



# THESES

OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE  
OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF GREECE  
ON THE 21ST CONGRESS

**SECOND**

**TEXT**

## CHAPTER A

### THE CURRENT INTERNATIONAL REALITY

**1** Since the 20<sup>th</sup> Congress of the Party, the main contradiction between capital and labour has been sharpened and the unevenness between the capitalist states has increased.

The gap between the wealth concentrated in large business groups and the relative and absolute poverty that the majority of the people are experiencing is objectively widening.

The potential of new technologies, which are presented as the “4th industrial revolution”, instead of liberating the working people and being utilized for the expanding satisfaction of social needs, become a tool in the hands of the capital for intensifying exploitation.

Evidence shows the increase of certain manifestations of the parasitic nature of the capitalist system, e.g. drugs, prostitution, and crime.

In the previous years, the negative consequences of the capitalist growth in the environment became very clear.

The imperialist conflicts and the wars stimulated refugee flows.

All these developments verify that capitalism is a historically obsolete system and confirm that, despite the negative correlation of forces, our era is the era of transition from capitalism to socialism–communism.

The outbreak of the new deep international economic crisis and the visible inability of the public healthcare systems to address the pandemic in the imperialist states highlight the decay and the sharpening contradictions of the capitalist system, despite its expansion after the victory of the counter-revolution at the end of the 20th century.

The increase in long-term unemployment and the degree of exploitation of the working class, the strengthening of the trend of relative and absolute destitution, the failure to utilize the contemporary scientific potential for protecting people’s health, as well as their educational needs etc., highlight the sharpening of the main contradiction between capital and labour and overall of the social contradictions.

In the framework of the new international crisis, the competition amongst imperialist alliances is strengthening, along with the competition amongst capitalist states within the alliances, for the control of markets, energy resources and transport routes, creating flashpoints of war in the Eastern Mediterranean, Africa, Southeast Asia and the Arctic.

In recent years, it is evident that discontent has been building up, which is often expressed through outbreaks of people’s rage and indignation, even in powerful capitalist states. As such, it is worth pointing out the strikes and mobilizations against the policy of Macron in France and the protests at the occasion of the murder of George Floyd in the USA. However, disorientation and integration into the competing plans of sections of the bourgeoisie prevail insofar as there is no structured communist party and a labour, class-oriented movement. This competition was recently expressed through the storming of the US Capitol, which was incited by Trump forces, at the occasion of the governmental change in the USA. The so-called “return to normalcy” is not going to address this competition, nor the acute problems that the US people and the peoples of the world are facing, due to the years-long policy of all governments in the USA, both Republican and Democratic ones. However, people’s mobilizations in a number of capitalist states should not be underestimated, since they constitute elements that show the possibilities for the development of the labour–people’s movement in the future.

### THE NEW INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC CRISIS

**2** In 2020, the new international economic crisis manifested itself in a relatively synchronized way, which was deeper than the one in 2008–2009 and the deepest since the post-war period.

Bourgeois analyses stress that the tackling of the COVID-19 pandemic was the main cause of the crisis (with measures for total or partial lockdown), which indeed led to an abrupt restriction of productive, transport and other economic activities. Undoubtedly, the pandemic did contribute to the timing and depth of the outbreak of the crisis; however, it was not its cause. It served as a catalyst, as an additional handbrake in the movement of the international economy that had already slowed down.

The slowdown that emerged already in 2019, revealed the large over-accumulated

capital, which could not be recapitalized and invested, thus not ensuring a satisfactory rate of profit.

In the decade that followed the previous international economic crisis of 2008–2009, only a few capitalist economies reached a higher level of growth than the one in the pre-crisis period.

This particular tackling of the pandemic, despite individual differences amongst the capitalist states, reflects its universal class character. The particular restrictive measures for tackling the pandemic (total or partial lockdown) and the negative social and economic consequences are defined by the capitalist relations of production.

The tragic situation of the public healthcare systems (due to the lack of state primary care, staff and ICUs shortage, issues of infrastructure, etc. in public hospitals), the major problems concerning the preventive measures to protect the health and safety of workers and the low degree of protection of the healthcare staff are not inevitable phenomena, but a result of the bourgeois policy supporting capitalist profitability. The strengthening of the commercialization of health services and medicines is typical of the capitalist states.

The bourgeois policy tries in vain to strike a balance between taking tight health measures and supporting the recovery of capitalist economy. At the same time, the competition between groups and imperialist centres concerning the global market of vaccines and medicines is sharpening, also within the framework of geopolitical confrontations.

### THE UNEVEN OUTBREAK OF THE CRISIS AND THE SHARPENING OF COMPETITION

**3** The uneven outbreak of the crisis and its consequences affects the changes in the correlation of forces and sharpens the contradictions both amongst imperialist alliances and capitalist states, as well as within the EU and especially within the Eurozone.

The struggle for the control of markets, energy resources and maritime transport routes for commodities from the Eastern Mediterranean to the South China Sea is sharpening. The risk of a generalized imperialist war is increasing and expanding.

The developments show that the ability of China to threaten the US supremacy in the international imperialist system in the following years is objectively growing. This dynamic is also reflected in the retreat of the US share and the significant increase in China's share in the 2000–2020 Gross World Product.

The trend for changes in the correlation of forces to the detriment of the USA is also reflected in the dramatic increase in the US trade deficit in the bilateral trade with China (during the period 1985–2019).

On this basis, the US–China trade war escalated in 2018–2019, with the US imposing increased tariffs on Chinese commodities worth of \$200 billion, and China imposing tariffs on American commodities worth of \$60 billion. The USA is placing particular emphasis on maintaining its supremacy in new technologies and, at the same time, on limiting China's expansion to this sector, since such an expansion could also lead to the strengthening of its political influence (e.g. the growing efforts to exclude China from 5G networks in Europe). At the same time, the US government, utilizing the massive tax reduction for the capital, called on the US monopolies in new technologies operating in China to abandon it or to return to the US, while making efforts to prevent China's expansion through the “New Silk Road” (also known as China's Belt and Road Initiative), and its investments in others states.

The sanctions imposed by both sides and the efforts for changes in the global transport supply chain, as well as for reducing the economic interdependence between the USA and China, have a negative impact on the international trade and contributed to the outbreak of the new crisis.

At the same time, protectionist trends are reinforced not only in the USA but also in the EU, following the explicit suggestions made by the President of the European Commission Ursula von der Leyen to the member states for the protection of the European business groups against any attempted aggressive takeover by foreign business groups—especially by groups of strategic importance— during the crisis.

The relations between the USA and Germany are deteriorating, through trade sanctions imposed by both sides and an intensification of disagreements on a wide spectrum of issues, e.g. energy cooperation between Germany and Russia, Germany's limited participation in

NATO's military expenditure, Germany's stance against Iran. Overall, the EU is in sharpening competition with the USA and the UK. The Brexit Withdrawal Agreement signed between the EU and the UK will sharpen the competition in the financial sector in Europe, since it is essentially restricted to the movement of commodities. At the same time, it reflects the pressure exerted to reach compromises, which will reinforce the Euro–Atlantic axis opposed to China's dynamic. This pressure will be intensified following the election victory of the Democrats in the USA.

The changes in the international correlation of forces in favour of China feed opposing trends towards reviving the US–Germany relations and strengthening the cohesion of the Euro–Atlantic alliance. The increase of economic sanctions and the pressure on Russia, which is also experiencing the crisis outbreak, is a manifestation of these trends. Different opinions are expressed within the EU about the stance on Russia and China, which impede the formation of a unified and solid position. Nevertheless, China is objectively emerging as the largest trading partner of the EU, as confirmed by the recent EU–China Comprehensive Agreement on Investment.

#### THE OUTBREAK OF THE CRISIS IN THE EU

**4** The contradictions amongst the EU member states that are generated by the competition of their respective monopoly groups and bourgeois classes are sharpened due to:

a) The impact of the law of uneven capitalist development both within the EU and in relation to the USA, China and Japan.

The strengthening of Germany's standing compared to France and Italy, which was recorded in the previous period of the uneven capitalist development, was further increased in the period of the uneven outbreak of the new crisis and its consequences on the Eurozone and overall on the EU. The differences concerning the changes in the GDP, exports, and productivity confirm this conclusion.

b) The objective difference between the fiscal situation and the problems of the management of state debt and annual deficits, which need to be addressed by the bourgeois governments of the member states to ensure the satisfactory support of their monopoly groups in a period of crisis.

What is being tested here is on the one hand whether Germany will be able to shoulder the main burden of a joint EU borrowing without experiencing a downsizing of its economic power, and on the other hand the extremely limited possibilities of Italy and other highly indebted states to shoulder the burden of new loans, along with the deterioration of the conditions for their competitiveness within the EU.

c) The alternative solutions provided by the changes in the international correlation of forces (the dynamic rise of China, the sharpening of the USA–Germany relations, Brexit, etc.) for the bourgeois governments. Some sections of the bourgeois classes of states, such as Italy, realizing that they reap comparatively less benefits by their participation in the EU single market and in the Euro, are reconsidering the prioritization of their international alliances.

d) The aforementioned objective factors, which reinforce the centrifugal forces of the Eurozone, do not negate the existing benefits that the bourgeois classes of the EU member states reap from the large EU single market in the international competition against other imperialist centres.

**5** This contradiction that objectively characterizes the course of the EU and the Eurozone is reflected in the decisions of the EU Commission. The EU decided for the first time to proceed in joint borrowing to support plans of great state intervention for the recovery of the capitalist economy in all member states, through the formation of the Recovery and Resilience Facility.

It also decided to suspend the implementation of the Stability and Growth Pact for the period 2020–2021 and to proceed with not only loans but also grants to the member states.

At the same time, the European Central Bank (ECB) follows a lax policy and supports banking groups with a huge quantitative easing programme.

The resilience of the relevant compromise of the EU Summit will be put to the test by

the increasing diversion of the interests of the bourgeois classes of the EU member states. The increasing diversion between Germany and Italy in particular highlights the objective issue of cohesion exhibited by the hard core of the Eurozone. A temporary agreement on cheaper loans to the highly indebted and financially weaker member states does not eliminate the objective factors of unevenness; on the contrary, it temporarily retains the centrifugal trends in the Eurozone.

Until the outbreak of the new crisis, Germany rejected steadily the proposals for substantial loosening of the restrictive fiscal and monetary policy, referring to the dangers that would derive from the stability of the euro and its credibility as an international reserve currency. Germany's refusal of any proposal for joint borrowing, debt pooling and provision of grants to highly indebted states was even more pronounced.

Germany adapted relatively its position (thus reaching to a compromise at the EU Summit) mainly to avoid another shock in the EU after Brexit; to avoid a shock in the cohesion of the Eurozone and the dynamic of the euro, since this would have a negative impact on the economic power of the Eurozone and Germany's exports. At the same time, Germany utilized the pressure of frugal states to restrain the initial proposal for providing grants to member states and mainly to impose its terms on the next steps for the economic and political integration of the EU.

**6** The EU's decision to proceed with joint borrowing for the first time in order to provide grants to member states is a step towards the further EU integration.

The agreement on the formation of the Recovery and Resilience Facility is part of this framework.

France and the Alliance of Southern EU States present it as a historical step forward against the reactionary positions of the Frugal North. Germany advances compromise as a temporary adaptation for tackling a major emergency that does not constitute any radical change of direction.

In any case, this is a course towards a reactionary direction. Every step that strengthens the cohesion of the imperialist alliance of the EU, in reality strengthens the true opponent of the workers, i.e. the dictatorship of the capital. The further integration of the EU means the strengthening of unified mechanisms for implementing unified and reactionary directions at the expense of the people.

