Daily Mirror: ‘An “anti-Semitic” poster from outside the Labour Party conference has been removed. The poster featured a caricature of Labour leader Jeremy Corbyn speaking out on Palestinian rights.’ Note quotation marks and gash in the middle; it was attacked five time by Zionist thugs (see pages 10, 11).

Former Life Guards Regiment soldier Dennis Hutchings, who pleaded not guilty to “attempted murder” by video link from Plymouth on 26 September did not attend the Belfast court because he was “too ill”. He shot mentally ill John Cunningham DEAD in 1974; it was a successful attempt! But he was not “too ill” to travel to London two days later to take part in the 500-strong demonstration for Soldier F, who murdered at least four on Bloody Sunday, 30 January 1972.
Socialist Fight Where We Stand (extracts)

Revolutionary socialism
1. We stand with Karl Marx: ‘The emancipation of the working classes must be conquered by the working classes themselves. The struggle for the emancipation of the working class means not a struggle for class privileges and monopolies but for equal rights and duties and the abolition of all class rule’ (The International Workingmen’s Association 1864, General Rules).

2. In the class struggle we shall fight to develop every struggle of the working class and oppressed in the direction of democratic workers’ councils as the instruments of participatory democracy which must be the basis of the successful struggle for workers’ power.

Revolutionary strategy and tactics
3. We recognise the necessity for serious ideological and political struggle as direct participants in the trade unions and the mass reformist social democratic bourgeoisie workers’ parties despite their pro-capitalist, where we stand, leaderships when conditions are favourable. In fighting the attacks of this Tory government it is now necessary to work within the Labour Party as well as within other proto-parties such as Left Unity and RSPECPT that seek to present socialist and anti-imperialist politics in opposition to the neo-liberalism that is now deeply embedded within the Labour Party. We support all genuine left developments within Labour, such as the Corbyn for leader campaign.

4. We strongly support campaigns to democratise the trade unions’ traditional link to the Labour Party. We are for funding only those MPs who agree to and have a record of fighting for union policies.

5. We fight for rank-and-file organisations in the trade unions within which we will fight for consciously revolutionary socialist leadership.line with Trotsky’s Transient Programme statement: “Therefore, the sections of the Fourth International should always strive not only to renew the top leadership of the trade unions, boldly and resolutely in critical moments advancing new militant leaders in place of routine functionaries and careerists, but also to create in all possible instances independent militant organizations corresponding more closely to the tasks of mass struggle against bourgeois society; and, if necessary, not flinching even in the face of a direct break with the conservative apparatus of the trade unions. If it be criminal to turn one’s back on mass organizations for the sake of fostering sectarian factions, it is no less so passively to tolerate subordination of the revolutionary mass movement to the control of openly reactionary or disguised conservativist (“progressive”) bureaucratic cliques. Trade unions are not ends in themselves; they are but means along the road to proletarian revolution.”

6. We totally oppose all economic nationalists campaigns like for ‘British jobs for British workers’ that means capitulation to national chauvinism and so to the political and economic interests of the ruling class itself. We are therefore unreservedly for a Socialist United States of Europe.

9. We are completely opposed to man-made climate change and the degradation of the biosphere which is caused by the anarchy of capitalist production for profits of transnational corporations. Ecological catastrophe is not ‘as crucial as imperialism’ but caused by imperialism so to combat this threat we must redouble our efforts to forward the world revolution.

Special Oppression and Racism
10. We recognise that class society, and capitalism as the last form of class society, is by its nature patriarchal. In that sense the oppression of women is different from all other forms of oppression and discrimination. Sexism and the oppression of women is inextricably tied to the ownership of the means of production. To achieve sexual and individual freedom women need to achieve the abolition of all class rule’ (The International Workingmen’s Association 1864, General Rules).

21. We are for the re-creation of a World Party of Socialist Revolution, a revolutionary international, based on the best traditions of the previous revolutionary internationals, politically underground and internationally united, the Fourth and Fourth Internationals, with their determination to combat and overcome both reformism and centrist, ▲

Contents

Editorial: Constitutional Crises and fear of the global working class..........................................................Page 3
Defeat Johnson’s coup, constitutional crisis, letter to Morning Star, anti-union laws.............................................Pages 4 and 5
Irish Republican Prisoners Support Group..........................................................Page 6
Mobile phone seizures..................................................................................Page 8
CPGB Communist University........................................................................Page 7
Hong Kong and Universal Credit.................................................................Page 9
Peter Gregson and That Banner................................................................Pages 10 and 11
Modi Brutalises Kashmir, Assam................................................................Page 12
The Banality of Tony Greenstein................................................................Page 13
Defend Eddie Dempsey................................................................................Page 14
Now the coup is against Trump....................................................................Page 16

Leon Trotsky: I am confident of the victory of the Fourth International; Go Forward!
Whenever rival factions of the ruling class clash, they are always acutely conscious there is a third force, the working class, is listening in. Today that clash is obviously deep and bitter. Boris Johnson is now seeking to mobilise the far right and provoke riots to get his preferred hard Brexit through by the use of inflammatory language in parliament; surrender Act, betrayal, humbug, traitors etc. Johnson is pitching towards a reviving English nationalism, an Empire nostalgia, a hatred of foreigners and import controls in trade wars in which his preferred ally is Trump and US imperialism. In response the Labour party acknowledges the need to defend progressive EU legislation on workers’ rights, essentially won by the militancy of the French working class.

But the Labour party conference this year was very disappointing because the main concern of Corbyn and the leadership was to keep the membership in check. These were obviously younger and far more leftist than last year, as increasing numbers of CLPs have fallen to the left. And they were expressing the push from the mass of the working class as its vanguard. But Corbyn again and again blocked with the Trade Union bureaucracy and the right wing of his own party to frustrate that push, as Tony Blair had done.

Labour is determined to keep all the Thatch-erite anti-union laws so they can be wielded against a resurgent working class when that log jam is inevitably broken. This has the support of the Labour leaders and almost the entire trade union bureaucracy with the honourable exceptions of the FBU, the RMT and the IWGB. It is in direct defiance of Labour party conference decisions of 2017; they are pledged to repeal ONLY the 2016 Trade Union Act and only to “roll back” Thatcher’s Acts. In other words, to slightly modify them by a new trade union act but not to “make a bonfire” of them, as Trotsky said:

> “The economic model of the past four decades means a growing share of household income is financed by borrowing, while the increase in the profit share has either been saved or channelled into buying assets … Yet, businesses would rather sit on piles of cash or use profits to buy back shares rather than seize the plentiful investment opportunities.”

McDonnell also promised to raise the national living wage to a minimum of £10 an hour, a shorter working week with no loss of pay, and by rolling back (!) the Thatcherite anti-trade union legislation from 1979. Because, Elliot says:

> “The right to strike was easily the most potent weapon at labour’s disposal. Unions (bureaucrats, he should say!) don’t really like strikes, especially long ones that make it harder for their members to pay the mortgage and feed their families. But they know that often the only way to get a deal out of an intransigent employer is to threaten to walk out … Labour’s approach is like that of a trade unionist who reassures the employer from the outset of negotiations that there is no possibility of a strike.”

So we can see that the sharp conflict at the outset of the conference, over Jon Lansman’s attempt to remove treacherous deputy Watson and the defeat of the CLP delegates’ push to win Labour to a remain position was really a signal to the capitalist establishment itself that Corbyn was a safe pair of hands.

On 21 September, to assure the Labour party leaders before the start of their conference, The Guardian’s Andy Beckett, headlined, “Even bankers are starting to think Corbyn might be the safe choice now” and the subhead assured us, “Faced with the Tories’ no-deal extremism and a glaring crisis in capitalism, the financial establishment is losing its fear of a radical Labour government,”

He went on to supply the gory details; Oliver Harvey, an analyst for Deutsche Bank in the City of London, told the Telegraph: “We see the magnitude of economic damage caused by a no-deal Brexit as much higher than [that caused by] policies proposed in the last Labour manifesto.” In the same article, Christian Schulz, an analyst for Citibank, noted approvingly that “Labour has become more decisively pro-EU”, while “a fiscally profligate no-deal Conservative government” had become less “enticing”.

And Beckett observed that the city bankers see John McDonnell, who has been touring the city recently, as “a serious and intriguing figure: a supposed Marxist who looks, and sometimes talks, a bit like a bank manager.”

The Financial Times says, “Capitalism: time for a reset”, The Economist is grudgingly respectful of the efforts of Corbyn and McDonnell to please them, Conservatives Welsh MP Guto Bebb, says “a short-term [caretaker] Jeremy Corbyn government” would be “less damaging” than a no-deal Brexit. Ken Clarke said the same to the Observer but did not mention care- toker only (see page 5 on National Government).

The disgraceful capitulation of Corbyn yet again to the Zionist lobby over Peter Gregson’s banner (see pages 10 and 11) is another clear signal of subordination to the masters of life; the whole capitalist establishment.

For those who see politics as an eternal electoral conflict between Tory and Labour about who can best serve the interests of British imperialism these are comforting thoughts. Boris Johnson is making a complete hash of serving capitalism as seen in the Tory party conference.

