

# Some critical remarks on the KKE

The counter-revolutionary line that was imposed following the 20<sup>th</sup> Congress of the CPUS not only interrupted the socialist edification to pave the way for the restoration of capitalism in the USSR, but transformed the revolutionary working-class parties into revisionist, reformist and parliamentarist parties, proponents of class collaboration, leading the revolutionary workers' movement into a process of liquidation.

As a result of the collapse of the USSR and the bloc it headed, the various revisionist parties were weakened in every respect and their hegemony over the workers' movement was profoundly shaken.

Some of these parties disintegrated and their remnants became social-democratic, right-wing or left-wing reformist parties and currents.

Another part has oriented itself to survive through a renewal of its platforms by giving birth to 'new' currents that attempt to introduce alternatives within the capitalist system (e.g., '21<sup>st</sup> century socialism').

A third party sought to emerge from the ideological, political and organizational crisis by initiating an analysis of the causes of the victory of counterrevolution in the USSR and other socialist countries and the defeat of socialism.

Among these parties, that while retaining the name 'communist' initiated a process of criticism and self-criticism through various congresses and public documents, we find the KKE.

The KKE is a party with a militant attitude and practice. Its militants carry out combative actions against the imperialist war and NATO (such as blocking truckloads of weapons for the Ukrainian front), initiate mass strikes such as those that took place at the port of Piraeus against the *deregulation*, suffer repression by the Greek government.

Our critique of the weaknesses and errors of the KKE is therefore of a different character than our critique of revisionist parties, organizations and currents that are completely unrelated to the struggle of the working class. It is in fact a frank, loyal and fraternal critique that benefits the working class and communist movement.

In this historic moment one of the main battles the Marxist-Leninist have to fight is the defence of the Leninist analysis on the imperialism against the multipolarist conceptions.

The multipolarism negate that the rotten, parasitic and warmongering nature of our time is caused by the domination of monopolies and by the fight of imperialistic powers for the division of markets, resources and territories, but exclusively by the behavior of only one imperialism (the American or at most the Euro-Atlantic imperialism), replacing the materialistic analysis an idealistic and Kautsky-like approach, according to which from the strengthening of the 'weakest' capitalistic poles and the international competition between robbers peace and progress could flourish instead of war and plundering.

This critique is necessary because although the KKE has taken a positive stance with respect to some important ideological and political issues, such as the critique of the 20<sup>th</sup> Congress and Khrushchev's revisionism, it has not yet overcome the dismantling of the revolutionary core of Marxism-Leninism and consequently manifests serious limitations in understanding the function and duties of communist parties toward the working class and oppressed peoples.

As we shall see, the weaknesses and mistakes of the KKE played a negative role in the conditions of the deep political, social and economic crises that occurred in Greece.

The need for this critique also stems, of course, from reasons related to the development of the struggle for the communist party in our country.

For some time now in Italy the KKE has been presented as a strongly anti-revisionist, revolutionary party, siding with the defense of Leninism, by those who praise it (FGC-FC), while it has been labeled as dogmatic and sectarian with attacks from the right by supporters of the Russian or Chinese imperialism.

While the right-wing critique is pure revisionism, this positive attitude is not based on an objective analysis of the ideology and politics of the KKE, but rather on a phenomenon of ‘cheering’ also made possible by the fact that translations of this party’s writings and news stories about it reach Italy with difficulty, except by groups of KKE supporters themselves.

However, if one digs beyond the language barrier and deepens the analysis, the argument that the KKE is a Marxist-Leninist type party melts away like snow in the sun.

We proceed to show why, without any claim to exhaustiveness, but aware that it is impossible to remain silent on certain historical and principled issues.

## **RECKONING WITH AN INCONVENIENT PAST**

The modern KKE was born out of the events in Tashkent in 1955, when Nikos Zachariadis and KKE militants began the battle against Khrushchevian revisionism.<sup>1</sup> As a result of those events Zachariadis and party militants (including many partisans who had fought against monarch-fascism in Greece) were purged and exiled.

The strenuous resistance of the Greek communists in Tashkent (September 1955), who were met with a full-fledged political-military assault by the Khrushchevian clique, marked the beginning of the communists’ struggle against modern revisionism.

The V Plenum of the KKE in 1955 was a victory for the Marxist-Leninist sector of the Greek party, which was unwilling to bow to the counter-revolutionaries. But the VI Plenum of 1956, despite the fact that the vast majority of the party was against it, saw the direct and brutal intervention of a six-party ‘international committee’, chaired by the Khrushchevians, which decided, among other things, to remove the legally elected leadership, including Secretary Zachariadis, on the accusation-pretext of promoting ‘the cult of personality’ (perhaps in the labor camps of the dictator Metaxas or in Dachau, where Zachariadis had been imprisoned until 1945?).

The Seventh Plenum (1957) operationalized the decisions, initiating the expulsion of thousands of communists from the party (who suffered the same persecution as the Yugoslav communists) and effectively liquidated the KKE as a Marxist-Leninist party.

From then on originates the history of the KKE as a party completely subservient to Khrushchevian and Brezhnevist revisionism, with all its deviations.

The KKE established by the revisionists in 1956 actually no longer had any relationship-ideological, political and organizational with the previous revolutionary party. A profound caesura

---

<sup>1</sup> ‘Tashkent, September 1955: the beginning of the struggle of all communists in the world against Khrushchevian revisionism’, Organisation for the Communist Party of the Proletariat of Italy, Theory and praxis, n. 25, pag. 28. <https://piattaformacomunista.com/TP25.pdf>

was determined, as with other parties.

As Zhakariadis remarked in his letter to the comrades of Taskent:

*“The clique appointed to lead the KKE in 1956 lowered the communist flag in Greece, plunged the party into a deep crisis, slandered, besmirched, and soiled the revolutionary tradition in our country, dishonored Marxism-Leninism, and inevitably led to the defeat of April 21, 1967. Without the 1956 intervention, the evolution of the situation in Greece would certainly have been different.”* (Letter to MLO, may 23<sup>rd</sup> 1967).

For decades, this party ‘refounded’ by Khrushchev and associates was a standard bearer of modern Soviet-style revisionism, until it reached the height of shame when Pappariga, General Secretary of the KKE Central Committee from 1991 to 2013 and currently a member of the KKE Central Committee, handed Gorbachev a statuette of Hercules to honor him for his Herculean efforts in building socialism.<sup>2</sup>

In the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century the KKE was marked by a split in 1968, from which originated the KKE-Interior, linked to Eurocommunist conceptions, and from whose members would largely spring the present Syriza.

The KKE, forced into hiding by the colonels’ dictatorship, then, with the restoration of legal activity, offered a moratorium to the social-democratic Pasok government in 1981.

In the late 1980s the KKE and KKE-Internal formed the SYNAPSISMOS coalition, which participated in a coalition government with the right-wing New Democracy and Pasok from 1989 to 1991. The KKE later criticized these policy choices as opportunistic.<sup>3</sup>

In 2011 the KKE seemed to be back on its feet and rehabilitated the figure of Zachariadis, recognizing his merits in the struggle for socialism in Greece. All’s well that ends well?

Unfortunately, no. A closer look makes it clear that the KKE’s position remains extremely problematic.

In the belated and partial rehabilitation of Zachariadis all criticism of Khrushchevian revisionism is barely hinted at, if not muted, and there is a constant attempt to make the post-1955 history of the KKE cohere with the figure of Zachariadis. There is no clear mention of how in 1955 in Uzbekistan the Greek communists initiated the heroic struggle against the Khrushchevians, but there is a vague and misleading reference to the ‘problems of Tashkent’. The rehabilitation is thus ambiguous, hypocritical and does not take place in the light of Marxism-Leninism.