The procedures provided for the approval of payments both in the framework of the Recovery and Resilience Facility and the Multiannual Financial Framework (seven-year EU budget) strengthen the monitoring and enforcement mechanisms for full compliance of the member states with the EU directions. The monitoring of the highly indebted states, such as Greece, will be conducted in a multiform way. A mechanism for constant evaluation of the reform programme and the commitments agreed will be added to the European semester. Based on this mechanism, it will be decided whether these famous subsidy budgets will be released or frozen.

### THE BOURGEOIS MANAGEMENT OF THE NEW CRISIS

**7** The bourgeois staff in the USA, EU, and Japan have proceeded with great state intervention to support the recovery of the capitalist economy, by utilizing Keynesian proposals. They follow an expansionary fiscal policy, i.e. an increase in government spending, mainly for the direct strengthening of business groups, but also as an effort to temporarily mitigate the acute consequences of the crisis on the people. This policy is related to tolerance towards the increase in state debt, that is to say, it is accompanied by a loose monetary policy.

From the viewpoint of the European social democracy, the need for a steady return to suggestions of Keynesian management is stressed, which is promoted as a progressive and pro-people answer to neoliberalism, that, according to them, is responsible for the outbreak of the crisis.

The truth is that on the one hand various crises manifested themselves during the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century in the framework of a Keynesian type of management, but on the other hand various expansionary Keynesian proposals and directions of loose monetary policy were still present from the previous mix of bourgeois management.

After the international crisis of 2008–2009, the ECB and the Federal Reserve in

particular followed *a quantitative easing monetary policy* to support the banking groups. The governments of the EU member states were given the opportunity to issue bonds purchased by banking groups, technically absorbing borrowed capital from the ECB at favourable rates.

Afterwards, the Green New Deal was introduced. Initially, it was submitted to the US Congress by the “left wing” of the Democrats in 2019. At the same time, the European Green Deal was promoted by the European Commission on the grounds of environmental protection and public health, aiming to form a temporary profitable way out of investments for the over-accumulated capital. In essence, this proposal, along with great state intervention, on the one hand provides incentives through the financing of new investments in the sectors of energy, transport, manufacturing and agriculture in conjunction with the strengthening of the digitalization of the economy, and on the other hand it ensures the controlled depreciation of capital, e.g. the closure of lignite stations, the withdrawal of conventional vehicles, the change of energy networks.

The expansionary fiscal policy and the greater state intervention place a heavy burden on the people once again, but this time differently. The people are called upon to pay for the new loans and shoulder the burden of loss-making private enterprises in the event of their temporary or partial nationalization and vice versa, of their privatization or restriction of state participation, by burdening the Public sector.

They promote the policy of cheaper labour force on the grounds of “employment protection”, by turning the Labour Agreements from full-time employment to part-time or rotating employment and by cutting the working hours enforcing their further flexibility and reducing remuneration, bringing about the intensification of labour and an increase in the degree of exploitation.

In the same framework, the possibility for the unilateral implementation of the anti-labour framework of teleworking is expanding, which, in several cases, eliminates in practice the distinction between free and working time.

The new anti-labour measures, which practically reduce wages, further facilitate dismissals and crush social security rights, initially are introduced as emergency measures but become permanent afterwards. Thus, the policy for a contribution-based pension and strengthening of the private pillar in the social security system is established.

A policy of adaptation to the new productivity level without any improvement in labour wages and of management of extreme poverty, i.e. containing unemployment rates and preventing the basic consumption level of the masses from crumbling, is not a progressive proposal for ensuring the “just distribution of wealth”, as claimed by many social democrats. It is a necessary condition for the safeguarding and recovery of capitalist profitability.

At the same time, the number of long-term unemployed is growing in sectors affected by the green transition, e.g. the closure of lignite power stations, and the popular families shoulder the burden of the workers’ retraining.

The so-called new paradise of green growth includes expensive electricity, flexible labour relations and cheap labour force, new burdens on the popular families’ shoulders for purchasing green vehicles and appliances, green indirect taxes and the overall drain of the people, in order for the state to support the new green investments of business groups. At the same time, the investments of the so-called green growth lead to the environmental degradation of the Natura sites, of protected areas, and of the mountains throughout the country, by aggravating the local economies and the life of the working class and popular forces.

In conclusion, various forms are promoted for the increase in the degree of exploitation of the working class, to provide incentives and possibilities for new and profitable capitalist investments under the pretence of climate change.

**8** No proposal of bourgeois management, whether it is a Keynesian or a neoliberal one, is able to cancel the laws of capitalist production, its anarchy and unevenness, the contradiction between the social character of production and the individual capitalist appropriation of its results.

The crisis is bred by the contradiction existing in the core of the operation of the capitalist exploitative system, in the sphere of capitalist production: the universal and contradictory commodity character of capitalist production makes the outbreak of the capitalist crisis to

its contemporary dimensions inevitable.

The operation of production with capital increase as a driving force, periodically leads to its over-accumulation that hinders its reinvestment at a satisfactory rate of profit.

The bourgeois management proposals, such as the Keynesian ones and generally those of the so-called counter-cyclical economic policy, can only postpone the time of the outbreak of the crisis and temporarily intervene in the degree of capital depreciation, which would lead to a deeper crisis in the future.

Any state intervention for retaining temporarily an extensive and anarchistic depreciation of capital and any plans for the strengthening of business groups in specific sectors by the state set out the conditions for outbreaks of newer and deeper crises of capital over-accumulation. At the same time, the great differences of state intervention amongst bourgeois governments sharpen the unevenness and competition both within each imperialist alliance and amongst the alliances.

The general increasing trend of the organic composition of capital and the decreasing trend of the profit rate in the “transition towards the 4<sup>th</sup> Industrial Revolution” establishes a fertile ground for a new and deeper crisis of over-accumulation, as a result of capitalist development.

Essentially, bourgeois management is trying in vain to address the growing intrinsic contradictions of the capitalist system. The cure for one problem of the “sick man” becomes poison for another. The “cure” of the wage increases for boosting people’s consumption undermines the increase of the degree of exploitation for retaining the decreasing trend of the rate of capitalist profit. Conversely, the wage cuts undermine the sale of commodities at a satisfactory profit for creating surplus value.

The great state intervention with constant increase of state and private debt is not limitless, particularly in periods when competition is intensified and contradictions are sharpened amongst imperialist centres. The latest forecasts of international imperialist organizations (OECD, IMF, etc.) rule out the return to the pre-crisis level in the EU, Japan and the USA over the next two years.

The outbreak of the crisis leads to the partial depreciation and destruction of capital and temporarily gives impetus to the system for accumulating once again. History has shown that this does not always occur unhurriedly and without redividing the global market or waging wars.

## CHAPTER B

### THE INTERNATIONAL POLITICAL–MILITARY FRAMEWORK OF THE CONTEMPORARY WORLD. FIERCE COMPETITION ACROSS THE WORLD. OUR REGION.

**9** The inter-imperialist struggle is waged by economic and political–diplomatic means; it is expressed in “local” wars, with the increase and modernization of armaments, the change of military doctrines, etc., while the danger of a wider imperialist war is growing. In Eurasia and Eastern Mediterranean, in the Persian Gulf and Southern Pacific, in Africa and Latin America, in the Arctic and Central Asia, strong monopolies, capitalist states and their alliances are in conflict. During the past years, one of the epicentres has been the Eastern Mediterranean region, which constitutes a channel between Asia, Europe, and Africa. The wars waged in our region, except for causing significant human losses, have forced millions of people to abandon their homes and flee to other countries and Europe.

### THE STRUGGLE BETWEEN USA AND CHINA FOR SUPREMACY IN THE IMPERIALIST SYSTEM

**10** International relations are strongly characterized by the escalation of the confrontation between US and China for supremacy in the imperialist system, which, apart from the economic background, is also reflected at a political–diplomatic and military level. The USA blamed China for the pandemic, accused it of technology theft, of “expansionism”, etc., while, on the other hand, China seeks to undermine traditional US alliances, using economic and trade agreements. The US is adapting its doctrine, declaring China as its main rival.

The USA seeks to disguise this inter-imperialist confrontation with anti-communist

contrived notions, while China utilizes the ideological construct of “democratization” of international relations within the global imperialist system and focuses on the need to overcome the “unipolar world” in favour of a “multipolar world” and against the imposition of US policy.

They seek to conceal that the struggle between the two strongest economic powers of the contemporary capitalist world for supremacy in the imperialist system is waged in the framework of the capitalist relations of production that prevail in both countries.

The sharpening of the confrontation between the two powers, which takes on a global character as it manifests itself simultaneously in many regions of the world, includes other international and multilateral organizations and agreements. This demonstrates that the interdependence of capitalist economies can go hand in hand with the intensification of inter-imperialist contradictions. The US policy to contain China through the multilateral agreements with the countries of Central and South America and the Pacific, followed by the US leadership before Trump, had not yielded the expected results. It was later replaced by the US administration under Trump, that followed a rigid stance towards China, whose strategic core is not expected to be changed by the Biden administration.

The struggle between USA and China also affects the relations of cooperation and competition with other powerful imperialist centres, especially with Russia and EU states.

### THE NATO PLANNING AND THE STRUGGLE WITHIN IT

**11** NATO’s strategy is characterized by the planned expansion across the globe, its enlargement with new members, the establishment of partnerships with dozens of countries, and the establishment of combat-ready military units. A plan aiming at Russia, Iran, and China is promoted, hence the establishment of fully equipped infantry, air and naval units that can intervene in 30 days, on any front chosen by the NATO staff (the “Four Thirties”).

NATO forces are deployed in many regions in the world, from Afghanistan to Kosovo, from the Baltic to Caucasus, in the Mediterranean, the Black Sea and Africa.

At the same time, there are growing contradictions within NATO between the USA and Germany or the USA and France or France and Germany, as well as other important contradictions, such as the ones between Turkey and France or Turkey and Greece. So far, these contradictions have been settled by various temporary compromises, often by means of tension easing; however, their tangle is becoming increasingly complicated, while the functionality and dynamics of the imperialist predatory alliance are challenged even by bourgeois political forces and analysts.

### THE EU, THE UNION OF CAPITAL IN EUROPE

**12** The EU treats the world as its “strategic environment”, based on the International Strategy it has developed and is preparing to readjust. It also seeks the most effective penetration of European monopolies in third countries. Thus, the so-called “Permanent Structured Military Cooperation” (PESCO) was established. At the same time, the French-inspired “European Intervention Initiative” is being promoted in order to overcome the delays caused by the unanimous decision process, so as to carry out imperialist missions immediately. Today, the EU has already deployed imperialist missions in three continents.

Measures are being taken to strengthen the goal of the so-called “Strategic Autonomy” in the context of strengthening the alliance and joint interventions with NATO, which remains its main pillar.

The planning to develop research and armaments programmes by the EU market, aiming at autonomous military competence is being strengthened in an attempt to reduce the dependence on the US armaments market. The financing of the so-called “European Defence Fund” (EDF) and the “European Defence Industrial Development Programme” (EDIDP) play an important role, as well as the establishment of the “Coordinated Annual Review on Defence” (CARD) to monitor the implementation of the EU goals in armaments and the promotion of military mechanisms and missions by the Member States to the corresponding standards of the “European Semester” for the economy.

Member states are called upon to allocate 2% of their GDP to EU armament, in addition to NATO commitments, in order to modernize the EU defence industry. PESCO plans to



upgrade the so-called “military mobility”.

The militarization of the EU is deepening. This is also in evidence in the establishment of the “European Peace Facility” (EPF), a new fund apart from the budget (multi-annual financial framework 2021-2027), which will provide additional funding of € 10.5 billion. This mechanism will finance the activities of the “Common Foreign and Security Policy” (CFSP).