For internationalist socialists, who look to the global state of the international working class and who note the very similar constitutional, corruption and sexual assault crisis in the USA over Trump (see page 16) these are pre-battle manoeuvres between the two great remaining classes on the planet, the international working class and world imperialism.

We always remember with Karl Liebknecht that the main enemy in war and conflicts is ALWAYS at home in an imperialist country. We are left remainers in this ongoing political and constitutional crisis. Everything that increases the confidence of the working class and its vanguard in the Labour party ranks and its confidence in its own strength and ability to confront and defeat capitalism itself is good.

Everything that seeks, like the Labour party leadership now, to put them back in their boxes by bureaucratic manoeuvres and to use them only as a stage army to get Labour elected the better to manage capitalism, is wrong.

Of course, vote Labour now and still fight to get Corbyn elected, the Tories are the main class enemy, Labour is better for the class conscious- ness and militancy of the working class but have no illusions. As in international wars and conflicts the Marxist united front motto is ALWAYS at home in an imperialist country. We are left remainers in this ongoing political and constitutional crisis. Everything that increases the confidence of the working class and its vanguard in the Labour party ranks and its confidence in its own strength and ability to confront and defeat capitalism itself is good.

Everything that seeks, like the Labour party leadership now, to put them back in their boxes by bureaucratic manoeuvres and to use them only as a stage army to get Labour elected the better to manage capitalism, is wrong.

Of course, vote Labour now and still fight to get Corbyn elected, the Tories are the main class enemy, Labour is better for the class consciousness and militancy of the working class but have no illusions. As in international wars and conflicts the Marxist united front motto is always unconditional but critical support to every, even partial and half-hearted, opposition to imperialism and capitalism itself. ▲
Defeat Johnson’s Coup! Stop Brexit, No immigration controls! No National Government! General Strike Now!

LLOYD RUSSELL-MOYLE, Labour MP for Brighton Kemptown, has made the correct response to Boris Johnson’s constitutional coup in procouring parliament on 28 August (see box overleaf). It must be met with mass mobilisations on the streets and a general strike.

The demos in London and in several other British cities on 28th and the call for the mass national demonstration on 31st and subsequent actions must be answered by the whole organised labour movement and every immigrant and oppressed minority in the land.

For we are all under threat as in the 1930s from a creeping fascism promoted by far rightist regimes and movements in Italy, Eastern Europe, France, Brazil but above all by the war-mongering racist bigots who now control the US Presidency, Donald Trump and his team.

Johnson is the expression of a vile English nationalism, protectionism, immigration controls, import controls and trade wars inevitably leading to WWII in the short to medium term.

So we are not just demonstrating in defence of “democracy” or “parliamentary sovereignty” but for our own futures and for a socialist society which will abolish capitalism globally and end all wars, hunger and want on the planet.

Humanity has all the resources to achieve this now but the global imperialist hegenom, the USA and all its subordinate allies in Europe, Japan, etc., rule all via their great finance houses and transnational corporations. Their mode of production is individual profit based on private property. Capitalism can never produce for human need so our task is revolutionary and not reformist.

As Trotskyists we understand that only the socialist revolution, spread internationally, will achieve this. But, as Trotsky observed, “those who cannot defend old positions will never conquer new ones”. This coup threatens the democratic rights of all the working class and oppressed and their ability to fight.

Attacks escalate on the poor and disabled, from Universal Credit and vicious sanctioning of DWP claimants and the disabled to attacks on immigrant workers, etc. Inevitably flowing from the racist referendum are the surge in attacks on all Black, Asian and ethnic minorities, on LGBTI and all the oppressed.

The 2016 referendum fostered these divisions in the working class that can only be healed by a revived class which confronts in militant struggle the whole capitalist system for wages, conditions, against zero hours contracts (now rapidly growing) and in defence of all its weakest and unorganised, the cleaners, the couriers, construction workers, sex workers, etc.

Finance’s glib justifies and the uprisings in Algeria and Sudan, the resistance in Yemen, Palestine, Venezuela, Brazil and Russia and above all the internationalist courage of the climate change youth led by Greta Thunberg are new layers and a new generation who are ready for the fight and know no defeat.

TO FIGHT FOR SOCIALISM the working class must secure the repeal of ALL the anti-trade union laws from the Thatcher and Cameron eras. But an incoming Labour government has not pledged to do this. In fact the 2017 general election Manifesto, For the Many, not the Few says in Rights at Work it will only:

“Repeal the Trade Union Act (2016) and roll out sectional collective bargaining – because the most effective way to maintain good rights at work is collectively through a union.”

But there could be no mistaking the political import of the article in the Morning Star of 26 July: In a full-page rambling article Andy Green, Secretary of the Campaign for Trade Union Freedom, produced this gem towards the end:

“A new Industrial Relations Act could and should, we believe, restore a right to strike without necessarily making a public bonfire of the Thatcherite Acts of Parliament.”

The Campaign for Trade Union Freedom speaks for the TUC and the majority of the TU bureaucracy in Britain. It has refused to pledge to repeal the seven major anti-trade union laws passed by Thatcher, which makes Britain the most oppressive anti-union state in Western Europe. Why not make this “bonfire”?

We see here a very important division in the trade unions and the labour movement in general, a division in the ranks of the Stalinists and the bureaucracy.

Only the FBU and Matt Wrack, Mick Cash and the RMT, and the small but militant non-TUC Independent Workers of Great Britain (IWGB) and all those grass roots labour bodies who have rallied to the AWL-initiated Free Our Unions Campaign (80+ regional, local and other labour movement bodies), now stand for the repeal of all the anti-TU laws. We give them our unhesitating support.

The Campaign for Trade Union Freedom DID support the repeal of all eight anti-trade union Acts. Why this sudden collapse, why is the Campaign for Trade Union Freedom and the majority of the trade union bureaucracy now against trade union freedom?

Defence of their privileges under capitalism and a fear of a resurgent working class that it could not control is obviously the reason these conservative, arrogant and corrupt bureaucracy now seek to defend Thatcher’s reactionary legacy. A genuine rank-and-file movement within all the unions is a burning necessity.

The monarchy has just been wielded against the democratic rights of the majority of the population. It must be destroyed.
**Letter to the Morning Star: No Popular Fronts, No National Governments!**

**THE MORNING STAR COMMENT, “the left must be on guard against a national government” (MS Aug 7) is correct in its conclusion, “even a major break with a significant number of MPs leaving the party would do less damage than meek participation in such a government”.**

I say this from the standpoint of a left remainder who believes that the international perspective of the working class must be fighting alongside the EU working class against EU imperialism, Karl Liebknecht wrote “The Main Enemy is at Home” in 1914:

“This enemy at home must be fought by the German people in a political struggle, cooperating with the proletariat of other countries whose struggle is against their own imperialists”

Paul Mason, in The Guardian on August 3, wrote:

“Labour must adopt a tactic from the 1930s: a popular front … we need a one-off electoral arrangement between parties of the left and centre aimed at preventing a no-deal Brexit and removing Johnson from Downing Street”.

In Spain the Popular Front took power in January 1936 and “in May that year the Popular Front won in France, giving the country its first socialist prime minister”, he pleads. This went so well that it paved the way for Labour’s wartime coalition with Winston Churchill. This tactic, “halted or delayed the march to fascism in the 1930s”, he claims.

It did not. It facilitated the victory of fascism in Spain in April 1939 and in France in June following the Nazi occupation; right wingers in Paris chanted, “Better Hitler than Blum.” In conditions of frontal assault by the far right and fascism the most precious commodity the working class possesses is their class independence; conceding that to popular fronts and national governments with the liberal bourgeoisie denied them the possibility of fighting for socialism via revolution, the only real way to defeat fascism.

That former fellow Trotskyist Paul Mason has forgotten, if he ever understood it in the first place.

Comradely Gerry Downing

**Constitutional coups and revolutions**

BORIS JOHNSON’S CONSTITUTIONAL COUP by pro-roguing parliament on 28 August has been likened by some to Oliver Cromwell’s dissolution of the Rump Parliament on 20 April 1653. This was the remnants of the Long Parliament, purged of the Presbyterian faction compromisers with Charles I by Colonel Thomas Pride on 6 December 1648.

The execution of Charles I on 30 January 1649 was England’s single most revolutionary act. The Rump Parliament then passed an “Act prohibiting the proclaiming any person to be King of England or Ireland, or the Dominions thereof”, and to declare the representatives of the people, the House of Commons, as the source of all just power.

An act abolishing the kingship was passed by the Rump on 17 March, followed by an act to abolish the House of Lords on 19 March. On 19 May an Act Declaring England a Commonwealth was passed.

The Treasons Act made it an offence to say that the House of Commons (without the Lords or the King) was not the supreme authority of the land.

Cromwell’s speech at that time was that of a bourgeois revolutionary who have grown impatient with those who wanted still to compromise with the old regime and make only half a revolution. Even the Rump had retreated from finishing the job:

“Ye are grown intolerably odious to the whole nation; you were deputed here by the people to get grievances redress’d, are yourselves are yourselves become the greatest grievance! ... Take away that shining bauble there and lock up the doors. In the name of God, go!”

