of easing the transition from private ownership of land to collective ownership, so that the peasant arrives at this of his own accord, from economic reasons. It must not hit the peasant over the head, as it would e.g. by proclaiming the abolition of the right of inheritance or the abolition of his property. The latter is only possible where the capitalist tenant farmer has forced out the peasants, and where the true cultivator is just as good a proletarian, a wage-labourer, as is the town worker, and so has immediately, not just indirectly, the very same interests as him. Still less should small-holding property be strengthened, by the enlargement of the peasant allotment simply through peasant annexation of the larger estates, as in Bakunin's revolutionary campaign." [Conspectus of Bakunin's Statism and Anarchy, Karl Marx, 1874]*

With this discussion closed, it is therefore not an exaggeration to say that none of these anti-colonial processes are revolutionary in any way, not even within the narrow framework of the democratic revolution, because their function is not to liberate new or potential modes of production but to reorganize the current form of bourgeois competition. Are those who call Hamas "timid" from the perspective of the democratic revolution correct, then? Of course, but only if we consider

that anyone who starts from these national tasks necessarily is timid, and cannot be otherwise in a world in which capitalism has already killed off all obstructions that were external to it, in which the bourgeois revolution is already more than realized, and therefore, there are no "true democratic nationalists" in this sense. The moment that the capitalist mode of production has become generalized globally, every bourgeois war is a reactionary war, even one of separation.

Does this mean we don't care about some side winning? Absolutely not:

*"According to Lenin, beginning in 1871, after the period of "peaceful" capitalism, wars were imperialist wars: their ideological acceptance constituted betrayal. In 1914, every workers party, both in the Entente and in the Central Powers, should have fought against the war in order to transform it into a civil war, above all taking advantage of a military defeat. Despite the fact that all alliances with the bourgeoisie in armed actions, regular or irregular, were therefore excluded, the problem of the effects that different military outcomes might have must, however, be taken into consideration. It cannot be maintained that, when such immense forces clash, the victory of one will have the same effects as the victory of the other. In general, one can say that the military victory of the oldest, wealthiest and most politically and socially stable bourgeois states is the least favorable outcome for the proletariat and its revolution.*

*There is a direct connection between the unfavorable course of the proletarian struggle of the last 150 years, which is three times as long as Marxism had predicted for victory, and the series of victories of Great Britain in the wars against Napoleon, first, and then against Germany, later. The bourgeois power of England has been stable for three centuries, and while Marx expected that the American Civil War would weaken it, that conflict did not engender a force capable of challenging Europe for power, but rather one that would later come to the aid of English power. If the United States has gradually assumed a central position in world capitalism, this was not after a direct conflict with England, but thanks to the wars it fought on the side of England.*

*In 1914 Lenin clearly pointed out that the defeat of the Czarist armies would be the most favorable solution because it would hasten the outbreak of the class struggle in Russia, and fought with all his resources against those who considered that the victory of Germany over the Anglo-French forces was the most unfavorable scenario, while always directing equally harsh criticism at the German social-chauvinists." [Teaching old dogs new tricks, Sul Filo del Tempo]*

When we say that we are internationalists, that we stand for the self-organization of the proletariat against all nation-states and all bourgeois parties, no one should think that we care little about the outcomes, what we mean is that bourgeois war and revolutionary war have completely different natures, and to unleash the latter, one must be able to seize the moments of general crisis within capital and transform them into a general crisis of capitalism. This can only be achieved if one's political activity is geared toward capitalizing on these ruptures, something that cannot be done by taking sides

with the interests of either of the two frames of accumulation embroiled in that war.

However, this is precisely why we care about the outcome of the war. Because victory in the war by the bourgeoisie that is less capable in consolidating that victory extends the period of crisis, and provided that there exists a revolutionary movement capable of making use of that crisis (for which the restoration of class independence is necessary), it buys time for revolutionary preparation. Time that, in those wars where the stronger bourgeoisie has triumphed, could be reduced to just a few years. But this is a double-edged sword, and the conditions being more favorable to the proletariat in the case of victory by the weaker bourgeois side, does not mean that it won't kill workers. It is not the first time that a state that has recently gained its independence turns its weapons against the workers' party as soon as it can.

Leaving aside the arguments about "pending tasks" in fully capitalist states, there remains a shapeless mass of weak and, above all, moralistic arguments about the right of Palestinians to defend themselves, the need to cooperate in ending the colonial state "and only then fight against the nationalists," in general, a whole string of empty proclamations that appeal more to the emotions of the militant than they follow a reasoning based on the critique of political economy and the setting at the head of the agenda our historical tasks as a class.

