

REVIEW OF “ON THE QUESTION OF NATIONALISM AND PATRIOTISM WITHIN SETTLER STATES” FROM /R/GENZHOU

If the reader does not know, /r/GenZhou is a subreddit which serves as a sort of educational arm for /r/GenZedong, the communist meme subreddit. About a month ago, the user /u/Means-of-Production published *On the Question of Nationalism and Patriotism within First world, Colonial and Settler States*ⁱ, which contains some points regarding nationalism in the German, French, Italian, Anglo-Saxon, etc. nations.

What is a nation? A nation is a historically constituted and stable community of people formed on the basis of a common language.

Not dissimilar from myself, the Author writes that they “refrain from using the word Patriotic because it implies support for the existing social order”. They explain that “a Communist can and must be at the same time an Internationalist and a nationalist”, adding that “Communist Nationalism is far different from Reactionary Nationalism”. They assert that “the movement wherein one imperialized nation seeks to liberate itself from a foreign overlord is a core part of Marxism-Leninism”, and that “almost all major nationalist movements in the last one

hundred or so years have taken a socialist character”.

There is a fair bit of truth to this, and the reader can look into it on their own if they have their doubts. For now, we wish to address in particular the part wherein they state that “none of these movements have taken place in the settler colonies of the world, save for maybe Korea.”

In their mentioning of Korea, it naturally begs the question: what exactly is a “settler colony”?

What is a Settler Colony?

By “settler colony”, our Author surely must not mean “imperialist country”, since obviously, the Korean nation has never occupied a place as an imperialist country, and the closest it has come is in the modern South Korea, which is 1. Only half of the Korean nation and 2. A functionary of imperialism rather than a direct originator of it. Further, a settler country cannot simply be a country founded on settlement, for “no socialist and nationalist liberation movements have occurred in the settler colonies of the world,” when revolutions of such character did take place in Russia, Cuba, China, and elsewhere – all countries which were founded on, as the reader probably knows, an incredible amount of violent settlement.

However, our Author does not specify to us what exactly a “settler” is, so we will have to make our own assumptions. The Author gives us a list: “The settler colonies that remain” today are “Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and the United States of America.”

It seems the “settler colonies” are simply the centuries-old Anglo-Saxon nation, with the exception of the UK. The Author explains that the UK is not listed “since it is an isle inhabited by its indigenous peoples”; what constitutes an “indigenous people”? We are not told. Are Saxons indigenous to Britain?

They make no mention of Israel, born a little over a single century ago when Jews settled upon the Arabs; nor any mention of Peru, which is little more than a loose collection of many nations under the Hispanoamericans; nor any mention of the Philippines, where the Tagalog work ceaselessly to assimilate the some 180 nations (like the Bisayans) into their quasi-Hispanic state; nor is there mention of China, which is not itself a nation, but a millennia-old conglomeration of many nations like the Mongolians and Tibetans, living under the governing Han.

This is of course not a problem for us: just a fact to be noted about the Author's writing. Ultimately, we are unable to deduce what exactly a "settler colony" is supposed to be. Why not just speak in terms of imperialist states, imperialized states, and anti-imperialist states?

What is “Australia”?

Our Author now declares that “reactionaries do not celebrate Australia, they celebrate being white [Anglo-Saxon] IN Australia!”

This begs the question: what is “Australia”?

Is it different than New Zealand? If so, how? I can’t tell the two apart. They look pretty close on the map, to me. They speak the same language, and in fact, I can’t even tell their accents apart. Are their histories different? If so, these separate historical constitutions have certainly been lost on myself – I can’t even tell their flags apart.

I did once have a neighbor who spoke with a thick Australian accent; I understood every word though, and living beside me, I noticed little to no difference in our broader social lives beyond a few slang terms.

Or, were they British? I cannot even remember.