Cromwell’s “fool’s bauble” is the ceremonial mace, symbolising the then absolute monarchy – disrespect for that is still taken as implicit republicanism. Lloyd Russell-Moyle refers to his own interference with the mace in the box opposite.

**On 28 August, Lloyd Russell-Moyle, Labour MP for Brighton Kemptown, called for a general strike to stop Brexit in the Daily Mirror:**

AT THE LAST ELECTION the majority of parties pledged they would not allow No Deal and, in the referendum, even the leavers said that No deal was a bad idea. By forcing through a No Deal Brexit, the government will have ignored widespread warnings about food and medicine shortages, NHS ward closures and security risks. It will cost the public billions and usher in a new era of austerity.

Because of these dangers and strong evidence that the public does not want a No Deal Brexit, MPs have explicitly voted against a No Deal Brexit on no fewer than three occasions. The Government’s move to try to suspend Parliament is an attempt to force through No Deal anyway – against Parliament and the people’s will. I therefore call on Parliament and the people to resist this deeply anti-democratic move, using any peaceful means available to them.

Last year I picked up Parliament’s ceremonial mace in protest at the last Prime Minister’s decision to call off a crucial Brexit vote. Today, my shadow cabinet colleagues have pledged to occupy Parliament to resist the greatest abuse of executive power in living memory.

I chaired the Socialist Campaign Group rally at Labour Conference where Laura Smith MP called for a general strike to stop the Government in its tracks. Whilst it might have looked, for some, that they looked more and more like the only way forward to stop our country falling into the hands of the undemocratic right. If the Government tries to drive No Deal through by stopping Parliament from sitting, we cannot just rely on the courts and parliamentary process. We need a mass movement of resistance, with marches, civil disobedience and protests in every village, town and city of this country.

If the Government plans to ignore the will of Parliament and the people, then that is a coup. The resistance starts now.
Gerry, a chara,
I have watched a few videos of Bernadette McAliskey and in every one she is consistently, at best, a centrist. In the early days she spouted out really puerile socialist rhetoric as her defence against any “sectarian” allegations, especially on US TV. And throughout the heady days of the H Block campaign she alluded to a more republican stance.

But my point now is at this vital and very sensitive time over Brexit, and with fundamental political and historical issues emerging, she swings back to an essentially pro-imperialist position, using the insulting, pejorative reference to the other side of the border in her own country, the “Free State”. I understand the use of this term in the same way that the N word is used in the US, it depends on who is using it and for what reason. The British left group in Ireland, the SWP, refer to the twenty-six counties as: “a pathetic little statelet”. This is meant to be anti-Free State bourgeoisie in some way but is essentially anti-Irish in their use of the term and its meaning which is essentially only an accommodation for their pro-imperialist core.

McAliskey’s speech has been reported widely, and it is added to the broad campaign by Johnson’s regime and the MI5 media offensive currently underway in Ireland using its media assets to promote British interests against Ireland, from Eoghan Harris to well-known British media agent Bruce Arnold, Olivia O’Leary who worked for the BBC for some years, and anyone else they can dredge up in the current Brexit crisis. McAliskey’s speech puts her into the same camp as other left traitors to Irish independence. Her words might have been couched in other ambiguous terms but there can be no doubt of the intended effect. It was a clear accommodation to Brexit and to the slimy camp of quasimonarchist, state-socialists, insidious, Stalinists of the CPI who have always supported British imperialism in Ireland based on their attachment to the Churchill/Stalin pact, and of course to the Orange gangs who now have a direct line into Downing Street.

Although the Irish government and bourgeois political establishment are in a temporary deadlocked situation with the British, they will not openly turn on these left-wing supporters of British colonialism even though they were caught inside the camp of MI5, and they are not called and to account, and won’t be, for their treachery/political blunder. They are still given plenty of media exposure even when the topic is Brexit and the Irish response. They are allowed to discuss it with a new political spin allegedly on their concerns for the working class as if they had always been opposed to Brexit instead of what they actually did, which was campaign for it in the six-counties.

But although the pro-Brexit left may be posturing differently now, hiding their support for it, they are setting their face against any potential movement by the Irish masses in response to and against the changing face of British colonialism in Ireland. Bernadette McAliskey has thrown an olive branch to Ireland’s enemies along with Eamonn McCann and others on the 50th anniversary of the Battle of the Bogside. There can be no compromise on principals, no compromise on Irish independence from British imperialism such as indicated by McAliskey, and constantly promoted by the stage-lefts and insidious Stalinists of the CPI. In real terms such conclusions are no more than political cowardice and deserve to be treated in the same manner as Fintan Lawlor would have done in the circumstances.

McCann of course is a Brexiteer as is the rest of the Irish left. Recently they, People Before Profit (PBP) have been given plenty of airtime on RTE to voice their adjusted, opportunistic account of the political landscape in Ireland vis-a-vis Brexit. McCann had the gall to say on radio that they supported Brexit at the time believing it to be Brexit but that it faded away to reveal a right-wing project. And that nobody at the time could have foreseen this. You know well Gerry this is a lie.

Leon Trotsky: I am confident of the victory of the Fourth International; Go Forward!
Mobile phone seizures: Rape complainants treated as terrorists  By Ian Donovan

THERE HAS RECENTLY been an alarming combination of statistics regarding rape accusations, charges and convictions. According to statistics released by the Rape Monitoring Group (RMG) on 25 August, the number of reported rapes in England and Wales rose quite considerably over the last year, from 41,186 to 54,045, a 31% rise in reports. At the same time the conviction rate fell from 6.8% to 4.2%, which in relative terms is a 38% fall from the previous year. The number of alleged rapes that were not reported as crimes rose from 8,624 to 11,913, again a rise of 38%. The number of cases that resulted in charges fell from 6,606 to 6,012, a drop of 8%. But the number of convictions fell much more, from 1,350 to 1,062, a 21% fall.

Quire a shocking combination of statistics! If you discount the farcical idea that over 95% of rape accusations made by women are false – there are people around who genuinely believe such things – then obviously a major injustice is happening here.

Getting dramatically worse
And things are getting dramatically worse, despite the existence of trained female rape specialists in the police forces and decades of supposed improvements in court procedures. A huge number of women are suffering trauma, and have no apparent recourse as the situation is getting worse.

One very aggravating factor in this is the increasing demands from the police for the seizure of complainants’ mobile phones upon reporting a suspected rape. The various police forces have come to do this as a result of a few well-publicised cases where cases collapsed due to non-disclosure of some significant evidence to the defence.

However, it is blindly obvious that the enforced handing over of an alleged victim’s phone, the content of which will be given to the defence, which has increasingly become the norm, is grossly intrusive and traumatising to any genuine victim.

It is a complete invasion of privacy and allows someone who, irrespective of the legal presumption of innocence until proven guilty, may well be in fact guilty of rape, total access to the personal and private material of their alleged victim. Everyone has private and confidential aspects of their personal life and a right for them to remain private, in the absence of reasonable suspicions that they themselves have committed a crime; and certainly not to have every confidential aspect of their personal life, unrelated to the case, available to a likely rapist and their often unscrupulous lawyers, to use against the alleged victim as they will.

Of course this raises the question of ‘innocent until proven guilty’, both at an individual level, and at an aggregate level. These are two aspects that have to be balanced: it is perfectly possible that in an individual case a complainant may be lying, and that the ‘victim’ may in that particular case be withholding evidence that would result in the accused being exonerated. But what is equally prejudicial as assuming guilt of an alleged rapist in an individual case, is assuming that, in their majority, women who report rape are lying and should be assumed to be so.

The implicit assumption behind the police position seems to be the latter. This is because it is obvious that the contents of a person’s phone are as private as their home. In order to search someone’s home (if they are not invited to do so) the police have to get a warrant, authorised by a judicial authority. This should be the case for mobile phones as well; their contents are as sensitive and private as the contents of their home, and should be subject to the same safeguards.

It is not normal to insist that the victim of a crime have their home subjected to a search as if they are the perpetrator of a crime, unless there is some reasonable suspicion that they have actually committed a crime themselves, and a judicial authority can be shown that evidence and agree.

‘Reasonable suspicion’ under anti-terrorism laws
In fact the only circumstances currently where searches can as a matter of course take place without a warrant granted because of ‘reasonable suspicion’ is under anti-terrorism laws. And even those do not include people’s homes. So arguably, this coercive searching of alleged rape victims involves treating them as terror suspects, or even worse! No wonder so many end up not pressing charges!

This demand is a basic reform that should safeguard the privacy of victims. It goes some way to rebalance something which statistically cannot possibly be true: that most women who report rapes are liars, to be assumed to be guilty of such, and therefore it is correct as a default position to hand their most intimate details over to the accused who is assumed to be innocent. That is a malicious assumption; and an example of gross misogyny in the criminal justice system.

This is not fool proof however, and there are likely to be a very few cases where a guilty lying accuser can create a miscarriage of justice at the expense of an innocent accused person. The problem is that the opposite system is inevitably going to produce many more miscarriages of justice.