Pappariga states that much earlier (1960s-70s) the rehabilitation of Zachariadis had already been discussed and that in 1991 the KKE wanted to return his body to Athens (Zachariadis was killed by the revisionists in 1973, while being forcibly exiled by them to Surgut, and passed off as a suicide, with a version of events to which the modern KKE adheres).<sup>4</sup> In her judgment this is a sign of how even before 2011 the KKE was prone to right analysis and self-criticism.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> The revisionists of ‘K’KE, Organisation for the Reconstruction of the Communist Party of Greece 1918-1955 (Anasintaxi). <https://anasintaxi-en.blogspot.com/2010/12/revisionists-of-kke.html>

<sup>3</sup> Declaration of the CC on the 100<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the KKE. <https://inter.kke.gr/en/m-article/DECLARATION-OF-THE-CENTRAL-COMMITTEE-ON-THE-100TH-ANNIVERSARY-OF-THE-KKE/>

<sup>4</sup> The Struggle of the Greek Communists against Revisionism, Organisation for the Reconstruction of the Communist Party of Greece 1918-1955 (Anasintaxi). <https://www.revolutionarydemocracy.org/rdv14n2/greek.htm>

<sup>5</sup> Event honoring Nikos Zachariadis in Surgut, Russia.

But 1991 was the same year that the Pappariga led KKE was extolling Gorbachev and Perestroika!

Pappariga wanted to rehabilitate the consistent Marxist-Leninist Zachariadis, but in the meantime sang the praises of those who frontally attacked Marxism-Leninism and socialism with glasnost and perestroika, of those who wanted to switch to capitalist exploitation without a mask to crown bourgeois aspirations!

## THE ANALYSIS OF THE HISTORY OF SOCIALIST COUNTRIES

The KKE since 1995 has carried out extensive critical analysis of its conduct and the process of restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union. In these analyses it has arrived at considerations seemingly in line with Marxism-Leninism, such as criticism of post-20<sup>th</sup> Congress revisionist politics (e.g. the theory of peaceful coexistence) and criticism of economic theories that paved the way to decentralization and market development, such as those of the economists Liberman, Leontiev, etc., the Khrushchevian reforms of agriculture that demobilized the MTS<sup>6</sup>, opening up the free sale of tractors as commodities, or Kosygin's theories that decentralized industry and increased the power of business executives.

However, a major blemish remains in the KKE's analysis, namely the claim that although the counter-revolutionary processes that from Stalin's death (1953) subverted proletarian power and overturned the relations of production, the USSR and the Warsaw Pact countries remained socialist countries, until 1991.

This view is the result of an anti-Marxist approach, since in the USSR and the other Eastern Bloc countries (with the exception of Albania) there was no longer the dictatorship of the proletariat, replaced by the '*state of the whole people*', the leadership of the state was taken over by the revisionists, who materially are representatives of the bourgeoisie, and the socialist base of the economy had been progressively destroyed (by the late 1960s Kosygin's reforms already affected more than 70% of the industrial sector) with company directors appropriating the surplus value of the working class with bonuses and incentives that guaranteed wages as much as 20 times higher than the working-class wage, the ability to buy and sell means of production, lay off labor-power, etc. Under these conditions it is clearly impossible for a socialist country to exist.<sup>7</sup>

The KKE, on the other hand, upholds this false conception, which does not allow it to permanently distance itself from its creator (Khrushchevian-Brezhnevian revisionism), which artfully confuses state capitalism with socialist relations of production. A conception that moreover winks at the Trotskyist theory of the 'degenerate workers' state'.

The KKE, on the basis of the above, also repudiates the Marxist-Leninist analysis that the restoration of capitalism in the USSR had transformed the country into a revisionist and social-

---

<https://web.archive.org/web/20240910070956/https://inter.kke.gr/en/articles/Event-honoring-Nikos-Zachariadis-in-Surgut-Russia/>

<sup>6</sup> 'The leading role of large-scale socialist industry in collectivisation is exercised through the machine and tractor stations (MTS). These are State socialist enterprises in agriculture, disposing of the tractors, combine harvesters and other complex agricultural machines, and servicing the collective farms on a contractual basis. The MTS is the industrial basis of large-scale collective agriculture. The MTS ensures the correct combination of the voluntary effort of the collective farm masses in building and developing their collective farms with the guidance and assistance of the Socialist State.' Political Economy, A Textbook issued by the Institute of Economics of the Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R., pag. 348. <https://www.revolutionarydemocracy.org/archive/PoliticalEconomy.pdf>

<sup>7</sup> The Soviet Revisionist Clique Moves at a Quick Pace Toward the Re-establishment of Capitalism, 'Naim Frasheri' Publishing House, 1967. <https://www.marxists.org/history/erol/albania/reestablish-capitalism.pdf>. Veniamin Toçi and Kijo Kapetani, Soviet Working Class – Deprived of the Means of Production, Albania Today, 1973, 4. <https://www.revolutionarydemocracy.org/archive/sovwc.htm>

imperialist power with an aggressive and expansionist foreign policy, sabotaging the revolution. A superpower based on Soviet monopoly capitalism that asserted itself as a rapacious predator determined to subjugate its areas of influence in competition with the United States. Instead of condemning it, the KKE extols the conduct of the USSR in Czechoslovakia, Afghanistan and so on.

In its historical analyses the KKE is completely silent on socialist Albania. There is no reference whatsoever on the construction of the new society in this country, the defense of Marxism-Leninism and the open struggle against revisionism conducted under the leadership of Enver Hoxha, while instead it is wont to talk about socialist construction in Cuba, Korea, Vietnam, China...as well as all Warsaw Pact countries subject to the revisionist Comecon.<sup>8</sup>

## TROTSKYIST-LIKE HISTORICAL RECONSTRUCTIONS

In the following article<sup>9</sup> '100 years of the Communist International' dated 02/26/2019, excerpts of which we quote, the KKE makes heavy attacks on the Sixth and Seventh Congresses of the Third International. Let us briefly evaluate the most resounding and shameful passages.

*'[The Program] distinguished three main types of revolutions in the struggle for the global dictatorship of the proletariat, based on the position of each capitalist country in the international imperialist system [...] The international character of the epoch of monopoly capitalism and the sharpening of the fundamental contradiction between capital and labor were underestimated. Moreover, the analysis of the CI was not guided by the objective fact that the uneven development of capitalist economies and unequal relations between states can not be abolished on the grounds of capitalism. Ultimately, the character of the revolution in every capitalist country is objectively determined by the basic contradiction it is called upon to resolve, irrespective of the relative change in the position of each country in the international imperialist system. The socialist character and the tasks of the revolution arise from the sharpening of the fundamental capitalist-labor contradiction in every capitalist country, in the era of monopoly capitalism.'*

The KKE frontally attacks the Leninist analysis of the Third International, which based on the unequal development of capitalism, discerned the different development of the productive forces and the qualitatively different position of individual countries in the world chain of imperialism, conceiving the world proletarian revolution as the result of revolutionary processes of a different nature and not simultaneous.

For the KKE indifferently whether it is an imperialist, dependent or even semi-feudal and colonial country, the international proletarian revolution is not the result of processes of a different nature and not simultaneous, but should everywhere follow the same path of transition to the dictatorship of the proletariat and take place at the same time, thus making no distinction between proletarian revolutions, democratic-bourgeois revolutions turning into revolutions of the proletariat, wars of national liberation, colonial revolutions.