In any case, we want to make it clear that the party never forgets, and we know, from the mass murders of Turkish communists in the 1920s, where all these logics of "primary" and "secondary fronts" are headed, especially when the struggle is not even directed (as it cannot be) by a party of the working class.

Before we begin to discuss the character of Israel, a history lesson is essential:

*"Zionism was undoubtedly born as a reaction to the pogroms. They multiplied, especially at the end of the century in Russia and Poland, where most Jewish communities lived. From here, during the century, a strong emigration had developed, mainly towards the United States, which would continue to be welcomed until the 1930s, while a small part of it headed towards Palestine.*

*But the Dreyfus affair in France in 1898 also had a remarkable echo in the Western world and accentuated the development of the Zionist movement. It was a Zionism aimed at creating a State for the Jews, unlike previous Zionist, spiritual or cultural currents. It fostered a national feeling for the creation of a territorial centre or State populated by Jews in "land of Israel", the Palestine of the modern world, which was then part of the Ottoman Empire, where the Jewish population had lived in antiquity.*

*Its theorist was the Austro-Hungarian Theodore Herzl, born in Budapest and living in Austria, an assimilated and secular Jew. As a journalist he had followed the Dreyfus affair, and in 1896 he published a work "Der Judenstaat", "The State of the Jews" (not "The Jewish State", as it is often translated), in which he considered that Jews would never be integrated into other countries and that they needed their own State. Zionism therefore called for a return to Zion, which is one of the hills surrounding Jerusalem. No mention is made of the existence in that land of an indigenous population. It was in fact a colonialist project, placed in the context of colonialism and European imperialism. After all, in the past centuries, did not the Protestant refugees colonize North America? In the middle of the twentieth century, in 1938, Mussolini also advanced the possibility of the formation of a "Jewish homeland", which he was to establish in the African colonies, in the Migiurtinia. This is what Galeazzo Ciano wrote in his "Diary" on 30 August: «The Duce also communicated to me one of his plans to make the Migiurtinia a concession for international Jews. He says that the country has considerable natural reserves that the Jews could exploit». It should be noted that three months later Italy would issue the racial laws. A contradiction? Of course not! It shows how true it is that Zionism and anti-Semitism go hand in hand. Herzl boasted among the western bourgeoisie the interest that they could gain from seeing a poor population leaving and moving from East to West. In 1897 Herzl convened the first Zionist Congress in Basel. He approached the French banker Edmond de Rothschild, who had already started buying land in Palestine in 1882. Realizing that his plan for the future of European Judaism was in line with what the anti-Jewish movement wanted, Herzl quickly developed a strategy of alliance with the latter. He wrote in "Der Judenstaat" that «the governments of all countries affected by anti-Semitism will be very interested in helping us obtain the sovereignty we want», adding that «not only poor Jews» would contribute to an emigration fund for European Jews, «but also Christians who want to get rid of them».*

*Herzl confided in his diary that «the anti-Semites will become our most trusted friends, the anti-Semitic countries our allies». In 1902, Herzl contacted the British government, in particular Secretary of State Chamberlain, and obtained the support of the very rich Lord Walter Rothschild, a partisan and financial supporter of Zionism. In 1903 he met well-known anti-Semites such as Russian Interior Minister Vyacheslav von Plehve, who had organized anti-Jewish pogroms in Russia, and deliberately sought an alliance. And he also turned to another famous anti-Semite, Lord Balfour who, as Prime Minister of Great Britain, promoted the Aliens Act in 1905. The purpose of the Aliens Act was to curb immigration to the United Kingdom of Jewish refugees from the Russian Empire fleeing the pogroms, in order, as he openly declared, to save the country from the «unquestionable evils of essentially Jewish immigration». Racist and anti-Semitic theses had and have had much following in England. The Socialist Bund, the General Union of Jewish Workers of Lithuania, Poland and Russia, which was founded in Vilnius, in Russian Lithuania, on October 7, 1897, a few weeks after the first Zionist Congress was held in Basel, became the most open enemy of Herzl's Zionism. The Bund found itself aligned with the existing coalition of rabbis, Orthodox and Reformists, anti-Zionists as mindful of the article of faith that the Jews would not have their own land before the coming of the Messiah. (...)*