Rape is not shoplifting. Being raped can severely damage a person’s life and cause incalculable harm. So can a false accusation of rape. But the nature of things in a society like ours where women are still treated as less than equal is that currently the number of the former can only massively exceed the latter. Both in the interests of fighting anti-women bias in the justice system, and the minimisation of harm, this is the only just policy regarding mobile phones.

Indeed it will benefit everyone who comes into contact with the police if their phone is treated like their home, and subject to the same legal safeguards. To a degree there is some reality to that already, as the police are only able to search computers, data and the like from a home with a warrant. This must be extended to phones all the time, in and out of the home, as phones are by their very nature portable.

This is a basic reform which the labour movement must fight for in the here and now, while understanding that the real liberation of women from the danger of rape can only take place in a socialist society where people’s personal lives and sexualities are not mangled and warped by the social irrationalities of capitalism. ▲
Centrism and Zionism

They are the same over the crucial question of Zionism and the Middle East. In fact, they began witch-hunting others to their left even before the ‘anti-Semitism’ witchhunt was the ruling class response to Jeremy Corbyn, began. They purged our comrade Ian Donovan from the bloc they initiated within Left Unity in 2014, the Communist Platform, for stating provable facts: that the disproportionate representation of wealthy Jews within the Western ruling classes provides a social base for Zionist politics (which is hegemonic among Jewish bourgeois today).

This is the basis of potent Zionist factions in the ruling classes that dictate a bare-critically or often uncritical pro-Israel foreign policy among Western governments, together with potent attacks on the democratic rights of opponents of Zionism via the smear of ‘anti-Semitism’ in Western countries, very unlike the alliances that NATO allies such as the US, the UK, Germany etc. have with each other. When our comrade Gerry Downing was purged from the Labour Party amid similar fears in 2016 they, and their ally Tony Greenstein, denounced him as a ‘fool’ for criticising the Jewish-Zionist lobby. They also purged us from Labour Against the Witchhunt (LAW) for ‘anti-Semitism’ on the same basis in 2018.

Yet they were mortified when noted Jewish anti-Zionist scholar-activist Norman Finkelstein defended our right to argue our views at Communist University in 2016, and published an essay that made the same points as ourselves about the social base of the Zionist lobby during the “Corbyn Mania” witchhunt in the summer of 2018. Tina Becker admitted that Finkelstein would “have questions to answer” were he to apply to join LAW.

In the debate between Tony Greenstein and Moshe Machover on whether or not Israeli Jews are a nation, both participants denounced each other as akin to Climate Change deniers for failing to agree with the other’s arguments and observations. But regarding the social weight of Zionist Jews in the Western ruling classes, all of these people behave like Climate-Change deniers and worse.

Mentioning obvious, provable facts brings denunciation and flat denial that they mean anything. But as Marx said ‘facts are stubborn things’. Lenin’s observation that ‘the truth is always concrete’ is relevant here. As is Trotsky’s saying that the duty of revolutionists is to ‘say what is’. This issue has haunted them ever since. The prominent role they and LAW have played in opposing the witchhunt notwithstanding, they cannot justify their record on Zionism openly and honestly. Examples of this are legion: for instance in Tower Hamlets in 2015 the CPGB supported the ousting of the two-elected independent Muslim mayor, Lutfur Rahman, for ‘undi religious influence’ over the electorate. The electorate was overruled in a racist judicial coup orchestrated by Tony Friend of Israel Eric Pickles, without any evidence of corruption that would stand up in court (Rahman was never even charged with any electoral offenses). The CPGB defended the Labour figure who replaced Rahman, one John Biggs, against ‘scurrilous’ charges of racism by Rahman, and cited that as a ground for supporting ousting Rahman! Yet four years later, articles appear in the Weekly Worker by Tony Greenstein complaining that the same John Biggs has banned a Palestine Solidarity bike ride in Tower Hamlets!

When confronted with this political record, Jack Conrad and Mike McNair, two of their leading com- rades, denied that they had ever taken this position. As indeed, in a session by Moshe Machover, Jack Conrad tried to deny that they had ever argued a ‘Two-States’ position on the Israel-Palestine question, or that they had ever had fusion discussions with the AWL on the basis of these kinds of positions. This is characteristic of centrists politics, a cavalier attitude to your own political history, a desire to obfuscate the record of your own political development.

A useful week for Trotskyists

At previous year’s Communist University events our comrades have been somewhat isolated and kept at arms-length by many participants. This was not true this time, partly a reflection of the modest growth of our own tendency; we were now the main organised dissenting group at the event and quite clearly criticising the CPGB from the left, from an orthodox Marxist position. The CPGB had quite a mishmash of fanatics in the debate, most notably the Trotskyist witchhunt of anti-Semitism that purged our comrade Ian Donovan from the Labour Party amid similar smears in 2016. Instead of adopting the kind of hard left position, both participants denounced each other as akin to Climate Change deniers for failing to agree with the other’s arguments and observations. But regarding the social weight of Zionist Jews in the Western ruling classes, all of these people behave like Climate-Change deniers and worse.

To the Grant/Taaffe ‘Enabling Act’ road to socialism, except that the CPGB seem to reject nationalising the commanding heights of the economy because of the internationalisation of the productive forces under globalised capitalism. It is debatable which perspective is worse. On the other hand there were positive contributions from more left-wing CPGB supporters, such as Anne McShane’s excellent presentation on Women and the Russian Revolution on Friday morning, and James Harvey’s equally interesting final presentation on the German revolution of 1918-19. And there was some useful discussion in a fringe event by Allan Gibbon of the Bolshevik Tendency on Extinction Rebellion and Climate Change. All in all this was a positive experience for the Socialist Fight Group and a number of our supporters, who had never attended before, and we managed to exert some serious left-wing political pressure on those centrists, which is all to the good.
Hong Kong Protest Movement tends towards ‘Colour Revolution’

By Ian Donovan

The protest movement in Hong Kong that erupted this April against a new extradition law was fuelled by legitimate grievances and fear. The law threatened Hong Kong’s population with being directly subjugated by the much more draconian political regime in Beijing, from which HK currently has a degree of autonomy and protection as a result of past British colonial rule. But the movement has radicalised not in a good way and is now overtly pro-Western, pro-UK, pro-United States imperialism, and has engaged in wanton acts of provocative violence such as trashing the Hong Kong parliament.

The extradition law itself was first suspended and has now been completely scrapped by Hong Kong’s pro-Beijing ruler, Carrie Lam. But the movement continues, and both mass demonstrations and confrontations continue between demonstrators and the HK police. Shadowy groups of pro-Beijing irregulars, in some cases criminal triad gangs, have attacked the population. They have also clashed with reckless fired up opponents of Beijing minded to use force themselves, with ordinary passers-by caught up in the conflict and beaten, while this opposition waves the Stars and Stripes and calls for Trump to ‘liberate’ HK from Beijing, something that would require WWIII.

The HK movement in that small territory is not currently a major threat to the independence of China. And we are not supporters of the brutal, ex-Stalinist now-capitalist regime in Beijing, whose large state-sector, left over from the old deformed workers, is now being used to strengthen the growing and powerful mainland Chinese bourgeoisie, not to suppress capital as it was under the Stalinist regime.

But it is legitimate to fear that the Hong Kong movement could be a Trojan Horse for imperialism, and could potentially be used as a vanguard for something more widespread that could be the basis one day for imperialism attempting the kind of ‘colour revolution’ that they have used in other places to overthrow a recalcitrant regime that they dislike and replace them with a more compliant, pro-imperialist regime. Such as in Ukraine, or Georgia, or Lebanon.

We are in favour of a working class revolution in China, based on mass workers organisations and workers councils, which do have a real precedent in China going back to the sabotaged workers revolution in 1926-7, and to a degree the working class upheaval around Tian-An-Min Square in 1989, separate from the student movement which expressed such crazy illusions in the ‘democracy’ of US imperialism.

But we oppose any pro-imperialist overthrow of the relatively advanced, but semi-colonial, regime in Beijing by pro-imperialist forces, and while we do not advocate the suppression of the HK upheaval by Beijing at this time, nevertheless if this erupts into something that really does threaten Beijing with a pro-imperialist overturn, we will defend China against an imperialist proxy attack. ▲

Labour will Stop and Scrap Universal Credit!

Jeremy Corbyn’s government will scrap Universal Credit if elected, he has promised. However, we do not know the details of how this will happen. They have pledged a £3bn package of emergency reforms which will, amongst other things, remove the outrageous “rape clause”; tax-credit is only paid for the first two children now; a woman must prove any subsequent child was conceived as a result of rape.

The five weeks wait for benefits will be reduced to two.

As KUWG has repeatedly pointed out the hostile environment and underfunding of the DWP (and the Home Office also) has resulted in growing numbers of suicides and a ballooning use of foodbanks, more than four in ten have been forced to use them.

Far from the welfare state being the safety net it was intended to be now it is a means of humiliating and harassing claimants, particularly the most vulnerable, the disabled and mentally ill.

The purpose of Coalition and subsequent Tory/DUP governments was to save money to be transferred to billionaires and to force workers to take any job at any wage; those on the dole were only ‘scroungers’.

So low pay and zero hours contracts have ballooned, proving the evil intentions of the ‘Tories’ (and LibDems) was working for them by screwing us.