The KKE agitates the watchword of socialist revolution, but reduces it to an empty shell because it lacks the Marxist-Leninist strategy for seizing power. The alliance of the poor peasantry and the proletarianizing petty-bourgeois sectors with the working class and under its leadership (i.e., the hegemony of the proletariat in the revolutionary process and the building of socialism) is

---

<sup>8</sup> 18<sup>th</sup> Congress, Resolution on Socialism, Assessments and conclusions on socialist construction during the 20<sup>th</sup> century, focusing on the USSR. KKE's perception on socialism. <https://inter.kke.gr/de/m-article/18th-Congress-Resolution-on-Socialism/>

<sup>9</sup> 100 years of the Communist International, statement of the CC of the KKE. <https://inter.kke.gr/en/articles/100-YEARS-OF-THE-COMMUNIST-INTERNATIONAL/>

completely removed.

The bourgeois democratic revolution and national independence is totally annihilated under the maximalist and pseudo-revolutionary rhetoric. Under these assumptions, the struggle for revolution and proletarian dictatorship on a world scale can have no success.

*‘Regarding social democracy, it stated: “It often plays a fascist role when the situation is critical for capitalism. In the process of its development, social democracy reveals fascist tendencies.” The above assessment was not correct. The reality is that, in opposition to socialist revolution, social-democrats played the role of “fire extinguishers” from time to time during the crisis of liberal bourgeois governments, and allowed space for their alternation with fascist governments.’*

The KKE’s critique of the analysis and theses of the Comintern’s 6<sup>th</sup> Congress is visibly mystifying, useful solely for proclaiming itself vanguards in an instrumental way. The Third International ascertained how in the process of fascistizing the bourgeois state, the bourgeoisie made use of both fascism and social democracy, which in the process itself assumed fascist tendencies, especially at the most critical moments for capitalism. This analysis obviously did not contradict the function of social democrats as firemen of the socialist revolution, but rather reinforced it by showing the chameleon-like and ambivalent character of social democratic leaders:

For greater clarity we quote the CI program approved at the 6<sup>th</sup> Congress:

*‘In its systematic conduct of this counter-revolutionary policy, social democracy operates on two flanks. The right wing of social democracy, avowedly counter-revolutionary, is essential for negotiating and maintaining direct contact with the bourgeoisie; the left wing is essential for the subtle deception of the workers. While playing with pacifist and at times even with revolutionary phrases, “left” social democracy in practice acts against the workers, particularly in acute and critical situations [...] and is therefore, the most dangerous faction in the social democratic parties. While serving the interests of the bourgeoisie in the working class and being wholly in favour of class co-operation and coalition with the bourgeoisie, social democracy, at certain periods, is compelled to play the part of an opposition party and even to pretend that it is defending the class interests of the proletariat in its industrial struggle. It tries thereby to win the confidence of a section of the working class and to be in a position more shamefully to betray the lasting interests of the working class, particularly in the midst of decisive class battles’.<sup>10</sup>*

Let’s continue with the blunders of the KKE:

*‘Previous to the 7<sup>th</sup> CI Congress (Moscow, 25 July – 21 August 1935), the CP of France and Spain, in agreement with the CI’s Executive Committee, had called for cooperation with the Social-Democratic parties. After all, the People’s Fronts in these countries had been formed in 1936 as a form of political co-operation between the Communist Parties and the social democratic and other bourgeois parties and opportunist movements, and took part or supported governments that did not challenge capitalist power. [...] [the Congress] adopted the problematic estimation that within social democratic parties there was expressed a “revolutionary course”, leading to the need to “unite the communist and socialist parties”, provided that the latter would recognize the revolutionary overthrow of bourgeois sovereignty, the unity of action with the Communist Parties, the operation of a new party based on democratic centralism. The fact that the 7<sup>th</sup> Congress laid down the above conditions did not negate the essence: that this created illusions and a spirit of reconciliation, confusion and attenuation of the ideological-political front against social democracy and opportunism. Following fascist Germany’s invasion of the USSR, the CI changed its position*

---

<sup>10</sup> The Programme of the Communist International, Comintern Sixth Congress 1929.  
<https://www.marxists.org/history/international/comintern/6th-congress/ch02.htm>

*on the character of the war, defining it as anti-fascist, and stating that “...the basic strike is now directed against fascism...” and that “at this stage, we do not call for the overthrow of capitalism in the various countries, nor for a global revolution”*

In essence, according to the KKE, the Comintern was supposed to weaken the struggle against fascism by preventing unity of action against the fascist offensive among anti-fascist parties and alienating the sympathy and following of the working class and labor sectors that were hegemonized by the social-democratic parties, thus alienating sectors of the working class and progressive elements of the struggle against fascism. Truly a great service to reaction to fascism!

The KKE shows a specular regard for fascist and bourgeois governments on the basis that capitalist relations of production are in force in both, neglecting the fundamental political differences in which communists and progressive sectors find themselves operating under a fascist regime; it also denies the nexus that dialectically links the struggle against fascism and fascism, and socialist revolution. Also fed is the revisionist rhetoric that the Seventh Congress repudiated the theses of the Sixth Congress, without taking into account how it is necessary to adapt the political line according to the context and material conditions of the present.

The Seventh Congress did not condemn the analysis of social-fascism, but its misapplication that occurred when it accused social-democracy en bloc, without making the necessary distinctions, thus depriving itself of a chance to maneuver within the labor and trade union movement, but this cannot be understood with the KKE's sectarian view.

And again:

*‘The contradictions in the CI’s line on the character of the Second World War were also influenced by the aspirations of the USSR’s foreign policy and by its attempt to defend itself from an imperialist war. However, in any case, the needs of the foreign policy of one socialist state cannot supplant the necessity of a revolutionary strategy for every capitalist country. The ultimate security of a socialist state is determined by the worldwide victory of socialism or its prevalence in a powerful group of countries and hence, the struggle for revolution in each country.’*

Clear imprints of Trotskyism emerge here, evidently harboring in the KKE. The socialist Soviet Union is accused of violating proletarian internationalism on the basis of its security aspirations and needs, without considering how terrible a blow it would be to the entire international workers' and communist movement for the only socialist country to fall under the blows of the fascist offensive.

The proof lies in the following statement:

*‘The decision to self-dissolve the CI was in complete opposition to the principles that served its founding. It was in contradiction with the spirit and the letter of the Communist Manifesto, with the principle of Proletarian Internationalism, with the need, under all circumstances, for a united revolutionary strategy of the Communist parties against international imperialism.’*

An absolute mess! The usual long-denied accusations against Stalin are reiterated<sup>11</sup>, forgetting once again how forms of organization must adapt to current material conditions and it is entirely harmful to maintain a structure no longer suited to current tasks. The unity of the Communist parties internationally was maintained by other forms (Cominform, etc.) and the correctness of the decision on the dissolution of the Comintern was instead demonstrated by the results obtained where this was correctly put into practice (Albania, Czechoslovakia, etc.).

---

<sup>11</sup> On the dissolution of the Comintern we suggest reading this document:  
[https://piattaformacomunista.com/SCIOGLIMENTO\\_COMINTERN.pdf](https://piattaformacomunista.com/SCIOGLIMENTO_COMINTERN.pdf)

## THE THESIS OF THE IMPERIALIST PYRAMID

The KKE claims to have enriched the Leninist analysis of imperialism, of which it considers itself an admirer.

For the KKE, the imperialist character of today's China and Russia is quite clear. It also stands against the neo-Kautskyist theses that deny that imperialism is the supreme and final stage of development of capitalism, and argue that it is a policy favored by finance capital (a concept that serves to show that the imperialists can carry out another policy, a non-imperialist, non-conquest, non-robbery policy).

To oppose these positions, the KKE has advanced a critique by arguing for a view of the imperialist system centered on the scheme of a "pyramid". But as is often the case, the critique of what is wrong is no guarantee of a correct position, and as a result confusion in analyzing the characteristics of imperialism as identified by Lenin is fuelled.