Plans to strengthen the “Neighbourhood, Development and International Cooperation Instrument”, a powerful tool for EU intervention in third countries, are also being promoted.

At the same time, Brexit expressed the centrifugal force of the UK that pre-existed and was supported by the USA, which, on the one hand seeks to promote separate agreements with EU member states, and on the other hand to impose sanctions on monopolies and powerful EU countries, such as Germany and France.

### NEW POLITICAL, DIPLOMATIC, AND MILITARY ALLIANCES AND THE WITHDRAWAL FROM OLD ONES

**13** The relations of uneven interdependence, which govern the relations of all capitalist states, are also formed through a number of international and regional unions, organizations and agreements that also indirectly reflect the correlation of power, while often become a field of competition. In the past 30 years, in addition to the most well-known organizations (e.g. UN, NATO, EU, OSCE, WTO, G7, G20), most of which are led by the US, new ones have emerged, such as BRICS (Brazil, Russia, India, China, South Africa), the Shanghai Cooperation Organization, led by China, and the Collective Security Treaty Organization and the Eurasian Economic Union, led by Russia.

These unions, which are set up in the framework of monopoly capitalism, despite their differences or their different degree of integration, have the same exploitative class character and aim: the strengthening of the power, the economic and geopolitical standing of the bourgeois classes they represent in the division and redistribution of the world. In conditions where the prolonged capitalist crisis brings about the redistribution of power among the capitalist states, some of them are going through serious upheavals. Such examples are the BRICS, where the confrontation between China and India is increasing; the APEC<sup>[1]</sup> (Asia–Pacific Economic Cooperation) and ASEAN<sup>[2]</sup> (Association of Southeast Asian Nations), in which growing tensions surrounding the stance towards the claims of China and the US involvement in the region are rising; the ALBA<sup>[3]</sup> (Bolivarian Alliance for the Peoples of our America), which was supported by China and Russia but is significantly weakening after the predominance of US-oriented governments.

In order to secure its supremacy in the imperialist system, the US is moving towards the realignment of its alliances, the review of agreements, the restructuring of international organizations and the paralyzing of others when it cannot use them for its plans. It is characteristic how the USA has used the Organization of American States in recent years as its political tool in the region.

Thus, we can note that the USA has withdrawn in 2002 from the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty (ABM); in 2017 from UNESCO; in 2018 from the Iran Nuclear Deal. In 2017, it withdrew from the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) and froze the talks about the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) with the European Union. In 2018, while exerting pressure claiming that it would withdraw from NAFTA, it succeeded in replacing it with USMCA<sup>[4]</sup>. In 2019, it withdrew from the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty (INF) and the Paris Agreement on Climate Change; in 2020, from the Treaty on Open Skies. In addition, it announced that it is considering proceeding to new nuclear tests, in violation of the relevant 1963 International Agreement.

Thus, the stance of the most powerful imperialist centre to date dispels the illusions fostered and cultivated by various bourgeois and opportunistic forces that the “globalization of economies” and “multipolarity” would lead to a global system where all the issues would be “peacefully” resolved by the International Law and International Organizations.

The general situation, which is related to the implementation problems of the International Law, reaffirms the position that International law, as we knew it when the USSR and other socialist countries existed and was the result of the global correlation of forces between those countries and the capitalist ones, no longer exists. The resolutions of International Courts are influenced by the correlation of forces in the imperialist system.

The “imperialist peace” agreements express the correlation of power of the directly or indirectly involved capitalist states and are called into question by its change.

Powerful interstate organizations have become a cloak for advancing the interests of the USA, NATO and other imperialist powers. Within these organizations, confrontations and temporary compromises are taking place among the powerful imperialist powers. When compromises cannot be reached, bargains, threats, and even withdrawals from various agreements follow, as shown by the stance of the USA and other countries, such as Russia, which demonstrates the supremacy of national law against international laws and regulations, mimicking the relevant stance of the USA vis-à-vis International Law.

The trend for changes in the correlation of forces, the US withdrawal from a series of agreements aiming at the realignment of imperialist alliances in its favour, as well as the pursuit of shifting the basic US aims to the Asian region against China, is erroneously interpreted by a series of forces as a “US withdrawal” and a “power vacuum” in the world. The reality is clearly different.

The USA seeks to realign the web of international organizations and agreements, which always reflect the uneven interdependence of capitalist states, to its own interests. Thus, the US leadership considers that the present composition of the Group of Seven most powerful capitalist countries (USA, Japan, Canada, France, UK, Italy, Germany) is outdated and that Australia, South Korea, India and Russia should be invited, in an effort to forge a new anti-Chinese alliance. Particular emphasis is given to the Indo–Pacific region and the effort to link India to US plans, in an environment of sharpening of China–India relations.

[1] APEC: Australia, Brunei, Canada, Chile, China, Hong Kong, Indonesia, Japan, South Korea, Malaysia, Mexico, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Russia, Singapore, Taiwan, Thailand, USA and Vietnam.

[2] ASEAN: Vietnam, Indonesia, Cambodia, Laos, Malaysia, Brunei, Myanmar, Singapore, Thailand, Philippines.

[3] ALBA: It was an alliance of Cuba with social–democratic governments that had emerged in Latin American countries, first and foremost with Venezuela.

[4] USMCA: United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement

## THE MILITARY POWER IN THE “CONTINUATION OF POLICY WITH VIOLENT MEANS”

**14** We see that global military expenditure in 2019 was estimated at US \$ 1,917 trillion, at 2.2% of global GDP, with an increase of 3.6% compared to 2018 and 7.2% compared to 2010, for the third consecutive year, mainly due to US and China’s military expenditure and operations. International arms sales increased by 7.8% in the period 2014–2018, or by 20% compared to the period 2005–2009.

As regards military expenditure, the USA takes first place (US \$ 732 billion), followed by China (\$ 261 billion), India (\$ 71.1 billion), Russia (\$ 65.1 billion), Saudi Arabia (\$ 61.9 billion), France (\$ 50.1 billion), Germany (\$ 49.3 billion), UK (\$ 48.7 billion), Japan (\$ 47.6 billion), and South Korea (\$ 43.9 billion). In 2019, total military spending of all 29 NATO member states was \$ 1,035 billion.

In the period 2015–2019, the US remained first in arms exports, accounting for 36%, followed by Russia, France, Germany and China.

Nuclear forces continue to modernize their nuclear arsenal, replacing old warheads. The 9 nuclear powers (USA—owing 5,800 nuclear warheads, Russia—6,375, UK—215, France—290, China—320, India—150, Pakistan—160, Israel—90, North Korea—30 or 40), possess a total of 13,400 nuclear weapons, 90% of which belong to the US and Russia.

The US and Russia are announcing changes in their nuclear military doctrine, while both sides issue statements about new types of superweapons, such as automatic laser weapon systems, and new fields of application, such as space.

The United States intends to include China in a nuclear control and containment agreement, considering it a dangerous competitor, while the main nuclear armament issue under consideration is the “first strike” capability.

Military bases outside the borders are an important tool for the military planning of major powers. The USA appears to have over 700 bases for different uses all over the

world. UK, France, Russia, Italy, Turkey, China, Japan and India also have bases abroad.

An important new element of the period, which is indicative of the intensity of competition and military preparation, is the changes in the defence doctrines of a number of capitalist states (characteristic examples are Germany a few years ago and more recently Japan). At the same time, NATO is approaching states that for decades have been described as “neutral”, a characteristic example being Sweden.

### THE PARTICIPATION OF THE GREEK BOURGEOISIE IN THE COMPETITION

**15** The Greek bourgeoisie strives to upgrade its geopolitical standing, by actively participating in the military–political plans of the USA, NATO and EU. The goals and means of the geostrategic upgrade are adopted and promoted, despite individual differences, by the bourgeois parties and governments, either one-party or coalition ones, both of the SYRIZA before, and of the ND today. This is a strategic choice of all bourgeois parties, a basic element of their strategic alignment.

The Greek bourgeoisie aspires to upgrade its standing in the Balkans and the Southeastern Mediterranean, where it has great economic interests. It proceeded to the “Prespa Agreement” in order to pave the way for the accession of yet another country to the NATO-EU imperialist organizations. It strives for cooperation in the exploitation of the energy resources of the Eastern Mediterranean for their channeling to European markets, through the EastMed pipeline, as well as the construction of a vertical gas corridor in Northern Greece, from which US liquefied gas that will come into Greece, will be channeled to other European countries. All this is part of Europe’s plan to “wean itself” from Russian natural gas.

It seeks to make the country a technological, energy and financial hub in support of Euro-Atlantic plans for the region. The utilization of the Greek shipyards for the needs of the Sixth US fleet, the ports of Alexandroupolis and Kavala for the transport of liquefied natural gas and the investments of powerful US groups in the field of telecommunications–IT in Attica are all part and parcel of this objective. At the same time, it is trying to manage the US response to China’s investment in domestic port infrastructure and in the domain of electrical power transmission.

The SYRIZA government promoted the so-called “Strategic Dialogue Greece–USA”, which formed a framework for economic, political and military issues, with the crucial review and expansion of the Greek-US agreement on the bases.

This planning is also served by the agreement between the ND government and the USA, which includes the further upgrade of the Souda base and the creation of Drones bases in Larissa, helicopters in Stefanovikeio and the port of Alexandroupolis—which is a significantly upgraded link for US plans— while maintaining the base for AWACS flying radar in Aktio, Preveza, and modernizing the base in Araxos for “hosting” nuclear weapons. Today, the government is preparing to cede more than 20 points in the country to be used as US military bases.

In practice, a web of military bases is being created that geographically covers all regions of the country, turning Greece into a base for the implementation of imperialist plans, with the stationing of fighter jets and helicopters, the mooring of aircraft carriers, nuclear submarines, NATO and US destroyers, telecommunications–espionage infrastructure, fuel depots, and ground forces reception facilities. It strengthens the connection with the US bases and infrastructure in the Middle East region, the Balkans and the UK bases in Cyprus, with the possibility of launching nuclear strikes from Araxos, to encircle Russia and for transport to various war hotspots.

The Greek-US Agreement enables the installation and use of US forces in all Greek Army units with multiple consequences for their role and orientation, as an integral part of the NATO army.

In practice, the country’s involvement in imperialist plans is deepening, while our people together with other peoples with pay for the consequences of imperialist competition and for the already grave risks of the targeting of our country. Russia and Iran warn that if their security is endangered by US bases, they will strike at them with missiles.

The aggression of the Greek bourgeoisie is also evident from the deployment of Greek military forces to dozens of imperialist missions abroad. The Patriot missile system was sent to Saudi Arabia together with relevant military personnel following the recent government

decisions. Greece has also sent military forces and civilian personnel in Libya. Warships are patrolling the Strait of Hormuz, in the Persian Gulf, while a mission to Mali, where French and multinational forces are fighting, has been put on the table.

The attempt to justify the missions of Greek forces abroad under the pretense of adhering to UN, the EU and NATO decisions, is an affront and is supported by all the bourgeois parties, with the ND government and SYRIZA in the lead.

The pursuit of the bourgeoisie to create an “axis” with Israel, Egypt, the United Arab Emirates, and Cyprus strengthens the country’s involvement in conflicts that also concern the states of the allied groups it participates in. Even more so as the state of Israel is an occupying power in Palestine and is killing its people, it is in conflict with Iran, it is occupying and bombing Syrian territories, while Egypt is involved in the war in Libya and has general aspirations in the region. The euphoria that is cultivated is unfounded, while in any case the energy monopolies will benefit.