If Labour eliminates this attitude then the details of how to resolve the UC conundrum – what to do with those already on it and what to replace it with – can be worked out in collaboration with the user groups like KUWG and the PCS union. But we must continue to fight for ending the hostile environment, the real prize!

Jeremy Corbyn said: “When a Labour government takes office, we will introduce an emergency package of reforms to end the worst aspects of Universal Credit. And we will introduce a new system that will be based on the principles of dignity and respect and it will alleviate and end poverty, not drive people into it.”

Labour had already promised to stop the national rollout of UC if elected. ▲

CJ KUWG: Watching the statement by Transport Secretary Grant Shapps’ on Thomas Cook in Parliament (25/9/19) about the collapse and job loses, Therese Coffey, the DWP Secretary of State, heard his statement then walked out soon after. With questions which followed about job losses and proposed Job Centre help, it showed lack of interest on her part.

Shame. Grant Shapps was asked what would happen with sacked workers to get money quickly via Universal Credit to avoid the in-built delays? He replied they could get an “advance payment”.

Not the sacked workers would know they would have to pay it back as it’s a LOAN of course! Workers are only a company shut down away from a payment”.

Universal Credit which comprises of Government-inspired indebtedness for totally innocent people, should be SCRAPPED!

Mary: Typical, Well the government should have saved the company—not necessarily the bosses’ jobs but the jobs of the workers. They don’t care..... ▲

Leon Trotsky: I am confident of the victory of the Fourth International; Go Forward!
Anyway, I wanted to send you your election manifesto that you put before me 14 months ago (it is attached). In it you say your priority as our NEC rep “will be to ensure we trust and empower our members to choose the policies we need to win that transformative government.”

I must assume you said this because you want our views on policy. Isn’t that what your pledge means? To listen to members to help choose the right policies? It’s what you promised when you wanted my vote, wasn’t it? I think as long as you remain my representative on the NEC, you will need to allow me to keep writing to you about Labour policy- anything else would hardly be very democratic, and I don’t think would help you honour your election pledge, would it?

You’ll also see from the attached that you included your email address in your election materials. You chose for this to be sent to 550,000 people, presumably because you were keen to be contactable. What’s changed?

Best wishes,
Pete Gregson (a Labour Party member since 1986)

Peter Gregson to Jeremy Corbyn 24-9-19

Dear Jeremy,

It was I who put up the banner at Labour Conference whose removal by police was covered by numerous press on Monday. Sadly, your tweet failed to note that my banner had earlier been repeatedly attacked by Zionists who slit it from top to toe. Each time I repaired it, each time it was ripped apart again. Eventually a dozen extremists from the Sussex Friends of Israel and the Jewish Labour Movement (JLM) made such a furore that the police took the banner down, thereby undermining my right to freedom of speech. You can see the slashed banner at tinyurl.com/bannerbanned

Rabbi Ahron Cohen of the Neturei Karta told me this morning the he cannot fathom any way that it’s anti-Semitic. We are dumb-founded at your tweet describing it as such. And you have seen the Al-Jazeera documentary on which the banner was based, “The Lobby” (tinyurl.com/thelobby) . It shows how Israel funds the take-down of politicians sympathetic to Palestine. The film’s fairness and accuracy was supported by OFCOM and you called for an investigation, so you know that Israel pumps millions of pounds into Zionist defamation activities in the UK with the sole aim of shutting down any debate on Israel’s racist treatment of those who are not Jews.

But the Zionists, from the Jewish Labour Movement (JLM) and the Sussex Friends of Israel (FoI) were incandescent with rage. Repeatedly they complained and when the police refused to act, they took the law into their own hands.

Cllr Joshua Garfield from Newham Council rushed past me at the banner and slashed it in two. The police apprehended him and removed the large sharp scissors he had used and took his details. (Later Garfield boasted about it on twitter.)

The Secretary from Labour Against the Witch-hunt and I repaired it. Yet again it was

Because according to the IHRA definition of anti-Semitism adopted by most political parties, including Labour, to say that Israel is a racist endeavour is now seen as prejudice against Jews.

My banner says: “IHRA: tell the NEC how you feel”, because we want Labour members to tell our National Executive Committee to abandon the IHRA definition they adopted a year ago, an action you yourself objected to. Party members are now beholden to a definition whereby any activist criticising Israel becomes an anti-Semite, a plainly ludicrous claim.

Most of these accusations come from a group within our Party, the JLM, the Zionist society we are seeking to disaffiliate from Labour. It was shown in the documentary to be conspiring with Israeli agents to attack you and others for their pro-Palestine stance. We at LAZIR love Jews and want them to stay in the UK, not migrate to what we see as a racist colony.

Yours sincerely,
Pete Gregson Chairperson, LAZIR

Peter Gregson-LAZIR Press Release 23-9-19

On Sunday 22nd Sept, I, a Labour Party member since 1986, had my banner taken down from outside Conference. Why? The police agreed it was not anti-Semitic. When Zionists first started complaining about it, the police photographed it and referred it to their superiors. Not a problem, they said. The banner could stay.

But the Zionists, from the Jewish Labour Movement (JLM) and the Sussex Friends of Israel (FoI) were incandescent with rage. Repeatedly they complained and when the police refused to act, they took the law into their own hands.

Cllr Joshua Garfield from Newham Council rushed past me at the banner and slashed it in two. The police apprehended him and removed the large sharp scissors he had used and took his details. (Later Garfield boasted about it on twitter.)

The Secretary from Labour Against the Witch-hunt and I repaired it. Yet again it was
attacked, ripped in half again by another Zionist. We repaired it again.

At this point local hoodlum Simon Cobbs (Founder of Sussex Friends of Israel and ex-resident of HMP Exeter) stood spread-eagled before it and refused to move. After an hour of this he moved away, whereupon another extremist rushed the banner and this time ripped it in several places.

On each occasion we repaired the banner, and on each occasion the police caught the assailant and took their details.

The police asked me if I would consider taking down the banner; I said I would not do this– I explained this was a matter of freedom of speech; I was in a public space; the banner was not anti-Semitic.

Eventually, a group of Zionists stood before the banner and created a scene, arguing and shouting with a group of us who defended the banner, supporters of free speech. At a certain point the police made the decision that a possible public order offence had been committed. They removed the banner and took it away.

The police explained that it was now evidence in a potential public order charge… AGAINST me!

It would appear the police had been bullied into making a decision into taking my banner on the grounds that I had committed a public order offence, rather than those who had been harassing and attacking me, calling me an anti-Semite. Readers can see the slashed banner here.

Later that day, Jeremy Corbyn waded in. He tweeted:

“I'm disgusted that this banner was displayed near our #Lab19 conference centre. We asked the police to remove it and I'm glad they did. This kind of anti-semitic poison has no place whatsoever in our society.”

On the Monday, I attended a voluntary interview at the John Street police station where I was interviewed under caution with the duty solicitor present. I explained what the banner was about and why I had brought it to Brighton, to promote political discussion on the weaponization of anti-Semitism.

I explained about the Al-Jazeera documentary on which the banner was based, The Lobby, which portrayed how Israel funds the take-down of politicians sympathetic to Palestine, using groups such as the JLM and the FoI. I noted the banner had particular relevance at this time. An election was coming and that once the date was announced, newspapers would be full of accusations of anti-Semitism aimed at Labour politicians who have dared to criticise Israel, in an effort to undermine their vote. I thought it important to point out the role a foreign country was having in British electoral affairs.

I concluded by telling the police that I was disappointed in them for undermining my freedom of speech.

The police must now decide if they will ask the CPS to prosecute me; it is likely to be months before a decision is made.

In the meantime, I will pursue claims of criminal damage against those who attacked my banner and against the police for taking it down, for the Human Rights Act of 1998 – Article 10 protects my right to hold my own opinions and to express them freely without government interference, including through works of art.

The next day, Rabbi Ahron Cohen of the Neturei Karta spoke to me and gave his view that he could not fathom any way that the banner was anti-Semitic.

Many are dumbfounded at Corbyn’s tweet describing it as such. When the Lobby film was shown in 2017, its fairness and accuracy was supported by OFCOM and Corbyn called for an investigation, so he knew that Israel pumps millions of pounds into Zionist defamation activities in the UK with the sole aim of shutting down any debate on Israel’s racist treatment of Arabs and Christians.

However, according to the IHRA definition of anti-Semitism adopted by most political parties, to say that Israel is a racist endeavour is now seen as prejudice against Jews.

The banner says: “IHRA: tell the NEC how you feel”, because I wanted Labour members to tell the Party’s National Executive Committee (NEC) to abandon the IHRA definition they adopted a year ago, an action Corbyn himself objected to.

Party members are now beholden to a definition whereby any activist criticising Israel as racist becomes an anti-Semite, a plainly ludicrous claim. This enables Zionists to make endless charges of anti-Semitism against anti-apartheid activists.

Most of these accusations come from the JLM, registered as a socialist society affiliated to Labour.

I am chair of Labour Against Zionist Islamophobic Racism (LAZIR), a group of Labour Party activists which sees Zionism as racism and who want to end its influence, seeking to get the JLM disaffiliated. At the Conference, we distributed 1,500 flyers to Party members calling for this, highlighting the JLM’s role in undermining any politician who supports Palestine and criticises Israel.