The KKE on the basis of this assumption, by strongly emphasizing the character of imperialism as monopoly capitalism (thus dwelling on only one of the five basic economic characteristics of imperialism outlined by Lenin) comes to argue that imperialism is no longer a world system where a handful of oppressor countries crush and exploit dependent countries (a chain) but a pyramid-shaped world system where imperialism has embraced every country in the world, and where therefore anti-imperialist struggles for national liberation no longer have any revolutionary significance.

The KKE justifies this thesis by claiming that capitalism compared to Lenin's time has changed and that now monopoly capitalism unlike before has come everywhere, and therefore as good '*dialecticians*' we need to update the analysis.

Lenin, on the other hand, wrote, refuting the ravings of those who, under the pretext of the imperialist 'pyramid' in which all countries are in fact included to varying degrees, deny the division between imperialist countries and dependent, semi-dependent, and colonial countries:

*'But imperialism is the epoch in which the division of nations into oppressors and oppressed is essential and typical, and it is quite impossible to draw any distinction between reactionary and revolutionary nations in Europe.'* (Lenin, The Peace Program, 25 March 1916, Collected Works, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1974, Vol. 22, pag. 165)

Lenin had also already stated:

*'That is why the focal point in the Social-Democratic programme must be that division of nations into oppressor and oppressed which forms the essence of imperialism, and is deceitfully evaded by the social-chauvinists and Kautsky. This division is not significant from the angle of bourgeois pacifism or the philistine Utopia of peaceful competition among independent nations under capitalism, but it is most significant from the angle of the revolutionary struggle against imperialism.'* (Lenin, The Revolutionary Proletariat and the Right of Nations to Self-Determination, Collected Works, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1974, Vol. 21, pag. 409)

Lenin harshly criticized Radek's ideas, which held that once capitalism had reached the imperialist stage and had also developed in dependent countries, the national question had lost its importance.

Even the Political Economy textbook of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR (edition of 1954) reiterates:

*'Unrestrained exploitation of colonies and semi-colonies is one of the characteristic features of*

*monopoly capitalism.*' This means that *'Imperialism is moribund capitalism. It sharpens all the contradictions of capitalism, bringing them to the last borderline, the extreme limits, beyond which revolution begins. The most important of these contradictions are the three following: [...]the contradiction between the oppressed peoples of the colonies and dependent countries and the imperialist Powers which exploit them. As a result of the intensifying of imperialist oppression and also of the development of capitalism in the colonies and semi-colonies the national liberation movement against imperialism grows. The colonies and dependent countries are transformed from reserves of imperialism into reserves of the proletarian revolution.'* (Political Economy, A Textbook issued by the Institute of Economics of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, pag. 243, 249-250)

The KKE, with its imperialist pyramid model and its 'internal interdependencies', thus falls into positions that are foreign to Leninist theory of imperialism, a system that cannot exist without economically and politically enslaving dependent countries, subject nations, colonies, and semi-colonies, which are its rear guard.

What we openly criticize is the characterization of all countries within the capitalist system as imperialist countries. The problem is that the differences between these countries are interpreted according to a quantitative difference, neglecting the qualitative difference.

Therefore, the relationships of dependency between these countries are explained under the category of 'interdependence' rather than dependency, oppression, and plunder.

Since it is argued that all capitalist countries are in the imperialist stage, the phenomenon of dependent countries and oppressed peoples disappears along with the objective contradictions that brought them into existence.

But there is more. Suppose imperialism was a monolithic pyramid instead of a chain with more or less weak links. Where then could the rupture of the imperialist front manifest itself? How could it be broken? How would its interlinked components be desoldered? It would require a simultaneous global revolution at that point, rejecting the possibility of the revolutionary rupture of the imperialist chain at one or more points (the weaker ones) and the building of socialism in one or more countries, even if less developed and surrounded by imperialism, i.e., the thesis of Trotskyism.

With the theses of the KKE, the law of unequal development of capitalism would no longer have exponentially enhanced effects, as is the case in imperialism with the exploitation of oppressed countries and the struggle for a new division of zones of influence and resources.

In the pyramid scheme, in fact, there are no weak links in the Leninist sense, but only a distribution according to the economic and military strength of the countries, quantitative rather than qualitative differences.

## **GREECE, FROM DEPENDENT COUNTRY TO IMPERIALIST COUNTRY**

The KKE, with its positions, has denied and continues to deny that Greece is a country dependent on imperialism, even while the country was under the control of the Troika!

*'The basic position of opportunism in Greece is that the country is under German occupation, that it is being transformed or has been transformed into a colony and is being plundered primarily by Mrs. Merkel, the creditors. The triad of the representatives of the EU, the European Central Bank and the IMF which supervise and determine the management of the internal or external debt, the fiscal deficits is seen as the main enemy apart from Germany itself. They accuse the bourgeois class of the country and the governmental parties as being treacherous, unpatriotic, subordinate and subservient towards Germany, the creditors or the bankers. [...] They consider that Greece is a*

country occupied chiefly by Germany and above all that the regime is neo-colonial.’

‘Those who talk of subordination and occupation do not acknowledge the export of capital from Greece (a characteristic feature of capitalism in the imperialist stage), which was significant before the crisis and continues undiminished in the conditions of the crisis. The export of capital is being carried out for productive investments in other countries and of course in European banks until conditions are formed so that they can re-enter the process of ensuring the maximum possible profit. They see (the opportunists – editor’s note) a shortage of capital and not over-accumulation. [...] Lenin and his work on imperialism adds that the comparison cannot be made between developed capitalist countries and backward capitalist countries but between capital exports, an issue which opportunists everywhere do not want and do not dare to acknowledge because their view regarding the occupation of Greece, that Greece is a colony, is refuted by this criterion alone.’<sup>12</sup>

For the KKE, Greece is an imperialist country, but it is clearly not enough that there are some companies in Greece that export capital abroad for this country to become an imperialist country, just as the presence of a few monopolies is not enough if these have arisen and developed while remaining under the control of the large monopolies of the main imperialist powers.

On the basis of the above, it is therefore not surprising that this party has even gone so far as to openly criticize the Third Communist International’s analysis of dependent countries, arguing that in the 1930s, forms of monopoly capital had already been created in countries such as China and Brazil and that the national question should therefore be rejected.

‘Imperialism was mistakenly considered as a form of violent foreign policy of some – the most powerful – states, while within the imperialist system were dozens of countries (monopoly capitalism had been formed in both China and Brazil). At the same time, their characterization as dependent did not take into account the interplay of interests between the foreign and the domestic bourgeoisie.’<sup>13</sup>

For a more in-depth analysis of how the KKE unilaterally highlights the phenomenon of capitalist monopoly activity in dependent countries (without taking into account who the real owners of those monopolies are), and of capital export (without relating it to the export of goods) and the dialectical relationship between the five fundamental characteristics of imperialism described by Lenin, which are interlinked, giving rise to the relationship of domination and supremacy typical of imperialism, please refer to these articles in the footnotes.<sup>14</sup>

## ISSUES RELATED TO THE PROLETARIAN REVOLUTION

The KKE does not envision forms of transition and rapprochement to proletarian revolution.