An important area of inter-imperialist competition is the Balkans, which have particular geostrategic importance, both as a channel of transport and energy arteries to and from the EU as well as a bridgehead of Euro-Atlantic imperialism for its political, economic and military consolidation in the region of Eurasia, the Black Sea, Caucasus, the Caspian, etc. Today, all countries have joined the imperialist unions of NATO and the EU, while in recent years efforts to complete the integration of the Western Balkans into these unions have been intensified. US–NATO forces continue their strengthening in the area, already have a large number of bases, and conduct large-scale military exercises, characterizing Russia and China —whose monopolies are advancing their own positions in the region— as their opponents. The course of the Western Balkans’ integration was further upgraded by the “Prespa Agreement” concluded by the SYRIZA government and implemented by the ND government. At the same time, the integration process of the Western Balkans into the imperialist unions of NATO and the EU is not influenced only by the “festering wounds” of the imperialist invasions and protectorates of Kosovo and Bosnia–Herzegovina, but also the contradictions within the EU and NATO, as well as other strong monopoly interests (Russian and Chinese) outside of these unions, which have been strengthened in the region. For the promotion of one or other of those plans, the bourgeois political forces utilize the poison of nationalism, religious–cultural peculiarities or the cosmopolitanism of capital, seeking to manipulate the peoples into various plans, alien to the popular interests. In any case, they trample on the labour–popular rights of the peoples of the Balkans.

The participation of the Greek bourgeoisie in these rivalries is involving the country in dangerous developments, in bloody situations against other peoples, while the working class and the popular forces become hostages of imperialist wars.

### **GREEK–TURKISH RELATIONS. THE DANGER OF MILITARY CONFRONTATION AND “CO-EXPLOITATION”**

**16** The competition between the bourgeois classes of Greece and Turkey is sharpening, with each one seeking to upgrade its standing in the imperialist planning and competition in the area.

Turkey is amongst the 20 most powerful capitalist states in the world and takes 2<sup>nd</sup> place in NATO in terms of active military manpower, seeking to further upgrade its standing regionally and globally. It has invaded and is maintaining occupying troops in 3 countries (Cyprus, Syria, Iraq); it has military bases in the Balkans, the Middle East, and Africa; it is openly involved in the Libyan civil war and militarily supports Azerbaijan in the war with Armenia. It seeks to utilize minority groups in various regions (the Balkans, Crimea, Caucasus, Central Asia, the Middle East), as well as the Muslim religious doctrine for its planning. The Turkish bourgeoisie as a whole aims to upgrade its role, however, there are differentiations within it regarding its means and its necessary international alliances. In the context of the “neo-Ottoman” political doctrine, which the dominant section of the Turkish bourgeoisie has chosen as a vehicle for its interests, it appears as a “defender” of the Palestinian people, in confrontation not only with Israel but also with the ruling classes of Egypt and Saudi Arabia. Seeking to bargain with the US, NATO, and the EU from a position of strength, it is developing important and multifaceted relations with the Russian bourgeois class —it has been equipped with Russian S-400 anti-aircraft/anti-ballistic missile systems, which could bring about significant changes in the military balance

of power in the Aegean and the wider region— *as well as with Qatar*.

The relations of the bourgeois classes of Greece and Turkey, depending on the circumstances, are distinguished by the pursuit of cooperation and competition; however the peoples of the two countries do not benefit from these relations.

Since the previous Congress, Turkish aggression has escalated, with the disputing of the borders in the Aegean and Evros, the questioning of Greek sovereignty of dozens of Aegean islands, the attempt to claim a section of the Greek continental shelf and EEZ, which, according to the International Convention on the Law of the Sea, does not belong to it. In this direction, the Turkish state declared the so-called “Blue Homeland”, signed the Turkish–Libyan pact with the appointed leadership of Libya, which violates the sovereign rights of Greece. It also increased overflights over Greek islands, military exercises, research or drilling in the Eastern Mediterranean, in areas of the Greek continental shelf and in the Greek and Cypriot EEZ, it stirred up minority issues, used the issue of immigrants and refugees as a tool, utilizing the agreement with the EU.

Under these circumstances, US–NATO mediation and arbitration are ‘watching and waiting’, while the Turkish position for co-exploitation and co-management of the Aegean, for the “win-win” solution advocated by the US and NATO, is back on the table. At the same time, the possibility of co-exploitation and co-management of Cypriot sea zones with Turkey is being examined. This co-exploitation does not concern the prosperity of the peoples, but the profitability of the monopolies and undermines the future of the two peoples, as well as the environment.

Our Party defends the sovereign rights of the country from the point of view of the working class and the popular strata, as an integral part of the struggle for the overthrow of the power of capital. It has warned workers that under the current circumstances, bourgeois governments and imperialist alliances cannot guarantee these rights, at a time when International Law is being rewritten by imperialist agreements and the Hague Tribunal is acting out of expediency. Peace and the security of peoples cannot be guaranteed in this context. The struggle of the two peoples must be directed towards the elimination of the cause which gives rise to contradictions, conflicts, wars, the overthrow of the power of capital and disengagement from imperialist unions.

The KKE, which is firmly oriented towards the development of friendship, internationalist solidarity between the working class and the peoples of the two countries, has established close relations with the CP of Turkey, aiming to strengthen the anti-imperialist struggle of the labour–popular movement in both countries, against the bourgeoisie and Greek–Turkish participation and entanglement in imperialist plans, for the inviolability of borders, for their disengagement from NATO and EU imperialist organizations and unions, which are a permanent source of agonizing consequences at the expense of the peoples.

In this direction, there is room for strengthening the anti-war and anti-imperialist struggle and expanding the struggle of the Greek Committee for International Détente and Peace (EEDYE).

### ON THE CYPRUS ISSUE

**17** The ongoing processes as regards the Cyprus issue aim at the finalization of the partition of the island and the formation of two separate state entities that will only formally and in the short term have some elements of a federation.

The Cyprus issue is an international problem of the invasion and occupation of the northern part of Cyprus by Turkey, complicated by the issue of the exploitation of the region’s energy wealth by the monopolies, the competition of the imperialist forces in the region, the utilization of Cyprus as a military bulwark by the NATO forces, the plans of the US, the EU and other capitalist states in the region, as well as the competition of the bourgeois classes in the region.

Those who believed that the EU accession or the exploitation of hydrocarbons by monopolies would bring prosperity, peace and a just solution to the Cyprus issue were not justified, as shown by the Turkish provocations in the Cypriot EEZ, in Famagusta, the questioning of the sovereign rights of Cyprus and the context of the negotiations so far for a dichotomous solution.

The KKE stands firmly and decisively by the side of the people of Cyprus. It opposes the imposition of a solution that will perpetuate the partition, will not provide a viable

and reliable solution for the Cypriot people as a whole, Greek Cypriots, Turkish Cypriots, Armenians, Latins, and Maronites. Our struggle is directed towards the goal of a united and independent Cyprus (one and not two states), with one single sovereignty, one citizenship and international personality, without foreign bases and troops, without foreign guarantors and protectors.

## CHAPTER C

### THE SITUATION IN THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST MOVEMENT (ICM) AND THE ACTIVITY OF THE KKE. THE CURRENT PHASE OF THE ICM

**18** The regroupment course of the International Communist Movement (ICM), which is in deep crisis and comes under fierce ideological and political attack by forces supporting the capitalist system, is a constant concern of our Party and stems from the international character of class struggle.

Under these conditions, where the bourgeois states implementing more drastic legal and repressive measures against the communists are proliferating, our Party, in coordination with other CPs, took initiatives for the revolutionary regroupment of the ICM, which today lacks ideological cohesion and correspondent organizational structure.

Some aspects of the situation that we are facing are the following:

Many parties retain the title “communist”, but their ideological–political and organizational formation is not consistent with the communist characteristics, the ideology of scientific communism, the revolutionary strategy–Programme that corresponds to a revolutionary workers’, Leninist party.

Without downplaying the importance of a number of Parties invoking Marxism–Leninism and thus separating their position from those that openly rejected our ideology, many of these Parties still have a very weak class approach regarding the contemporary phenomena of capitalism and the class struggle based on communist ideology, the dialectical materialist analysis of history and the contemporary social phenomena.

The CPs’ approaches are often dominated by bourgeois and opportunist ideological influences, turning any invocation of our world view from a theoretical basis and a scientific methodological tool for understanding and changing society into a “wish list”.

Briefly, the overall negative picture remains, both in the leading capitalist countries (USA, countries of the EU, UK, Japan, China, Russia) as well as in countries and regions that are hotbeds of imperialist military interventions.

The situation is similar in the labour–trade union movement, where trade union leaderships and trade unions compromised with bourgeois governments and employers prevail, while the bonding between most of the CPs and the working class and its movement remains a great issue in order for the CPs to acquire new positions and a leading role in the class struggle.

In this situation, however, it is particularly important that a number of CPs is forming—not without setbacks— *which tried to amend their strategy facing many difficulties, declaring the socialist character of the revolution and seeking to overcome the old strategy that dominated the ICM.*

### IDEOLOGICAL–POLITICAL ISSUES THAT REQUIRE OUR ATTENTION

**19** A fierce ideological–political struggle is being waged among the ranks of the ICM on a number of issues, such as the analysis–interpretation of contemporary phenomena of capitalism and the international imperialist system. Views supporting that capitalism endures, that there are possibilities of its “humanization” and “democratization”, that its technological achievements can be utilized for the benefit of the popular forces with the active political intervention of the CPs even at a governmental level, etc. prevail in the ICM. In this context, positions about “the unity of the left, of democratic or patriotic forces”, “the cooperation with the left-wing social democracy”, “centre–left governments”, “new anti-fascist and anti-neoliberal fronts”, which are based on the rationale of stages, are reproduced by CPs, advocating a governmental goal in the framework of capitalism (anti-dictatorship, anti-occupation–liberating, democratic–anti-imperialist, anti-right-wing, anti-fascist–anti-neoliberal, etc.).

A struggle is also being waged on the economic and political scientific laws of the socialist



revolution and the communist society, focusing on the interpretation of the socialist–communist construction in the 20<sup>th</sup> century and the causes of the counter-revolutionary overthrow.

A key factor that impedes the revolutionary regroupment of the ICM is the fact that a series of CPs do not attempt an in-depth evaluation of the historical experience of the socialist construction and the strategy of the ICM based on fundamental principles of our theory. As a result, they continue to adopt positions of the strategy of stages and reforms for the transition to socialism. Thus, they adopt a policy of cooperation with social democratic forces, a political goal of a transition government in the framework of capitalism, as well as positions perceiving the laws of the market as elements that can be incorporated into socialist construction.

A series of CPs form the opportunist position that “socialism with Chinese characteristics” is being constructed in China, with a certain compromise with the capital and the misconception that Russia is not an imperialist power, but a capitalist country on the “periphery” of the imperialist system, which, together with “socialist China”, plays a positive role in international developments. This approach, which detaches politics from the economy, opposes the Leninist conception of imperialism.

For our Party, the study of socialist construction in the USSR is an important achievement–basis, although we are still faced with the task of continuing the research–study on issues of economy and foreign policy, more generally on issues of the superstructure in the USSR as well as in other countries of socialist construction. Most CPs, which have not conducted any relevant studies, remain very confused about the character of today’s China, Russia, and other capitalist states. This can have tragic consequences for their stance on the issue of war in the epoch of imperialism, where the communist movement, maintaining a stable front against the imperialist centres of the US, NATO, the EU, should not be dragged to the side of any capitalist state or imperialist centre. It must achieve the goal of consistently defending the class interests of the working class in conflict with the bourgeoisie of its country, not to choose a “foreign flag” under the pressure of petty bourgeois forces but also nationalist pressures on the working class.