Corbyn’s pro-Palestine stance has driven JLM’s ire and they have declared Corbyn “unfit to be prime minister”. They score Labour candidates seeking election according to their level of support for Israel, working with the media to undermine whose whom they don’t like or who support Corbyn.

One doesn’t have to be either Jewish or in the Labour Party to be in the JLM. Labour’s founding planks are fairness, equality and social justice. LAZIR point out that JLM’s sole focus is on protecting Israel, sharing none of Labour’s values in their disregard for Palestinian rights.

I emailed Corbyn in response to the tweet, pointing out the Rabbi’s views and that he himself had called for an investigation into Israel’s work undermining UK politicians; he had also not supported Labour adopting the full IHRA definition.

I copied in all NEC members and drew this response from Jon Lansman:

I do not wish to receive any more of your messages. Your obsessive hatred of those you call “Zionists” marks you out as an anti-Semite. To be clear, you do not have my permission to retain my contact details so please delete them and never contact me again.”

Lansman is Momentum leader and the man responsible for getting the IHRA definition adopted by Labour in 2018. He is a strong supporter of Israel and spent years on a kibbutz. He is also one of the nine CLP reps on the NEC and as such was elected to represent the views of CLP members, including me. I consider that as my rep, Lansman must accept that part of his role is to receive communications on Labour Party matters from members.

Labour’s deputy leader Tom Watson couldn’t resist wading in as well, saying in the Jewish Chronicle he was furious about this “deliberate intimidation of Jewish Labour members at the conference”.

He said “Regardless of where and why it is outrageous to come to a conference of a democratic party and to intimidate people who are just trying to make the world a better place.” I do not consider Watson’s unbridled support for Israel is in any way making the world a better place.

I am now in discussion with my solicitors; I will seek redress through the courts.

Notes
Carlos Latuff’s cartoon was first published in September 2018, when it was used to illustrate Gregson’s article ‘Why let Netanyahu write the Labour rulebook?’ It is a Brazilian freelance political cartoonist. His works deal with an array of themes, including anti-Zionism, anti-globalisation, anti-capitalism, and opposition to U.S. military intervention. He is best known for his images depicting the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and the Arab Spring events.
The attacks on Saudi Arabia’s Abqaiq oil refinery and Khurais oilfield on 13th September were a game-changer in the resistance of Yemen’s insurgent Houthi movement to Saudi Arabia, which has been trying to wipe out their movement since it gained control of most of Northern Yemen in 2015, challenging the Saudi-dominated ‘internationally recognised’ puppet regime.

The bombardment of the Houthi population and infrastructure has been pitiless since then, producing mass malnutrition and an epidemic of cholera since 2016 that continues to this day. 27 million people are blockaded and being pulverised, millions are threatened with starvation, disease and death by terror bombing.

But the Houthis have survived. The September attacks briefly knocked out close to 50% of Saudi oil production and caused oil prices to spike, though not as much as in 2018 when Trump tore up Obama’s nuclear deal with Iran. The Houthi action, which is really a simple act of self-defence against an imperialist-backed attack, has really spooked the Saudi Arabian regime and its US and Israeli backers. For the Saudi war on Yemen is part of a US/Israeli campaign of terrorism and aggression aimed squarely at Iran.

For those with decent information, these events were not a complete surprise. They were herald in a trial run by the Houthis of their new improved drones on 17th August. This attack was effectively predicted by an article in the Moon of Alabama, a most interesting anti-war, anti-imperialist US American blog. They published the forecast that:

“Today Saudi Arabia finally lost the war on Yemen. It has no defences against the new weapons the Houthis in Yemen acquired. These weapons threaten the Saudis’ economic lifelines.” (https://www.moonofalabama.org/2019/08/long-range-attack-on-saudi-oil-field-ends-war-on-yemen.html)

They went on to cite Associated Press (AP),

“Drones launched by Yemen’s Houthi rebels attacked a massive oil and gas field deep inside Saudi Arabia’s sprawling desert on Saturday, causing what the kingdom described as a “limited fire” in the second such recent attack on its crucial energy industry.

… The Saudi acknowledgement of the attack came hours after Yahia Sarie, a military spokesman for the Houthis, issued a video statement claiming the rebels launched 10 bomb-laden drones targeting the field in their “biggest-ever” operation. He threatened more attacks would be coming. (https://apnews.com/9ed1f71010847f2b321d1951997e797)"

And as we saw on September 13th, they came. As the Moon of Alabama noted: “Today’s attack is a checkmate move against the Saudis. Shaybah is some 1,200 kilometres (750 miles) from Houthi-controlled territory. There are many more important economic targets within that range.”

This is the reason for US/Israeli hysteria and attempt to deflect attention to Iran. It does appear that Iran has, entirely legitimately and correctly, allowed their Houthi allies access to more advanced drone technology than they previously had been able to develop.

Iran has allowed their Houthi allies access to more advanced drone technology than they previously had been able to develop to the 12er Shi’ite form of Islam that dominates Iran, are regarded by the US and Israel as an Iranian ally and therefore something to be crushed with the utmost brutality even if that means a near-genocide of the Yemeni population.

The US claim that the missiles ‘must have been’ fired from Iran and not Yemen is belied by what was already known and in the public domain from the August trial run. The American allegations are a classic smokescreen, both to justify possible future wars in the region – the standing threat of war against Iran by Israel and the US has been a huge threat hanging over the region, and indeed the world, ever since the Iraq War, and could even have the potential to go nuclear given the demented racist nature of the Zionist/neocon project.

This has particularly appeared to be true since the rise of Trump to power in the US, and his partnership with Netanyahu; his moving of the US embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem, his destruction of UNRWA, and recognition of Israeli annexation of Golan. However this may have been destabilised by Netanyahu’s failure to win the just-concluded Israeli election.

Trump is not the most stable partner for the Zionists in their war crusade; there is a right-wing populist-isolationist element in his base to which he promised not to get involved in more wars in the Middle East, and he sometime genuflects to that as well. In fact he seem to vacillate between pandering to both the neocon/Zionist element, and the isolationist/right-wing ‘anti-war’ element in ways that are quite incompatible with each other.

This was personified by his appointment, and then later sacking, of the demented arch-neocon hawk John Bolton as his National Security Adviser. He knew full well what Bolton was like when he appointed him, so sacking him appears oddly erratic.

Other elements of this instability in Trump are his deranged threats of destruction and even implicitly nuclear war, issued often on Twitter to such opponents as North Korea and Iran, and then his abrupt switches to a policy of personal talks with the likes of Kim Jong-II, and his attempt to do the same with Rouhani. Some of this behaviour is for electoral purposes, but it really is a sign that Trump’s right-wing populist government is severely dysfunctional from the point of view of the rational interests of US imperialism.

On 30th September the Houthi claimed to have killed 500 Saudi soldiers, captured a further 2,000 and seized a convoy of military vehicles. We cannot but applaud the heroic resistance of the Yemenis to the Western and Zionist-supported Saudi genocidal war; we seek the defeat of Saudi Arabia as the transparent proxy of imperialist and Zionist domination of the Middle East.

Hands off Yemen! Defend Iran against imperialist-Zionist attack! US/UK imperialism out of the Middle East! For permanent revolution throughout the region! ▲

Leon Trotsky: I am confident of the victory of the Fourth International; Go Forward!
On 5th August the extremist Hindu-chauvinist Indian government of Nandendra Modi revoked, by Presidential Decree, article 370 of India’s Constitution, which previously guaranteed the autonomy of Kashmir and Jammu, and article 35A. The latter restricted migration to Kashmir and property ownership by non-Kashmiris in the autonomous territory; its purpose was to stop Hindu chauvinist colonisation.

This autonomous Himalayan region, with a Muslim majority, a Hindu minority and a smaller Buddhist minority, was part of the larger Principly State of Kashmir and Jammu, which was split largely between India and Pakistan at the time of partition in 1947, also with a smaller portion incorporated into China, which is not directly relevant to the India-Pakistan disputes over Kashmir.

This division was on condition that Indian Kashmir would have considerable autonomy and dire warnings to the people not to leave their homes, Al Jazeera has reported up to 20 protests a day against Modi’s actions, leading to clashes with Indian police and troops, many injuries and an unspecified number of deaths.

Modi’s regime has been in power since 2014, the product of neoliberal reaction as manifested in India. As everywhere, capitalist attacks on social gains and free market economies have led to the impoverishment of large numbers of urban and particularly rural working class people and the despair has led to divisions, chauvinism and the rise of reactionary demagogues. This is particularly dangerous in the Indian subcontinent given that both India and Pakistan are nuclear powers, and they have twice already gone to power over Kashmir, in 1947 and again in 1965. The policy of Indian governments for decades toward Kashmir has been through repression to whistle away Kashmir’s autonomy in practice, while keeping the formal articles in the constitution.

There have been numerous national movements seeking to reassert that autonomy, and the demand for independence of Jammu and Kashmir has an obvious democratic content that socialists are obliged to support, given that decades long suppression, even prior to the removing of autonomy by Modi.