Indeed, it writes:

‘This is a big problem. The rationale of stages objectively (despite any intentions) entails the search of pro-people solutions on the terrain of capitalism on the grounds that the “intermediate stage” will contribute to the maturation of the subjective factor and will operate as a bridge to socialism

---

<sup>12</sup> Aleka Pappariga, On Imperialism – The Imperialist Pyramid, Article for the Theoretical and Political Review of the CP of Mexico ‘El Machete’. <https://inter.kke.gr/en/articles/On-Imperialism-The-Imperialist-Pyramid/>

<sup>13</sup> The founding, action and dissolution of the Communist International through the prism of the current tasks of the international communist movement, International Relations Section of the CC of the KKE. <https://inter.kke.gr/en/articles/The-founding-action-and-dissolution-of-the-Communist-International-through-the-prism-of-the-current-tasks-of-the-international-communist-movement/>

<sup>14</sup> Criticism of the ‘imperialist pyramid’ scheme, Organisation for the Communist Party of the Proletariat of Italy. <https://piattaformacomunista.com/wp-content/uploads/2023/11/Criticism-imperialist-pyramid-scheme-ENG.pdf>; From Multipolarity to the Pyramid: Endless Confusion in the Debate on Imperialism, Party of Labour (EMEP). <https://cipoml.net/en/unity-and-struggle-no47/#134>

[...] *This approach has not been confirmed anywhere and in any period. It is in contradiction with the lessons of the Great Socialist October Revolution in 1917. The worst thing is that the rationale of stages leads to the search of solutions for the management of the system e.g. of “left-progressive or patriotic governments” that will (objectively) manage the interests of the monopolies which will continue to have the ownership over the means of production and the political power.*

According to the KKE, ‘*this choice*’ fosters ‘*illusions*’, ‘*it does not contribute to the preparation of the labour movement for fierce class confrontations*’ and on the contrary ‘*it condemns it to backwardness and makes it vulnerable to bourgeois ideology and politics, it entangles it in the web of parliamentary illusions*’.<sup>15</sup>

The KKE leadership is missing important lessons in strategy, tactics, and history if it believes that certain approaches contradict the October Socialist Revolution and have never been validated. The double revolution of 1917 (February and October) itself, as well as the experience of the People’s Democracies, demonstrate the falsity of certain claims. It is one thing to criticize the ‘national paths to socialism’ and the reformist policies of state monopoly capitalism passed off as socialism (Soviet, Chinese, Arab, 21<sup>st</sup>-century revisionism, etc.); it is quite another to theorize the absence of transitional stages that favor the triumph of the proletarian revolution.

The victorious outcome of the revolutionary process does not come from renouncing, as the KKE claims, forms of transition or rapprochement with the proletarian revolution, which in every country must be studied, understood, and put into practice in order to lead, through appropriate means and forms of struggle, the broad masses to new positions that guarantee the victory of the revolution, but by the realization of the hegemony (leadership) of the proletariat, which through its party unifies, mobilizes, and guides the exploited and oppressed masses of the city and the countryside.

## **OVERLAP BETWEEN STRATEGY AND TACTICS**

The KKE is not only a party without a program of partial demands, but its strategy and tactics, due to the loss of their specific differences, are essentially identical. To reinforce this concept, Elisseu Vagena, a member of the KKE’s Central Committee and head of international relations, stated in an interview with the Turkish newspaper Evrensel shortly before the 2012 elections: ‘*[the] KKE is not fighting for “an intermediate stage” today and does not have a “minimum program”*’.<sup>16</sup>

The sectarian and doctrinaire tendencies and the strategic and tactical limitations of the KKE’s approach to the struggle for revolution and socialism prevent the working class—which this party claims to represent—from developing ‘*special and temporary*’ political relationships that improve its ability to fight the bourgeoisie and attract social strata susceptible to alliances. Instead, the KKE approaches the Trotskyist approach that rejected the alliance between the proletariat and the peasantry under the leadership of the proletariat.

Unable to distinguish between ideology and politics, when Syriza won the elections, the KKE rejected any alliance and declared that it would show no tolerance towards Syriza. Of course, it would have been wrong for the KKE to be an integral part of a coalition in a Syriza-led government. Engels’ example, which draws attention to the ‘*French Socialistic Democrats*’ who held seats in the progressive government formed after February 1848, is well known. The French Social Democrats were wrong, because ‘*As a minority in the Government they involuntarily bore the responsibility for all the infamy and treachery which the majority, composed of pure Republicans, committed against the working class, while at the same time their participation in the*

---

<sup>15</sup> Some questions on the unity of the international communist movement, International Relations Section of the CC of the KKE. <https://inter.kke.gr/en/articles/Some-questions-on-the-unity-of-the-international-communist-movement/>

<sup>16</sup> Solutions other than popular power benefit capital, Evrensel 11/6/2012. <http://www.evrensel.net/haber/30719/halk-iktidari-disindaki-cozumler-sermayeye-yarar>

*government completely paralysed the revolutionary action of the working class they were supposed to represent*.<sup>17</sup>

But it would *have been* possible for the KKE to create a platform that incorporated the urgent and vital demands of workers, to unite in a broad anti-capitalist-anti-imperialist alliance with progressive forces through this platform, and to make adherence to partial demands a precondition of the alliance. This would have been of great importance in winning the leadership of the movements of exploited and oppressed workers.

Such a tactical move did not mean expecting Syriza to follow a revolutionary line; on the contrary, it would have helped the working class and the popular masses to base their demands on Syriza on solid and real foundations.

Under the conditions of such a broad alliance, the support of the working masses would not have been left to Syriza alone. The KKE could have proven itself to be the most reliable defender of workers' and popular demands and the most determined force in meeting the urgent needs of the majority of the people. This tactic would also have been useful in overcoming prejudices among the working masses and in public opinion in general against communists and socialism.

Instead, the KKE turned its back on both the demands of the working masses and the proposals for unity, stating that the demands made against the policies of the *memorandum* during and after the years of the great crisis, such as 'non-payment of debts, exit from the EU, halting privatization', etc., could only be possible with popular power, thus marginalizing itself with falsely revolutionary rhetoric.<sup>18</sup>

If a communist party confuses the unity of its members with a '*social people's alliance*', if it does not aim for the unity of the working class in practice, if it fails to make the development of unity of action for the uncompromising defense of workers' interests the cornerstone of its class united front tactic and, on this basis, build a broad anti-imperialist and anti-fascist alliance, if it replaces all this with a separate field of '*vanguardist mass activities*' created within the workers' movement, then, regardless of what that party claims in theory, it cannot act as a revolutionary and class party of the proletariat. This translates into a failure to fulfill its duties towards the workers' movement.

## **PETTY-BOURGEOIS NATIONALISM**

In a pre-election interview in May 2024, the KKE's views took a further anti-Leninist turn, revealing a chauvinistic and ultra-sectarian approach.

The KKE takes a nationalist stance on the issue of nations' right to self-determination and therefore on national rights. It does not recognize the existence of a Macedonian nation in Greece and claims that Macedonia is only a geographical region.

In Turkey-Greece relations, it merely asserts that Turkey has expansionist ambitions and covets Greece's 'sovereign rights'. It considers the Turks living in Thrace (the last offshoot of the Balkans) as a 'Muslim minority'. These are the consequences of its line of denial of the national question as part of the general question of the liberation of colonies and semi-colonies from the oppression and plunder of imperialism and the movement for proletarian revolution.

Let's now see its stances on Palestine:

---

<sup>17</sup> Engels to Filippo Turati in Milan, London, January 26, 1894, Marx-Engels Correspondence 1894. [https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1894/letters/94\\_01\\_26.htm](https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1894/letters/94_01_26.htm)

<sup>18</sup> Modern social reformism and the KKE. <https://emep.org/en/modern-social-reformism-and-the-kke>

*‘Takis Hatzis: Let us now turn to Israel and what is happening with the Palestinians. A significant portion of the political establishment accuses you of supporting what they characterize as a terrorist organization, namely Hamas, and they wonder how the KKE, if one looks into it a little, and the Soviet Union had supported Israel on many occasions in the past and had even proposed to the UN, as you know better than I do, for a unified state or for them to separate, etc., that today, your critics say, you are on one side, with Hamas...*

*Dimitris Koutsoubas: We stand with the Israeli people. The Israeli people are struggling and being persecuted, they are in detention because they are protesting and want peace and do not want civilians, children, women and girls to be murdered. The position of the KKE from the outset, let me remind you again, has no ideological, political, or other affinity, much less with the forms of struggle it uses, with Hamas. We are diametrically opposed to it. First of all, it is an anti-communist organization in theory and in its structure, an Islamist organization’.*<sup>19</sup>

The secretary of the KKE reiterates a position that aims to prevent the political unity of the Palestinian resistance, repeating obvious statements such as Hamas’ anti-communism and Islamism; he does not understand the primary task of national liberation, he winks at the equation between the Israeli people and the Palestinian people, approaching the pseudo-revolutionary phraseology of the Bordigist type.