The thing is, our Author is right to support nationalism; *but they don't want to admit what nation they are from.*

They insist vehemently that they are “Australian”, and have already admonished those who “celebrate being White”. But the fact is, the Author’s nationality is quite apparent: they are, like myself, White, Anglo-Saxon. They speak English. They write like an Anglo-Saxon. I don’t

need to see or hear them, and I don't care what they look or sound like: I don't care what land their great-grandparents come from (they say Germany), or where their bloodline leads back to. They speak the Anglo-Saxon tongue, live in the Anglo-Saxon land; thus, they are an Anglo-Saxon.

The remarkable fact is that *our Author admits this is true*. They claim, *while attacking the nationalists of their own Anglo-Saxon nation* (of course, not realizing this is what they are doing), that “Challenging the current conditions in Australia would challenge the doctrine of *white supremacy that this country was founded on*.” Therefore, they imply that the Anglo-Saxons (“Whites”) constitute the integral unit of the “Australian” state, its majority population.

Our Author also admonishes White Nationalists for “adopting the iconography of white supremacy and colonialism”, and “the same applies to America, Canada, and New Zealand, all of which are home to ‘Nationalist’ groups who do not serve their countries, but rather serve the interests of their national or International Bourgeoisie.”

Thus, to our Author, the progressive nationalism is not the *unification* of the Anglo-Saxon nation and the demolition of the fractured Anglo-Saxon states, which he declaims as “reactionary” and “serving the interests of the bourgeoisie”; rather, the progressive nationalism

is positively combating the Anglo-Saxon nation's unity, and ensuring its separation into many states.

In fact, our Author's conception of the "Australian nation" is not even entirely Anglo-Saxon, because he explains that "In Australia, most indigenous tribes and communities do not have a concept of statehood, and although the law of self-determination must be respected, it is unlikely that any new countries will emerge after an Australian revolution."

So: to the Anglo-Saxon from Australia, the Anglo-Saxon from New Zealand is a foreigner, but the Warnindhilyagwa and Nunggubuyu are not.

Not Related to
Australians



Australian



Related to
Australians



"Hello, how are you?"

"Hello, how are you?"

"Ningkeningaba,
amiyembena ekirra
nungkwa-langwa?"

Is Australia Imperialist, or Imperialized?

Our author now takes time to plead a rather interesting case: “Australia is a second-world nation oppressed by foreign masters and has never ruled itself: it is an imperialised nation that is granted the privilege of being able to oppress some minor nations itself.”

This is the almost universal defense of the labor aristocratic class, whether in the United States, Portugal, or Germany. “My nation actually occupies a middle place in the chain, where it is devouring other nations, and being devoured itself. Thus, my nation is only semi-imperialist, or even not imperialist at all.”

Who is oppressing the “Australian nation”?

It is the English and their Queen, our Author tells us. “Australia is still a British Commonwealth realm - our head of state is still Queen Elizabeth II.” In fact, “Canada, Australia, and New Zealand” are “still under the rule of a foreign leader” (the Queen).

This is partially true, partially false. On the one hand, the Queen is by no means foreign to Australia, being an Anglo-Saxon. She also holds virtually no political or economic power.

However, the same is not true for her social reach: the Anglo-Saxon Nation is ruled by the globalist bourgeoisie, and so is the Queen; but

the globalist bourgeoisie holds the Queen in quite high esteem, and *by their own design*, they do let her “rule” them to some extent: in secret, through the Pilgrim’s Society and the Royal Order of the Garter. But those who make up the membership of these groups are those who really *own* the Queen, and could make her disappear in a day’s notice, if they really wanted to: cosmopolitan bourgeoisie, i.e. Rothschild, Rockefeller, and so on.

Our Author also tells us that “Australia’s media is run by the Murdoch dynasty in America”, when in fact, the Murdochs come from Australia, giving Americans the right to say “America’s media is run by the Murdoch dynasty from Australia”. The truth is, the US and Australia are one and the same country, the same Anglo-Saxon nation; and the Murdochs are nationless bourgeois functionaries kept tight on the leash of the B’nai B’rith. The bourgeoisie’s only allegiance is the dollar.

