

Platform

October 2025 No.29

The World Anti-imperialist Platform

A stylized illustration of a woman with dark hair, wearing a light-colored long-sleeved shirt, holding a large, dark flag aloft with her right arm. The background is a solid red color. The entire illustration is framed by a thin white border.





Contents

October 20, 2025
Caracas International Anti-imperialist Conference

“Comuna o nada”

The Commune as a Substantive Element of the Socialist Transition ····· 4

Amílcar Jesús Figueroa Salazar

Comuna ····· 12

Communist Party of Armenia

The People’s Commune—The Path to Socialism in Venezuela ····· 15

Baltic Platform

The Paris Commune of 1871: The Homeland in Arms Against Treason ···· 18

Aymeric Monville | International Committee for Democratic Rights in South Korea (CILD)

**“The Commune, far from being an episode frozen in Parisian history,
is a living idea”** ····· 20

Anatole Sawosik | Pole of Communist Revival in France (PRCF)

**The Paris Commune Is Not Dead
—It Is Reborn Through the Bolivarian Revolution** 22
Paule Djiane and André Fadda | Union for Communist Reconstruction (URC, France)

**The Communal Organization
as a Condition for the Emancipation of Humanity** 24
Miguel Ángel | Unión Proletaria (Spain)

Commune 27
Taimur Rahman | Mazdoor Kissan Party (Pakistan)

An Organized People Cannot Be Defeated! 29
Mücadele Birliđi (Struggle Unity, Türkiye)

“Comuna o Nada” and the 21st Century Revolution 32
Stephen Cho | Coordinator of the Korean International Forum

October 21, 2025
Caracas International Anti-imperialist Conference

“Anti-imperialism and Anti-fascism”

Imperialism and Popular Resistance 37
Carolus Wimmer | Committee for International Solidarity (Venezuela)

New Right-Wing Movements, Neo-Fascism, and Counterinsurgency 41
Néstor Kohan (Argentina)

“Forward with socialism!” 57
Aleksandar Đenić | New Communist Party of Yugoslavia (Serbia)

“Steps for the Triumph of Socialism Worldwide” 59
Valerii Novikov | Communist Party of Kyrgyzstan

**Patriotism and Internationalism:
Between Eastern Europe and Latin America** 62
Stefan Petrov | September 23 Movement (Bulgaria)

**The New Constitution
—A Stage in Venezuela’s Advance Toward Socialism** 64
Baltic Platform

What Unity Should We Establish Between Anti-Fascism and Anti-Imperialism?	67
Miguel Ángel Unión Proletaria (Spain)	
“Faced with the rise of fascism in Europe, we must unite as never before”	70
Anatole Sawosik Pole of Communist Revival in France (PRCF)	
Neofascism in Latin America, chapter El Salvador	73
Ramón Valencia (El Salvador)	
The Parenthesis Between Capital and Life (Reflections from an Organic Militancy)	80
Aminta Beleño Gómez Colombian Communist Party	
“Struggle against imperialism and fascism stands today at the forefront.” 87	
Pedro Rosas Popular Revolutionary Anti-Imperialist Unity (UPRA, Venezuela)	
“Anti-Imperialist and Anti-Fascist Front”	91
Irina Santesteban Liberation Party (Argentina)	
The Dawn of Dignity: From Caracas to the Sahel, The Struggle is One!	95
Aboubakar Alassane West Africa Peoples Organization (WAPO, Niger)	
Forging the Anti-Imperialist and Anti-Fascist Front: Strategy and Tactics for a World in Crisis	97
Hasan Almarzooq Unitary National Democratic Assemblage (Kingdom of Bahrain)	
Rise Against Imperialism, Resist Fascism, Defend Peace	99
Rafael C. Cardino Philippine Communist Party (PKP 1930)	
“Our Fight Against Imperialism and Fascism in the Digital Era”	101
Milan Dharel Communist Party of Nepal (Unified Marxist–Leninist)	
The Venezuelan People’s All-People’s Resistance Will Certainly Triumph Under the Banner of Anti-Imperialism and Anti-Fascism	104
Stephen Cho Coordinator of the Korean International Forum	

The Commune as a Substantive Element of the Socialist Transition

Amílcar Jesús Figueroa Salazar

On December 7, 2008, Commander Chávez, at a meeting held at the Venezuelan Military Academy, before all the leadership of the newly formed United Socialist Party of Venezuela (PSUV)^[1], those who held elected office, and those responsible for the most important aspects of the state apparatus, announced that: “... we have entered the third stage of the Revolution, the stage of the Communes and the Communal State”^[2]. He thus introduced the most defining element of the varied path of the advocated Venezuelan socialist transition, where the anti-capitalist nature of the process can be most clearly expressed.

Indeed, the question of how to build socialism, which has been present in the debate among revolutionaries throughout history, is incorporated into the current experience as a concrete proposal that imbues the Bolivarian model with a particularity; the progress or lack thereof of social transformation will depend on its development.