*The organization of the Bund, the General Union of Jewish Workers of Lithuania, Poland and Russia, created in 1897 in Lithuania, was a secular Jewish socialist movement, fighting for the rights of Jewish workers, demanding the use of the Yiddish language and opposing Zionism, seen as an accomplice of British colonialism. It was recognized as a fraction of the Social Democratic Party of Workers of Russia in 1898 and was close to the Mensheviks. In 1905 the Bund was at the forefront of the protests in Belarus; in 1917 it did not pass to the Bolsheviks, but several of its members eventually joined the Bolshevik Party. Let us remember that the bundist Marek Edelman, one of the leaders of the 1943 Warsaw Ghetto revolt, openly declared himself anti-Zionist. So, anti-Zionism was born historically as Jewish opposition to a project that denies that an individual who declares himself Jewish can be integrated into the country and a citizen of equal rights in the State where he was born and lives. Anti-Zionists were the Jews who did not recognize Palestine as their country. Even today, the majority of Jews, who live outside Israel, consider the possibility of their "alià", "ascent" (to Jerusalem) only when they need to emigrate from the country they have lived in for centuries, except in cases of religious idealism. This is clearly completely independent of the anti-Zionism of those who disagree and condemn the Israeli bourgeoisie's policy of colonizing the Palestinian territories and oppressing the Arab Israeli population, frantically shaking the Shoah's alibi" [Communist Left n. 47, 2020, Zionism and Anti-zionism<sup>1</sup>]*

Throughout history, Jewish proletarians have been instrumentalized by Zionism. Terrified by the violence that Western bourgeois states had exercised against them, they were drawn into the colonial project that has ultimately created what is now nothing but a concentration camp for 13 million people.

Credit where credit is due, Hamas is not the PLO, which could be called an extension of the state of Israel after it accepted, following the Oslo Accords, to recognize the right of such a state to exist, essentially establishing Gaza and the West Bank as a protectorate. It is clear that the dynamics established in recent years between Israel and Hamas are very different from those between the former and Fatah, and that Fatah would have been unable to launch this type of offensive.

The Israeli bourgeoisie, like all bourgeoisies, was aware of the old trick of "Divide and Conquer." They assumed the task of destroying the unity inside the PLO, which was still difficult to control due to its representation of the various factions of the Palestinian bourgeoisie, thereby complicating negotiation and control conditions. they made a "king's gambit", risking a piece to control the game, only to end up being drawn by the game and its pieces:

*"Brig General Yitzhak Segev, who was the Israeli military governor in Gaza in the early 1980s, told a New York Times reporter that he had helped finance the Palestinian Islamist movement as a "counterweight to the secularists and leftists of the Palestine Liberation Organization and the Fatah party, led by Yasser Arafat*

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.international-communist-party.org/CommLeft/CL47.htm#zionism>

*(who himself referred to Hamas as 'a creature of Israel')." General Segev even admitted to funding Hamas himself with Israeli taxpayers' money that was later used to kill the same people who were funding them." [The express tribune, "How and why Israel helped create Hamas?"<sup>2</sup>]*

Although Hamas and Israel have appeared as political enemies since then, we can only describe the relationship they have with each other as symbiotic. What do we mean by this?:

*"The air raids on Gaza over the last few days are just a continuation of the Israeli government's same old policy against the Palestinian people, and especially the proletarian class. Once again the Israeli government is fighting "terrorism" in Gaza, but not with the aim of totally destroying Hamas, despite what they say. Rather they want to use Hamas to serve its own ends, to continue to police Gaza as Al Fatah and the PLO did in the past. They aren't really out to destroy them because they know that a bourgeois movement like Hamas, cloaked in nationalism and religion, or even better, corrupt like Al Fatah, is the best defence against the development of a class movement. The two bourgeoisies, Israeli and Palestinian, have this interest in common. And the missiles launched from Gaza are certainly more useful to the Israeli, and global, bourgeoisie than to the "Palestinian cause".*

*Palestinian and Israeli proletarians are thus kept like rats in a cage in a miniscule stony ghetto between Jordan and the sea, intoxicated with patriotic idolatry and bloodlust, and pawns in a cynical ruthless game between the big imperialisms." [Communist Left n. 36/37 2014/15, War in Gaza<sup>3</sup>]*

The rhetoric of our comrades sounds somewhat triumphant, as right now the workers' movement in the region (and around the world) is far from posing an immediate threat to the national states. But it has its point of truth. Israel, up to this point, has had more than enough military capacity to eliminate what remains of Palestinian political authority in Gaza and the West Bank. If it hasn't done so yet, it's because the existence of quasi-state authorities provides points to which the Palestinian population can escape in the face of the violence and persecution of both the Israeli state and its settlers. This eliminates resistance to land and house occupations, thus reinforcing the racial control of the Zionist state. Additionally, these Palestinian quasi-state authorities were, until now, extensions of Israel's own state, over which it exerted varying degrees of influence without having to exercise direct control, along with the associated costs of maintaining order with the military.