Communists must strengthen the front both against the conception of cosmopolitanism, which takes a non-class approach towards the international alliances of the bourgeois classes (EU, NATO, BRICS, etc.), as well as against nationalism, the “racial purity of the nation and culture” and other racist perceptions, which are developed against refugees and immigrants.

## INITIATIVES AND ACTIVITIES IN WHICH THE PARTY PARTICIPATES

### **20** **The European Communist Initiative.** **The International Communist Review.**

Our Party was at the forefront of the formation of the European Communist Initiative (ECI), which includes 30 CPs from Europe, as well as the International Communist Review (ICR), in which 10 Parties participate. Both of these forms of inter-party cooperation are based on specific founding principles and ideological–political framework.

The ECI highlighted significant problems that the workers face and put forward demands for their needs; for the right to permanent and stable employment against the scourge of unemployment and flexible forms of employment; for exclusively free public health, welfare, and education; for labour rights in the workplace, political and trade union rights and for the right to strike, against state and employer intimidation.

The parties participating in the ECI have developed a significant activity against imperialist wars and interventions, revealed the essence of inter-imperialist competition for market share and control over wealth-producing resources.

The ECI is in conflict with anti-communism, the persecution of Communist Parties, the ban on their activity and symbols, on the communist ideology.

The ECI marked historical anniversaries of the International Communist Movement and highlighted their contemporary messages; it defended the gains and achievements of socialism that was constructed in the 20<sup>th</sup> century and the fact that it was a process of socialist construction in the Soviet Union and other countries; it decisively confronted the systematic defamation by the EU and other capitalist mechanisms. In this regard, the events that were organized under the auspices of the ECI in Istanbul and Moscow for the 100

years since the foundation of the Communist International were of particular importance.

At the same time, however, we estimate that ideological–political confusions and problems are manifested to varying degrees within the Parties participating in the ECI. There are parties that have waged long-lasting struggles against forces of opportunism, however their specific ideological–political and organizational potential is limited, due to the long-term damage done by eurocommunism and social democracy to the European communist movement. Thus, they face many difficulties in the elaboration of the revolutionary strategy and in its connection with current class struggle, in conditions where the very negative correlation of forces also concerns the trade union labour movement. Under these conditions the opportunistic attack is reproduced.

For a part of CPs, the lack of ideological–political and organizational unity has its roots in the historical course of their dissolution and formation after the counter-revolution, while the process of strengthening the revolutionary communist characteristics is often accompanied by a sharpening of the struggle within them, even by splits. This is especially evident when an attempt is made to align the strategy to the needs of the anti-capitalist struggle, and therefore the revolutionary forces undertake the additional task of studying developments on a class basis, taking into account all the factors influencing their course in a timely manner and insisting on creating strong programmatic bases, on which the ideological–political and organizational unity of their ranks will be based.

The journal *International Communist Review*, in which parties from all over the world participate, moves in the direction of shaping the conditions for the formation of a Communist Pole. During the period under review, 4 issues of the ICR were published, on timely topics concerning the International Communist Movement (the October Revolution, the women’s movement, the labour–trade union movement, and proletarian internationalism). Through the discussion of theoretical and political issues, the meetings of the Editorial Board of the ICR aim to give impetus to the development of revolutionary theory and policy as a single basis for the CP. The publication of the journal in different languages, thanks to the joint efforts of the participating parties and despite a number of difficulties, is addressed to the members and cadres of the Communist Parties, defends Marxism–Leninism and seeks to approach contemporary issues on a Marxist–Leninist basis.

## **21 International and Regional Meetings. Joint Statements.**

The KKE, together with other CPs, contributed to the effort to maintain the communist characteristics in the International Meetings of Communist and Workers’ Parties (IMCWP), which started at the initiative of the KKE and into which more than 120 CPs participate. Our Party fulfilled its commitments to the other Parties participating in the IMCWPs regarding the operation of the joint website SOLIDNET, where the CPs can publish news and documents, of the system of rapid mutual information of the CPs, and the digital edition of the “Information Bulletin”.

Out of the 3 International Meetings that took place during this period, the KKE hosted the 20<sup>th</sup>, which coincided with the 100<sup>th</sup> anniversary since its founding in 2018. It also co-organized the 21<sup>st</sup> IMCWP in Izmir together with the CP of Turkey; a fact that practically demonstrated the internationalist ties between the Greek and Turkish communists and opened a new page in the coordination of the CPs’ activity.

Of course, as our Party has emphasized in the past, a fierce ideological–political struggle of strategic character has been waged within the International Meetings on many contemporary issues and especially on the direction of the struggle. The decided Joint Actions are only promoted by a part of the CPs, while other CPs, without hindering their issuing, do not implement them.

During the same period, our Party organized Meetings of European CPs (2018, 2019), a Regional Meeting of the Communist Parties of the Mediterranean, the Middle East and the Gulf (end of 2017), and participated in a series of thematic events organized by other CPs, such as the 100<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the October Revolution, the 100 years since the founding of the Communist International, the 200 years since the birth of Marx, etc.

In many cases it was possible to adopt Joint Statements or Declarations, such as those on the 100<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the October Revolution and the founding of the Communist International. Through the formulation of Joint Statements, an attempt is made to clarify





the assessments of each CP on one or the other issue, as well as to set common goals of struggle. This is a complex, arduous form of cooperation and coordination of the CPs, which retains its importance, despite the fact that many Communist and Workers' Parties are currently weak or operating in semi-clandestine conditions, under harsh persecution, or do not have at their disposal all the means that the KKE and some other parties now possess in order to struggle for the common goals that are set. The process of exchanging views and the corresponding struggle on serious issues, in the context of the preparation of Joint Statements, contributes, to a certain extent, to the direction of the revolutionary ideological regroupment of the International Communist Movement.

Especially in the pandemic conditions, where a number of International Meetings were postponed, joint statements as well as teleconferences were particularly important forms of work.

## **22** Supporting and developing internationalist activity

Our Party stood by the side of CPs and communists that are being persecuted. It issued statements, complaints, made *démarches*, organized pickets at embassies, submitted Questions to the European Parliament, sent delegations of MPs and MEPs to trials against CPs held in other countries.

It was at the forefront of the expression of solidarity with peoples facing foreign occupation and the consequences of imperialist interventions and blackmails, such as the Cuban, the Palestinian and the Cypriot people.

Our Party has further strengthened its bilateral relations with dozens of CPs around the world, conveying the KKE's experience from the struggles and the conclusions drawn from the study of its 100-year heroic history. It sought the cooperation and coordination of action even with parties with which it has serious ideological–political differences.

Of particular importance is the close and comradely relationship that has been developed with the CP of Turkey (TKP), the fact that the KKE and the TKP were able to issue Joint Statements on the developments in Greek–Turkish relations and in our region in critical moments of the previous period, setting up a front against both the nationalism and the cosmopolitanism of capital, showing the peoples of the two countries the way of struggle against the imperialist plans and interests of the bourgeois classes, the way of peace and friendship of the peoples, which is the way of socialism.

The KKE supported the effort of the KNE, which increased its prestige and took on serious responsibilities for the development and coordination of struggle of the Communist Youth Organizations, giving impetus to the Meetings of European Communist Youth Organizations (MECYOs), promoting rich bilateral relations, and utilizing the experience gained from the struggle of Communist Youth Organizations against the bourgeois and opportunistic intervention among the youth.

Our Party continued to support the activity of the World Federation of Trade Unions (WFTU), the World Peace Council (WPC), the World Federation of Democratic Youth (WFDY), and the Women's International Democratic Federation (WIDF), while it also participates in the International Federation of Resistance Fighters (FIR). The ideological and organizational weaknesses of the CPs and the intervention of opportunist and bourgeois forces are having a negative effect in these international organizations, whose formation was influenced by the USSR and the Anti-fascist Victory, following the end of the imperialist World War II. Opportunist and social democratic conceptions—that often have the final say and dominate the ideological–political struggle—are strengthened in these organizations, which, thanks to the active intervention of the communists, withstood the tide of the counter-revolution. Even bourgeois forces seek to exploit the historical course and legacy of these organizations, to benefit from the loss of anti-capitalist reflexes and the ideological confusion prevailing among communist forces, for example, about the economic–political content of imperialism, in order to promote their own plans, their support for one or another imperialist alliance. Further discussion is needed on the correlation of forces in each of these organizations, their outlook, their framework of struggle, and the communists' intervention.

### **THE PROCESS OF REVOLUTIONARY REGROUPMENT**

**23** . Our basic goal remains the ideological–political–organizational regroupment of the ICM in conditions of a great retreat of the labour movement and despite the sharpening of the contradictions of capitalism. The roots of the retreat are very deep, on the one hand due to the complete victory of the counter-revolution in the first cycle of socialist construction in the 20<sup>th</sup> century, and on the other hand due to the long-term integration of CPs into the bourgeois political system.

The impasses of capitalism and all forms of its capitalist management objectively prepare the ground for the development of the labour and communist movement. In the current conditions, our Party, expressing solidarity with every Communist and Workers' Party that is being persecuted, raises the issue of the ideological–political regroupment of the ICM, through the strengthening of joint activity with the Communist and Workers' Parties which:

- Defend Marxism–Leninism and proletarian internationalism, the need to form a corresponding pole.
- Defend the revolutionary prospect, clash with the forces of opportunism and reformism, have rejected the centre–left management of capitalism and any other variant of the “strategy of stages”.
- Defend the scientific laws of socialist revolution and construction, recognize the course of socialist construction in the 20<sup>th</sup> century and at the same time seek to research, realize the problems and mistakes, and draw lessons.
- Have a clear ideological front against erroneous views about imperialism, especially those that detach military aggression from the economic content of imperialism, resulting in a lack of front against any imperialist alliance.
- Establish ties with the working class, are active in the trade union movement, seeking to integrate the struggle for the rights of the working class and the popular middle strata into a contemporary revolutionary strategy for workers' power.

## CHAPTER D

### DEVELOPMENTS IN THE DOMESTIC ECONOMY. FROM A WEAK RECOVERY TO A NEW SLOWDOWN AND ITS TRANSFORMATION INTO A DEEP CRISIS OF THE CAPITALIST ECONOMY

**24** The period since the 20<sup>th</sup> Congress is marked by alternations in the development of the Greek capitalist economy. Initially, a sluggish recovery process was manifested in 2017–2019 that was followed by a new slowdown at the end of 2019, which, due to the measures to manage the COVID-19 outbreak, was transformed into a new deep capitalist crisis in 2020, with a fall in GDP by 10%, based on the existing estimations (e.g. IMF).

In Greece, the fall in GDP is expected to be higher than the EU and Eurozone average and the most countries in the wider region.

Since early 2017 until the end of 2019, GDP had risen at constant 2010 prices at an annual average rate of around 1.8%, covering a small part of the GDP contraction by 25% in the previous crisis (2008–2015).

The contraction of GDP, already in the 4<sup>th</sup> quarter of 2019, mainly reflects the decline in exports and investment. The stagnation in the Eurozone, the slowdown in the world GDP, and the sharp slowdown in international trade as early as 2019, before the pandemic outbreak, had a negative impact on the domestic economy with a delay of about six months.

The relative weakness of social capital to reproduce itself is evident in the official industrial production index for the period prior to COVID-19. In 2019, the relevant index decreased by 0.6% compared to 2018, when an increase of 1.6% was recorded, and the manufacturing index slowed by 1.2% compared to the increase of 2.8% in 2018. The index differs from sector to sector due to the uneven development among sectors, with the dynamic Pharmaceutical industry recording an increase of 23%, and the sector of oil refining products shrinking by 8.6%, while the food processing sector had increased by 1.5%.