The revocation of article 35A is particularly sinister given Modi’s affinity with Zionism, as far from being any sort of xenophobic measure, it was designed to counter the very real fear of large-scale, organised Hindu settlement of the sparsely populated, mountainous territory given India’s huge population: it is very easy to conceive that Kashmir’s Muslim population could become an oppressed, coloured population like the Palestinians given the kind of state-aided settlement that the Hindutva nationalists want. The Muslim 5 Pillars news portlet spelt it out:

“The problem for Muslims of Kashmir and Pakistan is that the re-conquest of land is also an integral part of the Hindutva vision. It views the historical Indus valley/river civilisation as part of Hindu India. The historical centres of this civilisation are claimed to be Mohenje Daro and Harappa in Pakistan.

Whilst in Kashmir, the priestly Kashmiri Hindu Pandit caste (or Kashmiri Brahmins) claim to have a pre-Muslim historical claim and pre-independence right as Hindu rulers with Muslim subjects.

In the context of the rise of this Hindu supremacist ideology, the forced integration of Kashmir into “Hindu rule” in India was inevitable. What happened a few days ago will be viewed by the Hindu supremacists through the lens of a ‘Hindu Reconquest’ of Kashmir.”


India out of Jammu and Kashmir! For the right of Kashmiri independence for all people in Kashmir where the population desires it!

The extremist Hindutva (Hindu nationalist, Hindu fundamentalist) regime of Modi is turning the entire country into a hellish place for non-Hindus in general. Another manifestation of this is what is happening in Assam, where 1.9 million of the Muslim population have had their citizenship removed, been rendered stateless and are threatened with mass deportation to Bangladesh. They are unable to prove that they lived in India prior to March 1971, coinciding with Bangladeshi independence from Pakistan and the 1971 India-Pakistan war.

The device for doing this is something called the National Register of Citizens (NRC). Those who cannot prove this: in a country with large scale poverty and illiteracy, often poor records and no state legal support for often poverty-stricken people who have to pay huge amounts in lawyer’s fees, is frightening. The regime is already in the process of creating large scale internment camps for up to two million people, and the plan is to expel them to Bangladesh. However Bangladesh is unlikely to accept them; the future for these people could be very grim.

Furthermore the Modi regime plans to extend the NRC India wide:

“In April, the BJP’s official Twitter account quoted party president Amit Shah as saying, “We will ensure implementation of NRC in the entire country. We will remove every single infiltrator from the country, except [Buddhists], Hindus and Sikhs.” Muslims were conspicuously absent from the list. In language reminiscent of U.S. President Donald Trump’s, who has referred to Mexican immigrants as “rapists” and “animals,” Shah referred to migrants by saying “infiltrators are termites and we will weed them out when we come back to power.”


All this is the outcome of India’s semi-colonial capitalism and fake ‘democracy’ that impoverised the working class and the poor rural dwelling population, which have nevertheless sought ‘modernisation’ in the most barbaric form: following chauvinist demagogues who claim to be able to enrich the dominant Hindu population at the expense of minorities.

Three quarters of a century of petty reformism at local and provincial level by India’s ‘Communist’ Parties, with the occasional flurry of guerillism, have left the Indian workers movement seemingly impotent in its face. Only the struggle to create a new revolutionary Marxist party, through programmatic struggle and debate, can begin to re-arm the masses to fight back against the hell that India has become today for the oppressed. ▲

Leon Trotsky: I am confident of the victory of the Fourth International; Go Forward!
The Banality of Tony Greenstein By Gerry Downing (Alex Steiner extracts)

PRIOR TO THE COMMUNIST UNIVERSITY, on 29 April 2019, Tony Greenstein, who claims to be a “socialist, anti-Zionist, anti-racist”, paid tribute to “Hannah Arendt – a Jewish Pariah and Daughter of the Diaspora … Arendt was the German-Jewish Refugee whose Universalism Overcame her Zionism” he told us. She was, he assured us, “the greatest Jewish political philosopher of the 20th century”, no less.

His adulation says far more about the politics of Tony Greenstein than he wished. When asked about her lifelong adulation of Martin Heidegger, an avowed Nazi, with whom she had sexual affairs after 1923 and again after 1950, Tony defended Heidegger and went as far as asserting that his philosophy had nothing to do with his politics, and he had done some good things, like not persecuting Jews as vigorously as he could have done under Hitler.

This bifurcation he compared to the impressionist Salvador Dali, who, equally, had fascist sympathies (for Franco and Hitler) but supposedly produced great works of art. And he mentioned others in defence of his theory of Heidegger’s bifurcation, although he did not advance another similar absolute contradiction of philosophy/politics.

Tony sees a few problems. “Hannah Arendt was an enigma. She rejected any materialist or class analysis in favour of a philosophical and metaphysical discourse.” Not a good start for class analysis in favour of a philosophical and metaphysical discourse.

As part of their public relations campaign Heidegger and his apologists were particularly keen to enlist the testimony of German Jewish philosophers who had themselves suffered under the Nazis. To this end the well-known philosopher and German emigré Hanna Arendt was solicited to write an essay for an anthology honouring Heidegger on the occasion of his eightieth birthday. Arendt’s essay, “Heidegger at Eighty,” contains the following cryptic allusion to Heidegger’s political activities:

“Now we all know that Heidegger, too, once succumbed to the temptation to change his ‘residence’ and to get involved in the world of human affairs. As to the world, he was served somewhat worse than Plato because the tyrant and his victims were not located beyond the sea, but in his own country … As to Heidegger himself, I believe that the matter stands differently. He was still young enough to learn from the shock of the collision, which after ten short hectic months thirty-seven years ago drove him back to his residence, and to settle in his thinking what he had experienced …”

According to the legal brief presented by Arendt, Heidegger’s unfortunate lapse was due not to the circumstances in which he lived, nor to his character and certainly has no echo in his ideas. The fact that Heidegger became a Nazi, which she euphemistically describes as, having “succumbed to the temptation to change his ‘residence’ and to get involved in the world of human affairs,” can be ascribed solely to the occupational hazard of being a philosopher. And if other philosophers did not follow in these footsteps, that can be explained by the fact that they did not take thinking as seriously as Heidegger. They were not prepared to “accept this wondering as their abode.”

Arendt’s piece is notable for its sheer effrontery. She manages to make Heidegger into the victim who fell prey to the greatness of his thought … She returns to the theme of Heidegger’s primal innocence and political naiveté, writing that “… the point of the matter is that Heidegger, like so many other German intellectuals, Nazis and anti-Nazis, of his generation never read Mein Kampf.”

Actually, there is good evidence to suppose that Heidegger not only did read Hitler’sopus, Mein Kampf, but approved of it. Tom Rockmore has convincingly argued that in his speech assuming the rectorate of Freiburg, Heidegger’s “multiple allusions to battle are also intended as a clear allusion to Hitler’s notorious view of the struggle for the realization of the destiny of the German people formulat ed in Mein Kampf.”

At a later point in her note, Arendt seeks to turn the tables on Heidegger’s critics by trotting out the legend, manufactured by Heidegger himself, of his redemptive behaviour following his “error.”

“Heidegger himself corrected his own ‘error’ more quickly and more radically than many of those who later sat in judgment over him—he took considerably greater risks than were usual in German literary and university life during that period.”

Even in 1971, Hannah Arendt certainly knew better, or should have known better, than the tale she relates in this embarrassing apologia. She certainly knew for instance of Heidegger’s 1953 republication of his essay discussing the “inner truth of National Socialism.”

She was also aware, through her friendship with Karl Jaspers, of the deplorable behaviour Heidegger exhibited toward Jaspers and his Jewish wife. (Heidegger broke off all personal relations with Jaspers and his wife shortly after he became rector. It was only after the war that Heidegger tried to repair their personal relationship. Despite an intermittent exchange of letters, the two philosophers could never repair their personal relationship as a result of Heidegger’s refusal to recant his support of Nazism.)

End of extract

We are bound to conclude that Arendt defended Heidegger the Nazi because she remained a Zionist despite criticisms and identified those racist elitist elements in Heidegger’s philosophy that chirmed with Zionism itself; the contempt for the Untermensch Jews in Germany 1930s and Palestinians today. Fear of revolution makes it imperative for these ultra-reactionary ideologies to reject Marxism.
Defend Eddie Dempsey

We defend Eddie Dempsey against these slanderous accusations. Of course, Socialist Fight has big political difference with Eddie and Stalinism in general and we are not slow to fight these out.

But Eddie recognised the unprincipled attacks on us by Labour Against the Witchhunt and came to defend us in 6 January 2018 when we were witchhunted and expelled. Political differences must be fought out in earnest and we reject the methods of Jim Denham, the Guido Fawkes of the Labour movement.

Owen Jones, Ash Sarkar and the AWL’s Pete Radcliff have their own poisonous anti-Communist motives for attacking Eddie Dempsey and should not be indulged. This is connected with their support for the racist witchhunt in Labour against supporters of Palestine liberation and anti-Zionists. On this question, on their support for the purge of Chris Williamson and other leftists, they are just as much scabbing as Galloway is with his support for Johnson’s coup.