Territorial expansions in 1949 and 1967 occurred in leaps, according to the state's convenience in consolidating its power in certain regions and when it could take responsibility for the Palestinian population without endangering its character as an Etnostate, with Israel establishing a military administration in

---

<sup>2</sup> <https://tribune.com.pk/story/2302309/how-and-why-israel-helped-create-hamas>

<sup>3</sup> <https://www.international-communist-party.org/CommLeft/CL36.htm#Gaza2014>



the occupied West Bank between 1967 and 1982 before replacing it (which, for all practical purposes, continues to be a military administration and is headed by an IDF officer, currently Lieutenant Colonel Fars Atila since 2021ii) for a civilian government, where control is exerted in a more direct way than in Gaza, with permanent military presence in the territory and near to 400.000 Settlers.

Furthermore, the politically aggressive nature of Hamas pushed away other more secular and moderate factions, which were more inclined toward a two-state solution, like Fatah. This division within the Palestinian nationalist movement left the field open for its division, which gave Israel a greater sense of control.

At the same time, it appeared that Hamas was only interested in carrying out sporadic attacks through which to press for renegotiating borders and coexistence conditions. It seemed that the situation was under control. It seemed. In the end, one cannot comprehend (as of now, and with the information we have at hand) how Hamas managed to advance so far in such a short time (to within 10 kilometers of the West Bank), across the borderlines, without assuming that the Israeli military was unprepared to face anything more than skirmishes from that direction.

Now, according to official IDF iii statements, they are concentrating 100,000 troops for an offensive on Gaza, and it's unclear what the plans of the colonial state are: to destroy Hamas forces and allow another organization to take its place, or to take direct control of the area. Despite everything, we are told to support Hamas because, in the end, they are fighting against a genocide, and setting aside the already proven experience of capitalist parties in preventing genocides, we can only ask: how?. Is it possible to establish strategic alliances with Hamas or join Hamas without compromising the interests of our class? We have already seen that it is not.

So, what support are they referring to, what is that support that does not involve the slightest subordination to the interests of the national bourgeoisie, to the capitalists? Moral support? The worst of all, because not only does it in no way assist in that struggle (therefore incapable of carrying out its task), but it also signifies ideological commitments of the proletariat, defeats for it.

The same thing happens when one argues against this from the "powerlessness" or "timid character" of nationalism, not from its class character. Then:

*"One runs the risk of "preparing" the ground not for a socialist and class movement, but for the clever maneuvers of a few pitchfork-wielders disguised as modernists or a few democrats dressed as harlequins. Returning to the antimilitarist question, we find a similar fact. The cleric is a "false Christian", the nationalist a "false patriot". In absolute terms, this may be true, but it should not be stated in such a way that implies that we aspire to be the "true" patriots.*

*We can, and must, demonstrate that all bourgeois "idealism" suffers from a deep contradiction between philosophical principles and political action, based on the results of history and daily life. However, the true critique of these idealisms must be carried out solely based on socialist principles, showing how both the practical action and theoretical tendencies of every bourgeois party counteract the achievements of the exploited proletariat. This fatal contradiction between theory and action serves to demonstrate the artificial nature of bourgeois philosophy, which is the political instrument of class defense, but not to uncover supposed cases of personal bad faith in adversaries, accusing them of "false patriotism," and the like. Thus, anti-war propaganda should not aim to present warmongering imperialists as "enemies of the homeland," but rather be based on the necessary internationalism of the workers' movement, showing that capitalism relies on militarism by exploiting the patriotic and national sentiment of the masses, and, therefore, the class struggle has an antimilitarist and antipatriotic character."*  
[From "L'Avanguardia," 1913, For the Intransigence of Thought<sup>4</sup>]

Our analysis must break with the idea that Hamas and Israel both enjoy constant and unconditional support from the entire population. This is something we should bear in mind. We have recently seen demonstrations against both the government of Israel (September 11) and against Hamas (July 30), and Hamas represses proletarians, and we are not blind in the face of the existence of Jewish groups that are against the state of Israel (Like Anarchists Against the wall) or the Refuzniks, that by any means elude military Service.