The period 2017–2019 was accompanied by a gradual change in the sectoral structure of the domestic economy. Dynamic sectors have strengthened even more (Telecommunications/IT, Pharmaceutical Industry, Chemical Industry) through high

investments and profits. The same also applies to the export-oriented commodity production sectors, international tourism, Transport, etc. On the contrary, the Construction Industry and the relevant manufacturing activity declined significantly. The sectoral restructuring of the domestic economy was promoted through the contribution of government projects and the utilization of European programmes (NSRF).

The new government of the New Democracy (ND) was overly optimistic about the “growing momentum of the domestic economy”, an estimation that was quickly refuted.

Our Party characterized in good time these forecasts for a strong growth of domestic economy in the medium-term period as over-optimistic. We repeatedly warned about the negative effects of the so-called “extroversion”, which was promoted as a significant post-crisis achievement by the governments of the ND and SYRIZA, the Hellenic Federation of Enterprises (SEV), and the Bank of Greece. The infamous “extroversion policy” led to the further integration of the domestic economy into the world capitalist market, and thus exposing it to a more generalized crisis.

### **The governmental economic policies after the formal completion of the memoranda**

**25** In the summer of 2018, the memoranda were officially completed, while the framework of enhanced surveillance was activated. In April 2019, the Stability Programme and National Reform Programme were submitted since the country joined the framework of the European Semester requirements.

Each government plans and develops its economic policies based on the overall needs and internal contradictions of big capital. Each alternation in government expresses, amongst others, contradictions among sections of capital and differentiations in the interests of bourgeois forces, a different rate in the implementation of certain aspects of bourgeois strategy. However, strategic bourgeois planning remains unchanged. The formation of conditions for the acceleration of capitalist development, the country's geostrategic upgrading, the shift towards sectors in which the country “has competitive advantages”, and the system's fortification against a potential sharp and mass popular reaction constitute its main components.

The government of ND passed legislation promoting the “indirect” support of capital's profitability, the attraction of investments (land-use and investment scheme changes, abolition of mechanisms that hindered centralization, etc.), as well as the direct support of monopoly groups (tax deductions, utilization of NSRF and EU funds, etc).

It is firmly oriented towards strengthening capital's competitiveness through policies aiming at cheaper labour force and the promotion of privatizations. The attraction of new major investments from the so-called “digital” and “green” economy require cheap labour force and increased rate of exploitation. The attack against the working class is escalating with new regulations on the flexibility of working hours, the relative reduction of employers' social security contributions and the implementation of a fully funded system in Social Security, the reduction in pensions and the average wage, the lifting of the primary residence protection. Moreover, as a result of the activity of mechanisms interlinking the urban and rural self-employed with industry and trade, their liabilities to banks, the Public sector, the Hellenic Agricultural Insurance Organization (ELGA), etc. have increased.

### **The impact of the general indebtedness of the country**

**26** The general indebtedness is an aspect of the contradictions within the framework of capitalism. The management non-performing (“red”) loans in favour of banks and the promotion of land centralization were implemented through the respective government pressure on popular strata, even for partial debt payment.

The forecasts for 2021 are grim regarding the domestic bank system since there is an assessment for a new and higher level of non-performing loans. According to the assessments of the Bank of Greece, the ratio of non-performing to the total amount of loans will be higher and several times the EU average, while the final and liquidated deferred tax assets of banks will approach, in early 2022, 75% of regulatory capital.<sup>[5]</sup>

Given the importance of the banking system in capitalist operation, the workers' and people's movement must be vigilant and develop their own front of struggle.

Based on IMF assessments, public debt could jump from 180.9% of GDP in 2019 to 208% in 2020 and could remain above 200% for the next four years, while the annual financial needs for the debt management could increase as a percentage of GDP.

[5] Regulatory Capital is a type of bank capitals that are considered by the EU supervisory authorities to be qualitatively secure to absorb future financial losses without causing problems in banking operations.

### **The current crisis and its impact on various economic sectors**

**27** The current crisis is also unevenly manifested in the various sectors of the Greek economy and is accompanied by widespread destruction of invested capital in Tourism —mainly of small capital— while any recovery stage will be accompanied by a new round of its centralization in the sector. The crisis, together with the COVID-19 management measures, is expected to cut down the internal Tourism – Hospitality–Recreation sector and fuel a new round of investments in the sector, which will be directed towards inbound tourism. A further contraction, besides the sectors of Retail Trade and Tourism, is recorded in the Hospitality, Air Transportation, Spectacle–Entertainment sectors. According to relevant assessments, a significant section of small businesses will close immediately and another one will be burdened with significant liabilities that will have to be repaid in the next period, while unemployment is expected to reach 20%.

The realignment among sectors has triggered a dispute amongst capital's representatives per industry on the direction of state intervention (aid schemes, tax exemptions, etc.); it has revived old contradictions, e.g. between industrialists and representatives of tourism or trade sector regarding the so-called change in the “production model”, the strengthening of industrial production. This is not merely the debate in Greece around the historical underdevelopment in the industry of means of production, which has its roots in the history of the country. The current debate and the respective inter-capital contradictions concern the EU and USA in general, as a result of the preceding extended industrial capital export to China and other Asian countries.

Current and future contradictions are related to a series of realignments, even within sectors (e.g. the trend in automobile industry towards electric vehicles; towards RES in electricity industry, etc), which are presented often as a green production–economy, as more environmentally friendly.

Under these circumstances, it is difficult to forecast whether a return to relative recovery will be carried out with the lifting of restrictive measures due to the pandemic or whether, on the contrary, the overall international situation will have a more long-lasting effect on preventing the recovery.

Recent history, of course, has shown that international crises do not affect the domestic economy directly and proportionately in terms of time and depth. In particular, we need to also take into account that in relation to the past—even the recent one—, the extroversion of the Greek economy has increased, thus making it more vulnerable to international turmoil, which is also marked by the sharpening of contradictions amongst the USA, China, and Germany. These factors, in combination with the condition of the domestic financial system, render any projection for the development of the Greek economy particularly precarious in the upcoming years. This is also demonstrated in the assessments of international organizations, such as OECD, IMF, etc., both for the depth of the crisis in 2020—even 2021— and the projected recovery rate in 2022. These assessments deviate greatly from the initial unfounded, over-optimistic government forecasts.

### **The adjustments in the management of the bourgeois economic policy under conditions of a new international crisis**

**28** The outbreak of the new international crisis and the corresponding decline in the new private investments led to changes and adjustments in the bourgeois economic policy aiming at their reinforcement.

In Greece, as well as in the EU and internationally, the governments and the bourgeois political system as a whole converge on adopting a greater state intervention, an

expansionary fiscal policy, and monetary easing to support the growth of the Greek economy.

Liberal-conservative forces present this option as the most appropriate for the “exceptional situation” of the sharp contraction of production and the lack of private investment. Social democratic and opportunist forces portray this as a “progressive turn, after the failure of neoliberalism”. In our country, the bourgeois parties of SYRIZA and KINAL criticize the ND government policy for an inconsistent adjustment to the respective EU one and project themselves as more genuine exponents of a similar, more expansionary state policy. However, of course, they are not convincing, since they bear the responsibility of the memoranda management of the economic crisis.

The possibility of greater state intervention to mitigate the negative consequences for the people from the great depth of the crisis is limited. The sharpening of competition amongst imperialist centres in the international capitalist market poses objective constraints on the expansionary fiscal policy adopted today in the EU and Greece. Sooner or later, the great slippage from fiscal targets will result in new harsh measures that the working class and popular strata will have to pay. German pressure is already mounting to re-establish the terms of the Stability Pact, after 2021, on reducing government debt and annual deficits. The state debt of Greece now surpasses 200% of GDP and its servicing costs will increase in the following period.

Thus, a vicious circle is reproduced: a direct state expansionist intervention to support capitalist reproduction and its new constraint, a phase in which the consequences will again be paid by the workers.

The ND government took a series of short-term measures to address the problems that jointly affect the domestic economy, based on a new government loan that exceeded €12 billion. They also took advantage of the surpluses of the previous period, which were achieved through the plundering of the people, while preparing a large finance package for the capitalist economy, with the lion's share of support measures being directed at strengthening the business groups.

The medium-term policy of the government, at about €70 billion, is the Greek version of the EU response to the new crisis, which now affects all EU economies. It aims mainly at supporting investments in the fields of green and digital transition, proving that the problem of reproduction of capital in Greece—but also in the EU—is much deeper than the consequences of the pandemic, since the green and digital transformation of the EU economy is being portrayed as the main solution.

The EU finance package and Greece's participation in the Recovery Fund are linked to the national development plan, which will determine the reform and investment priorities until 2026. This plan must be submitted by each Member State and is a precondition for the funding disbursement. Moreover, it is aligned with both the EU planning and priorities and also with the demands of domestic capital. Most of the funding will be utilized to implement large investment projects of green growth (at least 37%) and the promotion of new digital solutions (at least 20%). The tender procedure for the 5G spectrum is already expected in the next period, while Microsoft investment in Attica has been announced.

Although the economy is even more exposed to international turmoil, the bourgeois policy portrays extroversion as the main driving force of the domestic economy. The main goal behind this policy is to organically link industrial production to this direction, i.e. with the “relative participation of internationally tradable goods and services in the national product”.

The extroversion of domestic capital is in line with the level of internationalization of the world capitalist market, the increasing interdependences, its historical orientation towards international transportation, international tourism, and similar manufacturing sectors (Food, Beverage, Metallurgy, etc).

The Pissarides Commission report reveals how the next day of the “return to normality” will be like: a nightmare for the people, with an escalation of the policies that reduce the price of the labour force and abolish the remaining social security rights; a heaven for monopoly groups with new tax exemptions and measures that accelerate the concentration and centralization of capital.

### **The government's benefit policy under lockdown conditions**

**29** The government, under lockdown conditions, also took some measures of emergency benefits for the long-term unemployed, extending the payment period for the unemployment benefit and retaining the labour-people's income in view of the possibility of its sudden-large shrinkage and an uncontrolled rise in unemployment.

However, a part of these measures (benefits, deferred payments, contributions without their partial cancellation, etc.) are clearly temporary, since they just prolong the payment of these debts, making them basically unsustainable.

Another part, e.g. the special purpose benefit, the subsidy of social security contributions, was in fact a way to support the business groups, with the state assuming a large part of the wage costs during the period in which their operations are limited or shut down. In addition, the funding of mortgage loan repayment up to 80% contributed to the protection of the banks' liquidity and the avoidance of the creation of new "red" loans.

Respectively, some support measures for small and medium enterprises, e.g. repayable advances schemes, serve a dual purpose. On the one hand, they seek to support a more dynamic section of the small and medium-sized enterprises that have been affected hard over this period providing some liquidity. On the other hand, they seek to slightly reduce the extensive impasses and the possibility of immediate close-downs of a large number of small businesses that employ staff occasionally or do not have any staff at all.

### Accelerating the digital transformation

**30** . The outbreak of the crisis was utilized by the government as an opportunity to accelerate the plan for the digital transformation of the economy. In this direction, the digital transformation of the state administration functions has been advanced; EU funds have been absorbed to promote investments in digital infrastructure; compulsory digitization has taken place in a number of aspects of economic and social life, while the cheap and trained labour force in new technologies has also made the country a field of some investments in the production of relevant technological commodities and services. At the same time, the digital modernization in the framework of the capitalist economy and the digital transformation of state functions are utilized to promote work intensification and raise the exploitation level (e.g. teleworking), and also increase the means to monitor and suppress the people.

## CHAPTER E

### DEVELOPMENTS IN THE BOURGEOIS POLITICAL SYSTEM

**31** In the years since the 20<sup>th</sup> Congress, during the last two years of the SYRIZA government and the change of government between SYRIZA and ND, the consensus between the key forces of the bourgeois system regarding the strategic goals and objectives of the bourgeoisie and its corresponding political choices has been further confirmed.