## **REGIME OF THE COLONELS AND U.S. IMPERIALISM**

Based on its distorted ideological framework, in which there are no substantial differences in the nature of different countries and in which the contradiction between imperialism and the peoples of the dependent, colonial, and semi-colonial countries of the world is overlooked, the KKE has come to define the dictatorship of the Colonels (1967-1974) as **non-fascist**, but simply another form (not openly terrorist) of bourgeois dictatorship. Furthermore, by embellishing imperialism, the involvement of US imperialism in the fascist dictatorship is denied, arguing that it was an independent national government, thus erasing the reality of the great Greek popular struggle against the dictatorship of the Colonels, which took place under the slogans of ‘out of NATO’ and ‘out of the US’.

*‘The coup was not carried out by a foreign repressive mechanism, as was often the case in Latin American and Asian countries, with direct intervention by the US or other capitalist states. The US and NATO did not have any crisis in their relations with Greece that would require a puppet government.’*<sup>20</sup>

Eleni Bellou (Member of the CC of the KKE) admits in her speech that the coup leaders had ties to the CIA, US politicians, and officials, but clarifies:

*‘It is another matter which center organizes what, for what purpose, domestic or foreign. It does not mean that they exercise power on behalf of these foreign centers. [...] It is important to realize that Greek governments, whether parliamentary or coup-led, were not puppets of the US [...]’.*<sup>21</sup>

The KKE would even like to refute Clinton’s confession that, during a visit to Greece, he had to say:

---

<sup>19</sup> Interview of Dimitris Koutsoubas to the TV station One and the journalist Takis Hatzis.

<https://www.kke.gr/article/Synteyksi-toy-Dimitri-Koytsoympa-ston-tileoptiko-stathmo-One-kai-ton-dimosiografo-Taki-Xatzi-13-5/>

<sup>20</sup> Event at KKE’s Attic headquarters for the presentation of volume C2 of the history essay (1967-1974). Rizospastis, 27-28 /1/24. <https://www.rizospastis.gr/story.do?id=12401090>

<sup>21</sup> Ibid.

*'When the junta took over in 1967 here, the United States allowed its interests in prosecuting the Cold War to prevail over its interests—I should say its obligation—to support democracy, which was, after all, the cause for which we fought the Cold War'.<sup>22</sup>*

The justification of the 'non-fascist' nature of the Colonels' dictatorship is totally absurd and disconnected from any class criteria and from the Marxist-Leninist definition of fascism:

*'The junta was not supported by a Nazi/fascist-type party; its leaders were not politicians who had risen through the ranks of bourgeois parliamentarianism; they had no political organization, youth wing, etc.'<sup>23</sup>*

What about Dimitrov, who said:

*'The development of fascism, and the fascist dictatorship itself, assume different forms in different countries, according to historical, social and economic conditions and to the national peculiarities and the international position of the given country'?*<sup>24</sup>

The KKE's adialectical dogmatism does not contemplate this possibility, and clings to differences in form such as the absence of a youth base, the failure to rise through the bourgeois parliament, the presence of a Nazi/fascist party, etc. between the dictatorship of the colonels and Hitler's Germany or fascist Italy (features common to numerous other tragic experiences of coups in South America or Asia), hiding the substance of the phenomenon, namely *'the open terrorist dictatorship of the most reactionary, most chauvinistic and most imperialist elements of finance capital'*.

Bellou added in a new speech on November 16, 2024:

*'And as we have already revealed, in 1967, the military and political coup had been chosen by all sections of the bourgeoisie in Greece. [...] Above all, it was planned with the consent of shipowners, industrialists, and bankers. [...] Some in your schools try to say that 'the KKE absolves' the US, the UK, and NATO for the junta's coup. No, the KKE highlights the role of the domestic bourgeoisie in political developments. Shipowners, industrialists, bankers, and publishers were not 'pawns' of foreign armies and secret services; they chose foreign alliances for their own interests. Shipowners, industrialists, bankers, and publishers were not 'pawns' of foreign armies and secret services; they chose foreign alliances for their own capitalist interests'.<sup>25</sup>*

The KKE therefore attributes responsibility for the establishment of the fascist regime exclusively to the Greek bourgeoisie, effectively exonerating US imperialism and its monopolies, which held the reins of the Greek national bourgeoisie.

The inability to grasp the external factor of reactionary and fascist processes, to frame coup d'état, subversive, and terrorist phenomena, such as those that occurred in the 1960s and 1970s in Greece and elsewhere outside the US strategy in Europe, is a serious limitation and a serious mistake.

## **THE KKE AND THE OCCUPATION OF THE ATHENS POLYTECHNIC**

---

<sup>22</sup> On This Day November 20, 1999: President Bill Clinton Acknowledges U.S. Role in Greek Dictatorship. <https://pappaspost.com/on-this-day-november-20-1999-bill-clinton-acknowledges-us-role-greek-dictatorship/>

<sup>23</sup> Eleni Bellou's presentation of the second volume of the history of the KKE. <https://www.902.gr/eidisi/politiki/349378/paroyasiastike-o-g2-tomos-toy-dokimioy-istorias-toy-kke-apo-tin-el-mpelloy>

<sup>24</sup> Georgi Dimitrov, *The Fascist Offensive and the Tasks of the Communist International*, Lawrence and Wishart, London, 1938, pag. 3. <https://www.revolutionarydemocracy.org/archive/dimitrov.pdf>

<sup>25</sup> Eleni Bellou: The children of the people can not only envision but also pave the way for the overthrow of capitalist power. <https://www.902.gr/eidisi/politiki/379471/el-mpelloy-ta-paidia-toy-laoy-mporoy-n-ohi-mono-na-oramatistoy-n-alla-kai-n>

The problems with the KKE's analyses, historical reconstructions, and political positions obviously do not end there. In recent years, Greek revisionists have tried to make themselves look good by talking about how the KKE led the Greek people's struggle by organizing and directing the occupation of the Athens Polytechnic, which then led to the end of the Colonels' regime in Greece. Unfortunately, the reality is quite different, and in 1973 the KKE actually opposed the occupation of the Polytechnic, calling the students provocateurs and CIA agents.

On November 15, 2022, the KKE Press Office wrote:

*'Moreover, from the very beginning of the Polytechnic uprising, the KKE and the KNE (youth organisation of the KKE – editor's note) took a clear position, welcoming and supporting it. Its officials and members played a leading role in organizing the struggle, fighting for its orientation and content, against the maneuvers of the junta, while the party forces took the lead on the crucial issue of ensuring active, mass support from the labor movement.'*<sup>26</sup>

But at the time, in 'Panspudastiki No. 8' (the organ of publication of the 'anti-EFEE', 'Union of Students Against Dictatorship' affiliated with KNE) which was published later (January-February 1974), when the members of the Polytechnic Coordination Committee were illegal, a notice was presented with a forged signature of the Coordination Committee, which read:

*'We denounce the premeditated invasion of the Polytechnic on Wednesday, November 14, by approximately 350 organized agents of the KYP, in accordance with the provocative plan of Roufoglou Karagiannopoulos, based on the orders of the now-ousted former dictator Papadopoulos and the American CIA, with the aim of promoting, by any means of intimidation and provocation, ridiculous and anarchist slogans and slogans that did not express the moment and the specific forces. [...]*<sup>27</sup>