But denying a problem doesn't make it disappear. All of these initiatives are currently incapable of going further and organising true acts of insurrection.

Every position on tactics and strategy must start from the practical state of the general movement. We should ask ourselves what the communist left can do in terms of agitation and how that agitation can be connected to its goal, which is to raise proletarian consciousness. We must abandon all prejudice about any false consciousness we may have. It's not just that Hamas and Israel drag workers into the war, but that right now, some believe themselves defenceless against Hamas without the colonial state, while others believe themselves defenceless against the colonial state without Hamas. It's a mutually beneficial relationship for both states. The existence of one legitimises the authority of the other, allowing them to label all proletarian resistance as anti-national treason.

Consciousness in the revolution becomes a factor, and right now, consciousness, both in the masses and in the permanent organizations that they try to organise, is still incapable of going beyond being national consciousness.

We must avoid any analysis of the issue from an activist perspective that asks "what is to be done?" when there is no capacity to do anything. Therefore, our

---

<sup>4</sup> Paragraph translated directly from the spanish version of the article, found in: <https://www.pcielcomunista.org/index.php/es/textos-del-partido/767-por-la-intransigencia-de-pensamiento-1913>

defeatist critique of the Palestinian situation is not a call for defeatism. It is not possible to make a revolution without revolutionaries, and for the time being, it appears that we won't have them in the medium term. Today, there are no internationalist communists in Israel-Palestine, there are no groups of the (Communist) Left, and we cannot prescribe a tactic for non-existent groups.

We are determinists, and we analyze the tasks of revolutionaries by eliminating all metaphysical exaltation of the role of the subject in the revolution. If the objective conditions have not produced revolutionary minorities in Israel or Palestine, then there are still no immediate revolutionary tasks for the proletarians of the region we'll see for how long (no, by this, we are not justifying those who call for participating in the war, those who call for supporting one side, or those who call on proletarians to sacrifice themselves in that slaughter; precisely when the overall situation is historically unfavorable it is much more important not to betray our principles than to study the correct tactics of each moment when we are completely powerless to implement them). For now, the task of proletarian communist groups where they exist (including those in Palestine when they appear, and they will) is to develop anti-nationalist agitation against capitalist wars and for revolutionary defeatism.

For now, the rejection and criticism of Israel are done from a pacifist standpoint, from the rejection of excesses, without providing a revolutionary solution and without questioning its existence as a state, without objectives, without a program, without direction. All criticisms are still weak and cannot see a current struggle against Israel without conceiving it through the two-state solution or the victory of Hamas, and cannot see the struggle against Hamas beyond that. This should not lead us to liquidationist positions that completely and categorically reject all forms of agitation and organization, of the construction of solidarity among the workers of Israel/Palestine, under the excuse that they are Zionists/colonists or Islamists.

The truth is that while attempts at self-organization and resistance are reduced to dust due to the reproduction of international competition in the consciousness of the workers, if there are no organizations capable of intervening in their economic, fractional, and limited struggles to generalize them and transcend their immediate character, this is not so much due to the reflexes of colonial struggles as to the effects of a counter-revolution that has lasted for more than a century. It tore apart all the parties of the proletariat and today has degraded its vanguard to small groups of revolutionary minorities with weak connections to the masses. We cannot blame the Palestinians and Jews for a deficiency that we share.

Propaganda should highlight the fact that, although a nationalist victory may have temporarily positive consequences for the wages of Palestinians and

certainly lift the heavy burden of the colonial state, the following points are general to anti-nationalist propaganda in all countries:

1. New chains would loom with that independence (if Hamas can conquer it, since no Palestinian political authority can be independent as long as the State of Israel exists, and the situation right now is closer to a bloodbath for the Palestinians than their constitution as a state). Capitalism cannot abolish the international division of labour that reproduces this national oppression as long as there is trade. As long as there is commerce, there will be immigrants living in misery. The international division of labor creates differences in working conditions and wages, and competition among wage labourers to sell their labour power exists, and National forms/states, as the most developed expression of this competition, use their violent repressive mechanisms to kill proletarians, sometimes in the most atrocious and genocidal ways.
2. Nationalists are not fighting in this war for the proletarians but for their interest in conquering their own national market within the international imperialist structure.
3. Proletarians can fight for their own interests outside of the nationalist struggle by self-organising strikes in their workplaces against the state, creating dual power through workers' councils, promoting defeatism in both the occupying and "liberation" armies, desertion in collaborating unions, and abstention in elections.