These uniform objectives are:

The effort of the Greek bourgeoisie to upgrade its geostrategic position through its active role in the US-NATO-EU plans and the strengthening of its positions in the Balkans, in Southeastern Europe, in the Eastern Mediterranean.

Support for deepening EU integration.

The course of recovery of the Greek economy, with the creation of a more favourable environment for attracting investments, with the promotion of a new "productive model", "green" economy, "digital transition", etc.

The stabilization of the bourgeois political system and the further safeguarding of the bourgeois state against possible shocks and mainly against the struggles of the labour-popular movement.

Key manifestations of this consensus were:

The Strategic Agreement with the USA, signed and inaugurated by the SYRIZA government, and by ND government

The Prespa Agreement, dictated by the goal of strengthening the NATO and EU presence in the Western Balkans.

The successive legislative interventions for the further flexibilization of the labour

market, for the support of capital assets and the various investment plans.

The strengthening of the reactionary arsenal of the bourgeois state with measures against strikes, trade unions, etc.

It is also characteristic that during the ND and SYRIZA governments, strategically important bills, as well as changes in fundamental clauses of the Constitution, especially those concerning governmental stability and the undisturbed implementation of the ruling policies, were successively voted in, by both parties, together with PASOK / KINAL.

The common goal of stabilizing the bourgeois political system is promoted through assimilation and repression. A general invocation for “national unity” is alternated with the need for a “new social contract” in order to assimilate the labour–popular forces in the aims of the bourgeoisie, with the implementation of new and more advanced methods of state repression.

The bourgeois political system places special emphasis on the assimilation of the youth, promoting bourgeois democracy as a form of government that guarantees individual freedoms and rights, respecting individual diversity, as opposed to the “state repression” of socialism as we knew it in the 20<sup>th</sup> century. At the same time, it promotes the image of a “tolerant” capitalism, which with proper management and utilization of new technologies can become socially fairer and more environmentally friendly, a “smart”, “green”, “humane” capitalism.

These common aspirations do not negate existing differences between the bourgeois parties, regardless of the fact that these differences are absolutized and overemphasized to support disorienting dividing lines of confrontation, such as “Right–democratic forces”, “free market–reinforced state intervention”, “neoliberalism–social democracy”. These actual differences mainly reflect contradictions within the bourgeois class of the country, but also contradictions among the bourgeois classes of its allies in the international imperialist system and mark all bourgeois parties. However, most of the time they are also over-emphasized by the respective forces of opposition, depending on the so-called political audience and the aim to approach certain social strata for the elections, as well as due to the historical backgrounds of each party.

The differences are mainly related to the manner and the formula of bourgeois management of the capitalist economy, the degree of state intervention, etc., so as to achieve capitalist reproduction and the assimilation of labour–popular forces depending on the phase of the economic cycle. They are also significantly influenced by the international alliances and choices of the bourgeoisie, especially in conditions where the inter-imperialist contradictions are intensifying, and the Euro-Atlantic orientation of the bourgeoisie and its parties always ensured.

### ON “DIGITAL GOVERNANCE”

**32** Taking advantage of the pandemic, the ND government, with the consent of the other parties, accelerated the promotion of a series of “reforms” mainly concerning the so-called “digital transformation of society, government and the state”, etc.

It is attempted to conceal the class character of these changes by overemphasizing the modernizations that are necessary for the functioning of state services. The notions about a “more effective state”, “improvement of state–citizen relations” are used in this framework.

However, breakthroughs mainly concern the establishment of a more friendly investment environment, by way of, for example, the acceleration of investment licensing and do not concern the needs or the protection of the people.

Teleworking is a prime example of how new technologies —especially digital ones— are adapted to the needs of capital. Digitization is used as a tool to intensify labour and state repression. The “personal data protection net” invoked by the bourgeois staff is corrupt, as it is always available to monopolies, public and private security services. Data trading is a very lucrative business on a global scale.

At the same time, bourgeois parties are presenting their digitization as a modernization in their functioning. Regardless of the —up until now— failure of such attempts in our country (see i-SYRIZA), such changes will accelerate, forming even more “personalized” parties, parties with members – “digital followers”, in complete contrast to the more democratic profile which they invoke.

It is attempted to impose such changes on trade unions, student associations (electronic voting, registries of trade union executives), etc. The fact that the younger generation in particular, is highly familiar with communication, as it has been developed today, and the distorted socialization it has created, is being exploited so that these reactionary changes appear to be self-evident. In reality, they are becoming new tools of the state and the employers to manipulate workers and other forces, their youth, in order to undermine participation, debate, mass democratic processes, etc.

### ON MUNICIPAL AND REGIONAL ADMINISTRATION

**33** The changes in municipal and regional administration, which are part of the state apparatus, are part of the reform and the processes that take place within the bourgeois political system.

The network of reactionary restructurings in Local Administration starting in the 1990s (“Kapodistrias”), deepened in the decade of the capitalist crisis (“Kallikratis” – “Klesthénis”), having consolidated the local and regional bodies as essential administrative units and links in the state apparatus of the bourgeoisie. The new responsibilities and administrative functions they have taken on strengthen their class character and role, alongside that of the central organs of the bourgeois state. Their budgetary and operational responsibilities have been strengthened institutionally and functionally, and the profound negative effects on the life and income of working-class households are obvious.

The transfer of certain central state responsibilities to the responsibility of local authorities is directly linked to the drastic reduction in funding from the state budget, the intensity of taxation and the burdening of people’s income. It is also linked to the commercialization and degradation of basic social structures and services as well as the abolition of labour relations and rights.

In this new cycle of the economic crisis, the ND government is stepping up its efforts so that Local Administration and its bodies play a more active role. The aim is to direct in a more targeted way a large number of state/ EU resources towards regional networks and infrastructure in order to attract funds, facilitate, and enhance their profitability. Local Administration is being reinforced with new business and financial tools to boost the utilization of local resources by businesses, waste management based on business groups’ priorities, replacement and “rehabilitation” of lignite areas, promotion of RES, commercial utilization of public and local land tracts, forests, coasts and other infrastructure by tourist and other capital.

The institutions of the so-called Social Economy, of the “volunteering” networks, under the umbrella of and in partnership with Local Administration, are being utilized as a lever to promote and “legitimize” the goals and aspirations of capital among the people.

The “modernization and reorganization” measures of the bourgeois state and its local institutions, implemented to respond uniformly and effectively to the rapid changes in the needs and priorities of capital, constitute a strategic direction of all bourgeois governments and parties. It has become a dominant strategy in the bodies of Local Administration. This course will be strengthened over the next period through the new institutional interventions and responsibilities that have been announced by the ND government.

The bourgeois system as a whole is utilizing the more direct relationship of local administration with the working-class masses flexibly and in various ways. The Regional and Municipal Bodies, as state institutions that are closer to the labour–popular forces, are used to defuse popular reactions, and to assimilate them more easily. The Party needs to monitor more systematically and in depth their intervention and actions. The struggle and the demands of the labour–popular movement must focus on the activity of these organs. From this perspective, the responsibility of the Party organs to provide more substantial and comprehensive guidance to our representatives in the bodies of Local Administration is increased.

Elected communists, as well as those who cooperate with them, selflessly and against the character of these organs, fight for the relief of popular families, for the development of the struggle and the demands that will pave the way for the social alliance and rallying of forces in an anti-monopoly direction, with the political goal of workers’ power. This action, as that of all communists, regardless of whether they are in Parliament, the European Parliament, the regional or municipal authorities, whether they are in the minority or the



majority, such as in Patras, has a steady oppositional character against the anti-popular policies emanating from the central organs of the bourgeois state and which are interlinked with regional–municipal bodies.

## CHAPTER F

### THE POLITICAL FORCES IN GREECE

**34** **The New Democracy Party:** When ND took over the reins of government in July 2019, it promoted the acceleration of anti-popular capitalist restructurings, bourgeois state adaptations (e.g. “digital transformation”), repression and other requirements of capital and the EU. The pandemic was also used in this direction. Besides, ND, as the official opposition force, presented itself as the most genuine and authentic—in relation to SYRIZA— exponent of the goals of capital.

Initially, taking advantage of the recovery phase of the Greek economy, it tried to cultivate expectations among the masses, utilizing amongst others limited relief measures that mainly concerned small and medium-sized enterprises. This management policy quickly exhausted all its possibilities, especially after the outbreak of the new economic capitalist crisis and the acceleration of restructurings and measures to the detriment of the working class, the self-employed, the small–medium farmers. (e.g. the Bankruptcy Code). ND is based on the anti-labour and anti-popular framework formed by the four-year SYRIZA government (2015–2019) and is expanding it even further. At the same time, it is utilizing the conservative retreat, which was caused by the disillusionment of broad sections of the people with SYRIZA government, which is characterized by reduced demands, defeatism, fatalism, the “one-way road” of capital, and the “necessary participation” in NATO, the EU, etc.

Taking advantage of the pandemic, the ND government has become the main proponent of the concepts of “new trust in the state” and a “new social contract” between the state and the citizens. In fact, it is attempted to present the basic political choices of governments, of the bourgeois state as a whole, as unquestionable, objective—and even “rational”—, surrounded by scientific and technocratic gloss. In other words, to establish an even deeper acceptance of the current system and its management policies as something objective. It is sought to present the respective governments and the bourgeois state as exponents of the “common good”, regardless of class and social differences.

At the same time, the crisis phases are presented as times when the people—as responsible individuals— should be even more submissive in accepting any management policy as something “objective” concerning “public good”, so as not to give rise to the challenging of the system. Any objections or disagreements may exist only in this context and not outside it.

That is why the pandemic is being used as a “special situation” for the further restriction of popular freedoms, the strengthening of the repressive measures, mainly the consolidation of all of them as “socially necessary”, utilizing some actually necessary restrictive measures due to the pandemic.

The dominant cosmopolitan position of the bourgeoisie expresses the relation of its key sections with the international capitalist market, its “extroversion”, its ties to the capitalist economies of powerful imperialist centres, e.g. the US, China, its active participation in imperialist alliances such as NATO, the EU, etc. and is also related to its inferior political and military position in relation to its key rival in the region, the Turkish bourgeoisie. Being aware of this correlation of forces it has as its main option the support of transnational agreements and negotiations, following a line of co-management of the maritime zones under Euro-Atlantic supervision. This fact does not negate but coexists with elements of nationalism that may strengthen, especially in the event of an armed settlement of any disputes.

These trends are expressed in a contradictory way throughout the entire political system and, of course, inside ND itself as the key bourgeois party. Although it officially adopts cosmopolitanism, there are forces that openly reproduce nationalist and racist positions, seeking to influence the so-called far right. It is clear that nationalism and bourgeois cosmopolitanism are two aspects of the same coin, which are used by all bourgeois parties in order to serve the strategic interests of the bourgeois class.

At the same time, ND utilizes the theory of the “two extremes”, alternating vulgar and a more refined anti-communism, the anti-historical equation of fascism with communism, hatred towards popular struggles and the mobilizations, in order to justify the intensification of authoritarianism and the imposition of repressive measures. Especially after the decision issued at the trial of Golden Dawn, officials of ND speak openly about the need for measures against the other “extreme”, presenting as such the Communist Party of Greece.

**35 “SYRIZA—the Progressive Alliance”:** In recent years, SYRIZA has become a valuable supporter of bourgeois strategy, not only because it has consistently served its anti-popular goals, but mainly because it has tried to consolidate those goals in the consciousness of working class people as “necessary”, even as “progressive”.