Eddie Dempsey (in his own words) 25 August 2018

I was invited to London Young Labour Summer event to present my unions (dissenting) position on the EU and Brexit today. I was then last night and this morning labelled as an antisemite for reweeting Michael Rosen, George Galloway and comparing the treatment of Margaret Hodge with that of Marc Wandsworth.

The Blairite panellist who was supposed to be opposing me pulled out ‘no platforming’ me as an antisemite. I have consistently opposed antisemitism including being part of a mobilisation to physically defend the Jewish community in North London when a Jewish community event was violently attacked in Mansfield park a few years ago. I stand by my comments that there is antisemitism on the left that is being cynically used as part of a wider smear campaign against Corbyn and his allies in the media and elsewhere which has painted him as everything from an IRA volunteer to a Czech spy. My trade union officially recognises that as such in our national policy in the case of Marc Wandsworth which I defend.

I was met on the way in by two activists who asked me to leave. I debated them politely, told them I disagreed with them and I thought they were wrong and then took part in the panel which went very well with good debate.

The atmosphere leaving was warm and friendly with many introducing themselves and thanking me for my contribution. Now I am being hounded on twitter by people I don’t know and have never met. The culture of smear shutting down debate must be opposed. I congratulate LYL for not giving way to those elements. Corbyn is being attacked because he stands against the criminal occupation of Palestine and for peace. I will not apologise for my views or my unions national policy.

From back page ► for a New American Century (PNAC), created in 1997, under the Reagan administration. Bolton was a rabid dog always willing to wage war, attack North Korea, invade Venezuela and bomb Iran. In fact, compared to previous mandates, nothing truly effective Bolton has accomplished except warmongers. Trump used Bolton’s threats to advance the economic terrain, but not to carry out the threats.

First, by moving away from the neoconservative wing defending the PNAC doctrine of war economy hypertrophy and the arms race, the Trump administration seems to be stating another course for the US, more than military trade expansion, recovery, economic power through strong protectionism and a permanent trade war of sanctions and tariffs to the detriment of the maintenance of the huge military machine and its expansionary cost, as if economic warfare did not lead at any time to direct or indirect military dispute.

Second, the Trump administration has increased its US gas exports to Europe tenfold and wants to get rid of the previous scheme implemented by Democratic rivals to impose its own.

“The share of US liquefied natural gas in total EU gas imports in the first quarter of 2017 was six percent, increasing 10-fold compared to 2016. In the first quarter of 2017 the US became the sixth largest supplier of liquefied natural gas to the European Union.” (Why the US cannot replace Russian gas in Europe).

Unpopular between fractions of the great imperialist capital and the media, popular among its poor and right-wing electorate. Trump reduced unemployment at the expense of precarious contracts and anti-immigrant discourse, the real enemy of his mandate, through which he ensured the division of the US proletariat and the reopening of the labour force, enabling a relative recovery of US economy.

Some factions of imperialism, such as the billionaire Koch brothers, for example, have done well in the Trump administration, especially thanks to the fact that he has kidnapped the government of Brazil for his area of influence through the deepening of the 2016 armed coup by the Obama administration.

Deep State conspires against Trump

In this contradictory but relatively effective way, Trump has been neutralizing his threats of impeachment.

Now, in full campaign mode for re-election, Trump has got rid of Bolton, announced his willingness to renegotiate with Iran (which rightly demands the suspension of sanctions as preconditions and the reinstatement of the nuclear agreement with Obama as a precondition), hints at the suspension of import tariffs against China, especially those imports from US companies lodged in the Asian giant.

In this way, the US president tactically renegotiates with the Eurasian bloc, not because he is a mere agent of this bloc, but because as a minority wing of big capital, his economic interests and political survival must be based on this fraction of world capital against A more powerful fraction of imperialism than temporarily and contradictorily does not occupy the presidential seat, but controls the Deep State that conspires against Trump.

Trump is today the chief agent of world imperialism, arguably an enemy of the oppressed workers and peoples of the world. But those who want to bring him down are worse. Why? Because they are more consistent in the defence of imperialist interests. They are less brave and more executioners. If Trump is a traitor to imperialist interests (which is an exaggeration of the coup opposition) we are not the oppressed peoples that we will support in establishing a government more faithful to imperialist interests, stronger, ... against us. The Republican Democratic opposition speaks less and does more for US expansionist policy. The inter-imperialist dispute within the US opens a deadlock that must be tactically used by the oppressed peoples, without losing sight of the strategic goal of the struggle for victory over the whole of imperialism and its criminal agents like Bolsonaro. If Trump is overthrown the war escalation of the cold war will resume. Those who want to strike Trump have orchestrated all the successful coups on the planet in the last decade, such as Dilma’s impeachment, and now they want to do it in the White House itself.

Now the coup is against Trump  
Hummberto Rodrigues, Brazil 26-9-19

Democrat House Speaker Nancy Pelosi filed an impeachment case against Donald Trump on 24 September. The accusation against the president is that he violated US law by pressuring, through a call on 25 July, the new Ukrainian president, Volodymyr Zelensky, to reopen investigations into a corruption scandal against the son of Democratic main candidate for the 2020 elections, Joe Biden.

Biden’s son Hunter was named director of the largest energy and gas company in Ukraine, Burisma Holdings, in 2014, two months after the Barak Obama-orchestrated coup d’état, whilst Biden was vice president.

This fact in itself is outrageous, opens wide the moral double of the imperialist establishment and compromises even the “good boy” Obama and the high-minded “Democrats”. Under US law, the CIA cannot carry out foreign coups without the President approving them first through a so-called “presidential finding” by the 1974 Hughes-Ryan Amendment. Obama is directly implicated in the conspiracy that toppled a government, and orchestrated regime change which among other benefits gave control of Ukrainian gas to his vice-president’s son.

A large smokescreen by the Democrats

This leads us to believe that while impeachment may appear to be an offensive measure against the Trump administration, it is in fact a large smokescreen created by the Democratic party machine to protect itself and its preferred candidate, which is the pivot of the scandal.

This attack is a defence and the shot can even backfire. It is very likely that this attempt to impeachment, already called Ukraineagate, will have the same fate as Russiagate, that is, it will not overthrow the Trump government. Biden’s image should not get any better after this scandal, which may also favour Democrat Bernie Sanders (77, one year older than Biden) who is more popular than the former vice-president. Sanders’s candidacy was sabotaged in the 2016 election by the Democrat machine with their super delegates. This time the party machine favours the moderate Democrat Elizabeth Warren.

One of the accusations against Trump is that he threatened the Ukrainian government not to release US $ 250 million to Ukraine if the Kiev government did not cooperate in re-filing the case against Biden’s son. This accusation does not seem to make sense because Trump has already released the money even though Kiev has not yet complied with his request and because unlike his former coup Ukrainian president, the current Zelensky enjoys Trump’s and Putin’s sympathy.

However, the similar charge against Biden seems much more credible. That the then US Vice President even blackmailed Ukraine, threatening to withhold $1 billion in aid, unless the government dismissed the country’s top prosecutor, Viktor Shokin, who was accused of “inefficiency” while coincidentally investigating Burisma Holdings, an investigation that could have incriminated Biden’s son.

The coup presented by the media campaign as the “EuroMaidam revolution” in reference to Maidan Square, where fascist US and European Union defenders began to mutiny against Russia, was extremely lucrative for the US, disastrous for Ukraine, impoverished and divided. The country almost in half in a bloody civil war. The anti-coupists took the island of Crimea and founded the People’s Republic of Donetsk and Lugansk, which voted to integrate with Russia.

Part of the scam artists explicitly claimed the neo-Nazi ideology, started a witch hunt of workers and their organizations that had as one of the bloodiest moments the massacre of the Trade Union House in Odessa, set on fire by fascist forces led by the Kiev government, leading to 46 deaths and more than 200 injured, almost all shot or burned alive according to Wikipedia.

Burisma Holdings became the country’s leading gas company during this parasitic, repressive and corrupt process. Trump was elected with Putin’s support. Russian intelligence provided ammunition to the then-candidate businessman to provoke crisis within the Democratic campaign by demonstrating Hillary Clinton’s low game in sabotaging Bernie Sanders’ “socialist” candidacy. Democrats who held the strongest and most popular presidency, media and candidacies scrambled and allowed the outsider of politics to become president with reactionary, xenophobic speech addressed to the white proletariat.

Russian interference in the 2016 elections

The demo-republican establishment tried to impeach him from the outset by “Russian interference in the 2016 elections.” Throughout his tenure he pretended and said things that camouflaged that in fact he liberated the Eurasic bloc to follow globalizing multipolarism. China and Russia’s strategic plan to exponentially expand their influence on the planet, the Belt and Road Initiative (BRI), made great strides during the Trump administration, perhaps thanks to an unbeatable zigzag roadmap.

At this point, the most bellicose faction of the neoconservatives that made up the republican front that gave rise to the government moved away from Trump. So far, this fraction was best represented by John Bolton, as White House national security adviser. Bolton was one of the most active hawks among the Republican neoconservative think tanks, articulator of the US invasion of Afghanistan and Iraq, signatory of the Project...