To avoid antagonising the workers, it should be understood that each state of the development of the revolutionary consciousness of the workers' movement requires a specific form of propaganda organisation. If not, propaganda becomes mere slogans. Internationalist propaganda should serve revolutionary action and preparation (a highly controversial position for certain individuals) and, therefore, cannot start with the agitation of the final points in the development of our struggle (we cannot start the building from the roof). If there were a party of the working class in the region, it would also have to highlight the international obligations of revolutionaries in the region. This includes internationalist solidarity between Jewish and Arab proletarians and framing the struggle of the region's proletarians as part of the worldwide communist revolution. As Le Prolétaire says:

*"The war of the Palestinian proletarians has a perspective: to be at the forefront of the working class of all oppressed Arab masses, to fight relentlessly against all national bourgeoisies, to maintain independence from all pacifist and democratic slogans. proletarian anti-imperialism, the struggle for the destruction of the Zionist state and all Arab state institutions"*

However, there is no class party, and it cannot be built by its own will, so all these formulas are more useful as clarification for the internationalist forces themselves than as advice to Arab-Jewish proletarian forces that do not yet appear anywhere, and that as we have already said, when they exist they will have things clearer than we do.

---

**i** Which peasantry, which mass of small property owners can we win for our cause in developed capitalist countries? An interesting note about this is Herman Gorter's Open Letter to Comrade Lenin, a fragment of which we share (<https://www.marxists.org/archive/gorter/1920/open-letter.htm>):

*"The poor peasant here lives under conditions quite different from those of Russia. Though often terrible, they are not as appalling as they were there. As farmers or owners, the poor peasants possess a piece of land. The excellent means of transport enables them often to sell their goods. At the very worst they can mostly provide their own food. During the last ten years things have improved somewhat for them. Now, during and since the war, they can obtain high prices. They are indispensable, the import of foodstuffs being very limited. Regularly, therefore, they will be able to get high prices. They are supported by Capitalism. Capitalism will maintain them, as long as it can maintain itself. In your country, the position of the poor peasants was far more terrible. With you, therefore, the poor peasants had a political, revolutionary programme, and were organised in a political, revolutionary party: with the social-revolutionaries. With us this is nowhere the case. Moreover, in Russia there was an enormous amount of landed property to be divided, large estates, crown lands, government land, and the estates held by the monasteries. But the Communists of Western Europe, what can they offer to the poor peasants, to win them to their side? Germany counted, before the war, from four to five million poor peasants (up to two hectares). Only eight or nine millions, however, were employed in actual large-scale industries (over 100 hectares). If the Communists were to divide all of these, the poor peasants would still be poor peasants, as the seven or eight million field-labourers also claim their share. And they cannot even divide them, as they will use them as large-scale industries.[02] These numbers show that in Western Europe there are comparatively few poor peasants; that, therefore, the auxiliary forces, if there were any at all, would be very few in numbers. The Communists in Germany, therefore, except in relatively insignificant regions, do not even have the means to win over the poor peasants. For the medium and small industries will surely not be expropriated. And it is practically the same in the case of the four or five million poor peasants in France, and also for Switzerland, Belgium, Holland, and two of the Scandinavian countries.[03] Everywhere small and medium sized industry prevails. And even in Italy there is no absolute certainty; not to mention England, which counts only some one or two hundred thousand peasants. Neither will they be attracted by the promise that under Communism they will be exempt from rent-paying and mortgage-rent. For with Communism they see the approach of civil war, the loss of markets, and general destruction. Unless, therefore, there should come a crisis far more terrible than the present one in Germany, a crisis, indeed, far exceeding the horrors of any other crises that ever were before, the poor peasants in Western Europe will side with Capitalism, as long as it has any life left."*

ii

<https://www.inn.co.il/news/467450>

iii

<https://twitter.com/IDF/status/1711158369552138326?t=H6C1zaRd0AMcZqj8AcOWOA&s19>

iv

<https://libcom.org/article/electricity-protests-gaza-hamas-suppresses-working-class>



**Balance y Avante**

**October 2023**

<https://balanceyavante.comrades.sbs> | Website