Its social democratic “mutation” accelerated in its course towards gaining power, and even more so during its four-year governance, but also with its stance as an official opposition force.

This process will be completed organizationally through the processes of unification of the forces of “SYRIZA–Progressive Alliance”, with the absorption of forces and groups that broke away from PASOK. SYRIZA seeks to emerge as the main successor of the “democratic faction”, with more frequent references to Eleftherios Venizelos, Georgios Papandreou, Andreas Papandreou, but also with more active participation in the European Socialist Party, without abandoning its references to the “values and traditions of the Left”. It also maintains contacts with the so-called “progressive” forces in Latin America.

Regardless of the organizational form it will take on, the reorganization of the social democratic space in Greece is necessary for the stability of the bourgeois political system, so that it can be used as an alternative government solution.

The reform of social democracy, in Greece and in other countries, is focused on the beautification of fiscal relaxation and more extensive state intervention for the operation–salvation of the capitalist economy. This, of course, does not negate the fact that social democratic governments (e.g. Spain, Portugal) are applying all the anti-labour—“neoliberal” as they call them— measures, and are equally responsible for the collapse of the public health systems.

This policy does not constitute a pro-people shift, and even more, nor does it abolish the laws of the capitalist economy. Its implementation by all the bourgeois governments proves that bourgeois parties, in spite of their differences, can adapt to the needs of the capitalist system at any given time.

SYRIZA has effectively supported the government’s management of the pandemic and the measures taken, despite its efforts to criticize some specific aspects. Likewise, the EU decisions on the Recovery Fund. It presents itself as the most consistent exponent of this policy, in contrast to the ND which “cannot implement it, because it does not believe in it”.

SYRIZA has lost the advantage it had in previous years over ND, not only because of its activity as a government, but also because ND, like all bourgeois governments, has incorporated positions of so-called “neo-Keynesianism”.

**36 KINAL / PASOK:** The processes in the field of social democracy objectively bring SYRIZA in opposition to the other bourgeois social-democratic pole in Greece, the Movement for Change / PASOK, which gathers, at least for now, what was left over from the party after the utter collapse of PASOK in 2012 and on. This controversy is focused on which force will win over forces of similar orientation, mainly in the trade unions, in the Local Administration, in other state institutions (e.g. Chambers), in which KINAL / PASOK still maintains strong forces.

This controversy does not at all exclude the coexistence of these forces or sections of theirs, as a result of the reform process of social democracy, which is a basic and timeless aspect of safeguarding the bourgeois political system, but also the occasional use of them for partnerships in government formations, either with ND, or in formations for “national purpose”, etc.

**37 The opportunist forces in general:** The process of reforming the political system objectively strengthens processes, both within SYRIZA itself (group 53+) and in a wider front that includes MERA25, forces from LAE, to the rest

of the extra-parliamentary opportunist front. At the centre of these processes and debates is essentially the need to revive a truly “New Keynesian” type of management, a real “New Deal” like that in the 1930s, with extended state intervention in the economy.

A common denominator of these forces is the adoption of aspects that are promoted internationally by the “left wing of the Democrats” of the USA (e.g. “green” development, cosmopolitanism). This aspect is either projected as a government programme or as a transitional political goal “for socialism” to be implemented by a “left”, “radical” government. It objectively contributes to the bourgeois social democratic assimilation of radicalized popular forces into the logic of the various versions of bourgeois management as a counterweight to neoliberalism.

At the same time, forces of the wider opportunist space (MERA25, NAR, ANTARSYA, etc.), focusing on the intensification of inter-imperialist rivalries in the Eastern Mediterranean, embellish the imperialist “peace” and the corresponding international agreements signed by the bourgeois states. Behind their pseudo anti-capitalist or internationalist rhetoric, they actually hide their alignment—in the final analysis—with the pursuit of the US–NATO–EU, but also the Greek bourgeoisie, for the co-exploitation of the maritime zones. In practice, as a result of their policy, they are playing the game of the imperialist centres and the Greek ruling class, even unwittingly, whereby aggression may coexist with concessions as well in order to gain benefits elsewhere. At the same time, they compete, but also join in anti-KKE line another part of the same front that considers this attitude of the Greek bourgeoisie as an element of “subordination” and not as an element of conscious choice in order to serve its own selfish interests, which have no relation to the real interests of the working class, of the Greek people.

The current organizational course of disintegration of the opportunist front should not lead to the underestimation of its ability to trap radical sentiments, utilizing the influence of bourgeois ideology. After all, its basic objective is to act as a barrier preventing popular forces from approaching KKE and in this direction it promotes plans for the creation of a new organizational “communist” formation. At the same time, it has a “friendly attack” line calling for unity of action in the movement, which, as it is promoted, is a camouflaged co-operation of various political components, while at the same time it aggressively fights the need to promote the social alliance and the gathering of forces in an anti-capitalist and anti-monopoly direction inside the movement, i.e. the political line of the KKE for the movements.

The systematic ideological–political debate and confrontation with the positions and tactics of opportunism will contribute to the liberation of forces and will enable the Party to deal with the opportunist attack against the revolutionary strategy and the Programme of the KKE.

**38 . The far-right – nationalist – fascist forces:** The processes in the so-called far-right, nationalist space are marked by the judicial decision to convict the Golden Dawn as a criminal organization. It had been preceded by the failure of its entry in the Parliament in the parliamentary elections of 2019, its organizational disintegration, but also the attempt of its leaders to create new structures (party of Kasidiaris, Lagos, etc.). At the same time, a section of the voters of Golden Dawn is moving to ideologically and politically related fronts, such as the Helliniki Lysi.

These developments are also used to clean up the space and to prepare the ground for the emergence of a more moderate Golden Dawn, in order to be used by the bourgeoisie as a reserve, but also as a strike force against the movement and the KKE. For this purpose, the theory of “extremes” is utilized by these forces, but also by sections of the ND, which demands measures against the KKE, among other things, as compensation for the judicial decision on the Nazi Golden Dawn. These reactionary and backward views ignore the indisputable fact that it is precisely the very ideology of fascism-Nazism that makes such organizations and their corresponding political practice—as the long hand of a barbaric and exploitative system—criminal and murderous.

There is a need not only to avoid complacency, but also to intensify the effort to reveal the nature of these forces. These forces support the capitalist system, promote anti-communism, racism, while they are interconnected with employers and secret intelligence services. They play a role in disorienting the people from the real cause of the problems, as

is proven in the case of immigrants and refugees, the pandemic, etc., spreading reactionary, irrational, and metaphysical perceptions.

This need becomes even more imperative, especially since it is sought by various centres of the bourgeois political system (bourgeois parties, media, etc.), which in the past supported or tolerated the action of Golden Dawn, to promote an “anti-fascist” profile in retrospect which disorients and detaches the struggle against fascism from the struggle to overthrow the rotten exploitative system and conceals the historical responsibilities of the bourgeois parties, of social democracy, in strengthening fascism. This “anti-fascism” has no class characteristics and seeks to disorient popular forces and young people who mobilized when the trial of the Golden Dawn was completed in the first instance.

### **THE BOURGEOIS CLASS TAKES MEASURES FOR THE STABILIZATION OF THE SYSTEM**

**39** In all previous years the bourgeoisie has taken a number of measures to stabilize the bourgeois political system. This, of course, does not negate but coexists with the accumulation of factors that may lead in the next period to shocks or even greater political instability.

Utilizing the valuable experience —positive and negative— that we have accumulated as Party, especially over the last decade (2010–2020), we must be fully prepared, especially for possible rapid and unpredictable developments. It has been proven that in rapidly changing developments the attitude of the popular forces changes rapidly as well, in a positive or even negative direction.

These developments fuel the ongoing reform of the bourgeois political system, in particular the attempt to assimilate any radicalization that is growing, the intensification of repression and ideological manipulation, the attempt to prevent the the Party from playing its vanguard role, i.e. to gather forces in an anti-capitalist and anti-monopoly direction, by strengthening the social alliance.

### **ON THE INTENSIFICATION OF REPRESSION AND AUTHORITARIANISM**

**40** In recent years the legal arsenal has been strengthened by all governments to intensify the repression of popular struggles. The following events are characteristic examples:

The law to restrict demonstrations.

The successive laws of SYRIZA and ND for the restriction of the right to strike.

The law for the criminalization of mobilizations against auctions.

The laws on personal data, etc.

New interventions in the mass organizations are underway in order to strike trade union activity and rights, with the strengthening of “digital” state and employer control.

The above are promoted in combination with the EU-inspired measures against the so-called “radicalism”, measures which target the radical anti-capitalist struggle, the action of the Communist Parties.

The struggle against state repression, employer intimidation and authoritarianism, against the attack on popular trade union rights, the rights of refugees and immigrants must be at the forefront of the struggle of the labour movement and the social alliance, starting by the workplaces. Every worker, progressive person, scientist, artist, lawyer, etc. can and must contribute to this struggle.

The defense of the people’s trade union rights will be based on the organized disobedience of the class-oriented movement with the aim of canceling in practice reactionary laws. Above all, however, this struggle will strengthen the overall anti-capitalist and anti-monopoly orientation of the struggle, the emergence of the class essence of bourgeois democracy, against the notions that detach repression from the capitalist exploitative character of the bourgeois state, reinforcing the false bipolar schemes (progress–conservation) and fostering illusions of a future social democratic government management.

### **THE KKE CONSISTENTLY ON THE SIDE OF THE PEOPLE**

**41** In the previous years the KKE has consistently stood by the side of the people, in every small and big issue. It constantly reveals the impasse and anti-popular character of all versions of bourgeois government management, it confronts



the anti-popular policies of bourgeois parties and their governments, their state and its mechanisms, as well as of the Municipal and Regional Administration.

Its representatives militantly defend the interests of the working people's forces also in the Greek and the European Parliament as well as in the Municipal and Regional Councils; they take to the streets on a daily basis. The KKE reveals the false character of the "national unanimity" that disguises the uncompromising class contradictions that exist within society. It wages an unwavering struggle against bourgeois nationalism and bourgeois cosmopolitanism, state violence and repression, the policies restricting popular democratic rights and freedoms, fascism as a product of capitalism.

In view of the 21<sup>st</sup> Congress of the KKE, the Central Committee addresses a broad call to the people, to the workers, employees and toiling self-employed, to the young men and women, to the women of the popular forces to join forces with the KKE in daily struggles, in the labour-popular movement, in all political battles. It addresses to all those who recognize the KKE as a credible and militant power for their interests, regardless of what everyone voted for until today. It addresses to the members and cadres of the Party and the KNE to take the lead in this effort, to make the positions of the KKE widely known, to make steady progress in the multifaceted and comprehensive strengthening of the KKE.

The KKE will stand at the forefront, so that the daily struggles lead to the strengthening of the class-oriented labour movement, to mass participation in the labour unions, in the organizations of the self-employed, the farmers, the radical women's movement, the students. For the strengthening of the joint action, the social alliance in an anti-capitalist and anti-monopoly direction, the conflict with the imperialist organizations, NATO, the EU, in order to pave the way for the overthrow of the capitalist barbarity.

This perspective not only does detach the struggle from the workers' and people's problems. On the contrary, it reinforces this struggle creating the conditions for the real solution of these problems. Moreover, the increase of labour productivity, the development of technology and science can ensure the radical improvement of the life of the people and the solution of the social problems.

All the developments highlight even more that the organization of the economy on the basis of capitalist profit, the power in the hands of a social minority, of the representatives of the monopoly groups, become obstacles to social progress and prosperity. They emphasize the necessity of socialism-communism, that is, of workers' power for the establishment of social ownership, of the central scientific planning of the economy and of all services, based on the expanded satisfaction of all social needs.

**29 DECEMBER, 2020**  
**THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE KKE**