What matters is not some moral qualm about “is Australia *guilty* of imperialism or not?” It is a practical question of “does Australia benefit from imperialism or not?” The answer to the latter is an unquestionable yes, Australia is a beneficiary of imperialism, for in Australia, the average citizen makes \$90,000/year in an economy where 80% of the workforce is employed in “services” (only around 20% in industry), compared to say, the \$15,000/year average

salary of citizens in China, where 30% of the populace works in industry.

Clearly, Australia is thoroughly integrated into the world market, and it belongs to the Anglo-Saxon nation, one of the primary beneficiaries of world imperialism.

The United States

Our Author briefly covers the topic of the national question in the United States. He says that “a Rainbow Coalition is the most viable so far to achieve national and economic liberation in the United States”, the “Rainbow Coalition” being a multinational coalition advanced by Fred Hampton and the Black Panther Party in the latter 20th century. As the reader probably knows, this idea did not exactly pan out, and was eventually appropriated for use by the Democratic Party’s Jesse Jackson, a Black Freemason who ran for President in 1984 and 88, fathered the Senator Jesse Jackson Jr., and founded the National Rainbow Coalition and Operation PUSH (today combined into Rainbow/PUSH).

Unfortunately, no such coalition can take place in Australia, says the Author, because “our country, for better or worse, is overwhelmingly white - around 71%-81% of the population, the remainder being a mix of indian and southeast asian, with around 2.8% (~750,000) being indigenous.”

On the other hand, they tell us, “In America, only 60.8% of the population is white”, and that “the remainder of Americans are a very diverse mix of african american, hispanic, asian, and so on”. To my knowledge, this is incorrect: Hispanics officially comprise 18% of the US

population, but a full 30% of the US's identified "Hispanic" population is only Hispanic in *race*, and do not speak the Spanish language at all – they speak only English, making them Anglo-Saxons, not Hispanics. Around 12% state they speak both languages, primarily English, meaning they are assimilating. Thus, only 8% of the US is actually Hispanic.¹

This means that the Whites comprise around 70%, the Blacks comprise about 13%, and the Hispanics comprise about 8%, with the remaining 9% belonging to other groups.

Compare this to Australia, where the Whites comprise around (we'll assume the high estimate) 81%, indigenous comprise 3%, and the remaining 16% belongs to other groups.

Still, our Author takes us to the Russian Empire: they say that like America, it "was also filled with hundreds of" nations (it had over 160, contrasted to the US, which has about three or four along with some indigenous nations). They explain, "each desired their own representation, and yet they were organized into one, united, cohesive Union - not a New Russia, but a Union of Soviets."

To my knowledge, this is also incorrect – the Russians organized to form a Russian Soviet

¹ Further, the Blacks all speak English, but this is not a matter to get into here.

Federated Socialist Republic (RSFSR), releasing swathes of land back into the hands of the bordering nations, whether they were governed by feudal states, bourgeois states, or otherwise. John Reed in fact called it “New Russia” in *Ten Days That Shook the World*.

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR) was not even in existence until years after this, with the conclusion of the foreign intervention in the aftermath of the Civil War, in which the various socialist republics formed a Union built on the principle of the right to national secession.

The Author does reference the right to secession and acknowledge it as “ultimate”, but they further conclude by saying that “in America, the National Question is answered as follows: Workers must build a united front of all races and nations, as did the Bolsheviks, to overthrow the Bourgeoisie and build in its place not a Socialist version of the United States, but a Socialist State in America.”

But the fact is, there are some groups in America who have nothing left to gain from the US; and there are other groups which have quite a lot left to gain in the US, in fact risking something of economic catastrophe if they were this union’s fate were to be sealed. And this fact finds some groups entangled in bitter struggles with other groups, which cannot be reconciled except by carrying out to their natural

conclusion, which, as a man speaking openly of revolution, our Author should have no squeamish feelings about.

J. VOLKER

12-27-21

ⁱhttps://www.reddit.com/r/GenZhou/comments/qncjf/f/on_the_question_of_nationalism_and_patriotism/