The press office of the KKE, trying to justify the unjustifiable, brazenly claimed that what was written in 'Panspudastiki No. 8' reflected reality and referred to the actions of provocateurs:

*'The notorious complaint, published inside this issue, is an announcement by the Polytechnic Occupation Committee, referring to the actions of provocateurs and their attempt to invade the Polytechnic, and is a response to the slanderous announcement by the murderous ESA about the Polytechnic. The fact that the junta attempted to strike at the anti-dictatorial student movement and the Polytechnic uprising, apart from direct repression, by sending provocateurs – security agents, cannot be disputed.'*<sup>28</sup>

But the truth easily comes to light. In the 4<sup>th</sup> Plenary Session of the Central Committee of the KKE of July 1976 ('Reports and conclusions on the events of November 1973' published on Komep, journal of the CC of the KKE) there it was stated that:

*'The KOA and the Office of the CC of the KNE saw the occupation in principle as a dangerous complication in the development of the anti-junta struggle. Their thought was mainly to take measures for the immediate disengagement of the students from the Polytechnic [...] it must be said that the occupation was a surprise for the leadership of the Party and the KNE [...] "there was not even a thought of a struggle on such a scale" [...] The KNE Central Committee Office learned of the events almost by chance on Thursday morning. [...] Its first assessment was that the events*

---

<sup>26</sup> Writers... of a penny, Rizospastis, 15/11/22. <https://www.rizospastis.gr/story.do?id=11899788>

<sup>27</sup> Panspudastiki No. 8 is available here: <https://www.vrahokipos.net/old/history/gr/polytexneio/panspoudastiki.htm>

<sup>28</sup> Classic provocations, Rizospastis, 17/11/2018. <https://www.rizospastis.gr/story.do?id=10091090>

*constituted an irresponsible action, to a certain extent, outside the organization's line*'.<sup>29</sup>

What is the use of hiding the truth of historical facts? What is the use of attributing to oneself merits not one's own with partial self-criticism?

### **SECTARISM, MASSIMALIST EXTREMISM**

The KKE speaks of '*regroupment of the labour movement and the reinforcement of the class orientation, on the strengthening of the class unity of the working class*.' and its attempts to build an alliance '*between the working class, the poor farmers, the small self-employed, women and young people from the working class families*'.

It argues that: '*In the current conditions this alliance is expressed through the coordination of the struggle of the militant rallies: PAME in the working class, PASY in the farmers, PASEVE in the self-employed in urban centres, MAS in students, OGE in women*'.<sup>30</sup>

It might seem then that a true popular alliance was created in Greece, but such a situation never existed in reality.

In fact, it is argued that '*The people's alliance is a social alliance and has an anti-capitalist, antimonopoly orientation*' only because PAME, PASY, PASEVE, MAS and OGE are '*militant rallies*' that follows the same line of the KKE. There is no '*people's alliance*', but on the contrary there is an organizational unity among trade union, youth, women's and peasant organizations transmission belts of the KKE and/or those following its line.

The KKE is incapable of assessing revolution as a dialectical process, with relative class alliances and qualitative differences depending on the particular context of each country; this in a dependent country like Greece is particularly serious and benefits imperialist monopoly capitalism.

By declaring the confederations to which the workers' and labor unions are affiliated as 'compromised' and 'collaborationist' en bloc, without distinguishing between their base and capitulatory leaderships, and without grasping possible internal dialectics, the KKE formed PAME, which functions as a separate confederation.

This attitude has contributed to dividing the labor and trade union movement. PAME, in the name of a supposed class purity, proclaiming itself to be a trade union vanguard, has on numerous occasions over the years perpetrated a practice of fractionalization and disintegration of workers' and mass struggles, thus playing a negative role in the struggles, trying to channel them into electoral support for the KKE in each term, not working for the class alliance of the working class and popular movements under the political leadership of the Communist Party, but weakening and sabotaging everything that was not an expression of the KKE, thus alienating itself from all other progressive and workers' forces.

'*The character of the revolution is socialist*' says the KKE, and on the basis of that, parties, movements, unions, mass organizations that do not follow the KKE are automatically reformist and/or bourgeois. The alliances established must be, in its words, '*anti-capitalist and anti-monopolistic*' and therefore, should not take place with other realities, but on the contrary, '*people's*

---

<sup>29</sup> Reports and conclusions on the events of November 1973, Approved at the 4<sup>th</sup> Plenary Session of the CC of the KKE, July 1976, pag. 15. <https://www.antapocrisis.gr/wp-content/uploads/2022/11/%CE%95%CE%9A%CE%98%CE%95%CE%A3%CE%97-%CE%9A%CE%91%CE%99-%CE%A3%CE%A5%CE%9C%CE%A0%CE%95%CE%A1%CE%91%CE%A3%CE%9C%CE%91%CE%A4%CE%91-%CE%93%CE%99%CE%91-%CE%A4%CE%91-%CE%93%CE%95%CE%93%CE%9F%CE%9D%CE%9F%CE%A4%CE%91-%CE%9D%CE%9F%CE%95%CE%9C%CE%92%CE%A1%CE%97-1973.pdf>

<sup>30</sup> Some questions on the unity of the international communist movement, International Relations Section of the CC of the KKE. <https://inter.kke.gr/en/articles/Some-questions-on-the-unity-of-the-international-communist-movement/>

*alliance*' will be built with the workers' conquest of the '*vanguard, mass activities*' that are under the exclusive control of the KKE. Such a view clearly sins with severe sectarian narrowness in the approach and solution of the Communist Party's political tasks.

## EUROPEANISM AND ELECTORALISM

Following the past European elections, the KKE celebrated its '*further advance*'<sup>31</sup> after reaching nearly 10 percent of the votes. In the post-election analyses of this party's leaders, there was no room to point out how it was a figure distorted by a 40 percent turnout, the growing estrangement of the popular masses from bourgeois politics, and the fact that the KKE had taken fewer votes than in 2023 (367,796 vs. 426,628, suffrages far lower than the 536,072 of 2012 or the 734,552 of 1989).<sup>32</sup>

Clearly, votes in bourgeois elections are not a truly indicative parameter of the conduct of a Marxist-Leninist party, but the fact that the KKE after the elections celebrates the retreat of its support among the masses speaks volumes about a pernicious electoralist tendency.

Going on to assess in more detail the content expressed regarding the last election campaign, a serious KKE tare recurs, that of social-democratic or Trotskyist Europeanism.

In the aforementioned interview of KKE Secretary Dimitris Koutsoubas with Takis Hatzis, one finds indicative insights. Let us see an excerpt from it:

'T. Hatzis: *Yes, but would you want us to leave Europe? [...]*

D. Koutsoubas: *[...] What we want is not this EU, we want the Europe of the peoples, the Europe of the workers, the Europe of the workers. How is that going to happen? By changing the balance of power, for example in Greece and by the KKE coming out very high, by having a government based on the KKE's plan and program on how to have equal trade policies, economic and other relations with the current EU member states and with the whole world, we have to change the situation in France [...] The European Union that we want is the Europe of the peoples, which will not participate in imperialist wars [...]. It will be a Europe in which the worker decides in his factory and is the master of production, there will be a central plan organized to solve social popular problems. This is the Europe we want and this is what is in the programme of the KKE and this is what we are clearly proposing. They are not going to say that the parrots want it, we want the Europe of socialism, of course*'.<sup>33</sup>

It is evident how the KKE secretary's conceptions are imbued with electoralism and illusions about the 'Europe of the Peoples.' Such conceptions lead to the repudiation of the revolutionary path, and reject the building of socialism in one country, as well as the national liberation struggle of the Greek people against EU imperialism that has slaughtered the Hellenic people with austerity policies.

Lots of fine proclamations are made about a 'peoples' Europe', 'anti-imperialist', etc., but nothing is said about the EU of the monopolies being unreformable, attempting to skirt around this fundamental point. It is claimed that the solution to the problems of capitalist Greece and the EU is to 'bring up the KKE' in elections.

---

<sup>31</sup> The KKE emerged stronger from the elections where the heart of the people and their struggles beats.  
<https://inter.kke.gr/en/articles/The-KKE-emerged-stronger-from-the-elections-where-the-heart-of-the-people-and-their-struggles-beats/>

<sup>32</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Communist\\_Party\\_of\\_Greece#Election\\_results](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Communist_Party_of_Greece#Election_results)

<sup>33</sup> Interview of Dimitris Koutsoubas to the TV station One and the journalist Takis Hatzis.

<https://www.kke.gr/article/Synteneyksi-toy-Dimitri-Koytsoympa-ston-tileoptiko-stathmo-One-kai-ton-dimosiografo-Taki-Xatzi-13-5/>

The KKE secretary steadfastly refuses to talk about Greece's exit from the EU, further worsening the position of the KKE, which in past years spoke of '*disengagement from the EU*' instead of '*exit from the EU*'. And he proves to be excellent heir to Aleka Pappariga who argued that:

*'First of all, we are generally in favour of disengagement from the EU, the solution outside the euro and drachma in the present circumstances is disastrous. But, voluntarily leaving the eurozone and being kicked out of the eurozone right now, we don't see it.'*<sup>34</sup>

It should be emphasized that it is true that a reactionary exit from the EU could lead to inflationary spirals and other problems that would be dumped entirely on the proletariat; but at the same time, a revolutionary, democratic and popular exit from the EU is a watchword to be decisively supported with regard to the struggle in Greece and the advancement of a socialist revolutionary process.

## **STILL DISTORTIONS, AMBIGUITIES AND CONFUSIONS**

The serious problematic issues that have emerged regarding the conceptions and line of this party, the ambiguous positions, the heavy revisionist encrustations that have never been dissolved, depend on the history of this party and the composite and uneven nature of the members of the KKE, within which there is a core of militants who draw on Marxism-Leninism along with currents of a revisionist, social-democratic and Trotskyist nature, which link well with analyses and conceptions such as the 'Europe of the Peoples' and the 'Imperialist Pyramid', which implicitly deny the victory of revolution and the establishment of proletarian power in a single country.

A striking example of ambiguity and foreignness to Marxism-Leninism are also the recent statements of Aleka Pappariga, former secretary of the KKE, on the war in Ukraine, defined as a war of liberation against the external invader, in defiance of the KKE's own position on the war, despite the fact that she is still a member of her party's CC.<sup>35</sup>

## **CONCLUSIONS**

The failure to overcome the revisionist imprint that the KKE has carried with it since 1955 has not allowed this party to adopt revolutionary positions in line with proletarian socialism; its theses and analyses have been constantly conditioned over time by this factor, being influenced negatively by it.

As we have seen, today's KKE was born and strengthened under the aegis of Khrushchev and Brezhnev, never completely disowning its origin, but progressively integrating elements of Trotskyism and social democracy into its positions, and claiming Marxism-Leninism and to some of its figures only in a symbolic and instrumental way.

It should come as no surprise that today the KKE distances itself from the 20<sup>th</sup> Congress of the CPUS, from which it essentially sprang. No revisionist party in the world and no existing ideological current today defends Khrushchevism. But it does not follow from this that the parties that have adhered for decades to the positions of Soviet revisionism have engaged in serious and extensive self-criticism, in-depth debate on the origin of the problems. On the contrary, a number of revisionist parties have addressed formal, superficial, non-essential criticism of their past, and in fact have maintained and defended their revisionist line. No revisionist party has carried out a profound critique of the events since the 20<sup>th</sup> Congress, of the devastation caused by modern revisionism, which was of a far greater magnitude than that caused by the renegades of the Second

---

<sup>34</sup> Political struggle is needed for the people to impose better days, Rizospastis, 31/5/2011.

<https://www.rizospastis.gr/story.do?id=6273579>

<sup>35</sup> <https://youtu.be/Ny8sYAvoOQU?si=4FzydQdfSwJbnEyZ>

International. At most these parties have tried to rid themselves of certain obstacles and conditioning in order to continue their activities.

The KKE as we know it today, although it suffered a serious crisis and avoided its transformation into an openly social-democratic party in the early 1990s, has not yet, however, come to terms to the end with the errors, omissions, and opportunist deviations, which caused the party to side for decades with Khrushchev, Brezhnev, and Gorbachev who led to the overthrow of socialism in the Soviet Union and other socialist countries; just as it has yet to separate itself from openly revisionist and socialdemocratic-type parties.

At the theoretical level there are numerous tares of this party: the KKE revises the Leninist analysis of imperialism, national liberation, the definition of fascism, revolution, scientific socialism and the history of socialist countries.

This does not mean that the KKE at certain junctures in the class struggle does not play a positive role, objectively antagonistic to the oligarchy of international finance capital and the Greek bourgeoisie. It does not mean that at certain times and occasions the KKE cannot develop or participate in initiatives that should be supported. But until the KKE completely rids itself of its revisionist dross, until it 'recomposes' itself with its past and present, until it is consequential and consistent in theory and practice, it cannot represent the general and historical interests of the proletariat, nor can it be a vanguard party of the international communist movement.

Based on these considerations, it is a serious mistake to be inspired by the theses and positions of the KKE to rebuild the Communist Party in Italy. Instead, it is necessary to move forward in firmly combating these conceptions, to work relentlessly to unify communist and revolutionary forces on the basis of Marxist-Leninist principles.

The proletariat needs the unity of sincere communists more than ever, needs a political party independent of the bourgeoisie, not unity between communists and the enemies of socialism, revisionists and opportunists.

The process of communist unity is inseparable from its ideological, political, programmatic and organizational foundations. It is closely connected with the struggle against the deviations, degenerations, and deformations of Marxism-Leninism, which are as many manifestations of bourgeois and petty-bourgeois influence on the proletariat and which at any moment can open a way.

Communist unity presents itself as the goal and object of a fierce struggle between proletarian ideology and all other non-proletarian tendencies.

It is necessary to struggle against the denial and caricatures of Leninism, against its reduction to some quotation or reference with no connection to the whole theory, strategy and tactics of the movement for the emancipation of the proletariat.

The international communist movement is struggling to regain its revolutionary unity. The heavy legacy of revisionism that brought the early experiences of proletarian socialism to defeat still weighs on our movement, while old and new opportunist and social-democratic deviations are surfacing and sharpening in this period marked by the imperialist war being fought in Ukraine.

The revival of our movement can only take place as a result of a tight theoretical, ideological and political struggle against all these deformations and deviations, based on the defense of Marxist-Leninist principles applied to concrete reality.

Communists struggling to give the working class its own independent and revolutionary party, to strengthen the international cooperation of communist parties and organizations on firm Marxist-Leninist foundations, cannot escape the task of achieving the fullest clarity on the question of imperialism and the closely related question of opportunism, as well as and on numerous other questions on which, as we have seen the KKE does not have correct theses and positions.

At the same time, we must criticize and demolish all the clichés that are often repeated uncritically in our country, as well as the grafts of bodies foreign to Marxism-Leninism, the confusionism and eclecticism that are manifested due to deficiencies in ideological training and the failure to assimilate dialectical materialism.

As communists (Marxist-Leninists) we do not shy away from confrontation and joint action to support the cause of the working class and oppressed peoples, but develop this as an aspect of the ideological and political struggle on which the advancement of the battle for the Communist Party depends.

We therefore call for the development of ideological and political debate and confrontation in the spirit of struggle the unity of communists (Marxist-Leninists).

*November, 2025*

**Organisation for the Communist Party of the Proletariat of Italy**