Challenged by this possibility, we must recognize as a failure the fact that the Venezuelan process has not promoted a broad debate, incorporating all 21st-century revolutionaries, on how to understand the socialist transition, and even less so, how the Commune positions itself in relation to the hegemonic economic model in present-day Venezuelan society.

Of course, many questions arose. The old but little-known exchange of ideas between the radical current of Russian populism of the 1880s and Karl Marx^[3] reappeared among militants with a communist background. Could it be, as Vera Ivanovna Zasluch wondered, based on the social formation that existed in her country at that time, that the Commune could be the basis for the society to be built in Bolivarian Venezuela?

Above all, in our case, a central concern lies in the field of economics: to what extent can the Commune generate productive forces capable of satisfying the material needs of the population as a whole? (Figueroa S., A. 2010:14); and how can we avoid the kind of autarky to which communal action can be reduced?^[4]

At present, there are many concerns stemming from the objective fact that the Constitution of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela (CRBV), approved in 1999, enshrines different types of property with an indisputable preeminence of the private over the collective. Moreover, the successful examples of the economies of Asian countries, led by Communist Parties, point in another direction.

However, by that time, Chávez, the undisputed leader of the process, had become convinced of the need for the Revolution to create spaces where socialism would cease to be an abstraction, and that space was none other than the Commune.

This was indicated by his universal theoretical explorations, and even though he was convinced that the Bolivarian Commune should be a new construction for the current century, he drew on our historical past, so that our Commune would have to start from the experience of communal life of our indigenous peoples, driven by the examples of Manuela Beltrán Archila, José Antonio Galán Zorro, and the communal insurgency that, in 1781, swept through the Colombian-Venezuelan Andes with the slogan: “Union of the oppressed against the oppressors”^[5]. In addition, it should emulate the class-based content of the Cabimas Commune of 1935^[6] and, in general, the collectivist practices developed at different times by our people.

What was the context in which the Commune became the new feature of the Bolivarian Revolution?

An unavoidable premise for understanding the emergence in Venezuela of embryos of Popular Power and productive initiatives under social ownership during the early 21st century is the fact that the Bolivarian process was built on a society fractured in its structure of domination following the events of February 1989 and the military insurrections of 1992 (4F and 27N), which significantly challenged the power bloc. The electoral triumph of Hugo Chávez Frías in December 1998 was nothing less than the political victory of those rebellions, which the old Republic had managed to contain. But its significance in historical terms was that it opened the floodgates to profound reforms and revolutionary possibilities.

Therefore, the conditions existed for the process to move from one set of contents to another in a short time, all marked by an increasing radicalism. From the “rescue of the identifying values of the homeland” and the substantive expansion of democracy^[7] to the beginning of the Communes movement, there was a theoretical and practical effort guided by the need to reduce the nation’s historical deficits, settle enormous social differences, include humiliated and offended human contingents, and attempt to build a new societal model. Different political moments followed, characterized by democratic expansion, with spaces emerging where the protagonism of the majorities was put into practice.

In such circumstances, and especially since 2003, initiatives by pre-existing local powers—which had emerged from the grassroots and were very weak until then—were strengthened, and many others were promoted by the state. Thus, spaces began to be built where collective praxis prevailed (cooperatives, Socially Owned Enterprises (EPS), worker-controlled factories, and communes).

When the commune was launched in December 2008, there was a special moment of revolutionary momentum. It was a time of greater possibilities for collectivist and community alternatives, as material

resources were combined with political will to promote a new economy. Subjective factors favored the search for structural changes (Figueroa S.:2013). This is evidenced by the fact that, having proclaimed the socialist nature^[8] of the Bolivarian Revolution, Hugo Rafael Chávez Frías won the December 2006 election with 62.84% of the vote.

With a favorable correlation of forces and the presence, within the collective consciousness of the masses, of the search for collective solutions to overcome their material needs, there were unbeatable conditions for the commune to become the organizational form of this collectivization.

The first formulations

It can be said that the practical beginning of the formation of communes ran parallel to the theoretical elaboration of an existing commune. The document that served as a guide for that training workshop in December 2008 contains the following initial statements:

The Commune is a unit that implies a territorial dimension. Its formation obeys parameters agreed upon by several Community Councils that, after organizing themselves and conducting a territorial study, decide to form a Commune.^[9]

The Commander-President’s Robinsonian practice^[10] of building, making mistakes, rectifying, and moving forward led him to develop a theory about the construction itself, without neglecting theoretical references. Hence, his recurring calls to arm oneself with knowledge and his concern about the scarcity of theoretical elaboration existing at that time regarding the commune. This dissatisfaction was expressed, for example, in the program “Aló Presidente Teórico” No. 1, on June 11, 2009, where he stated:

We must articulate, encompass, clarify, and unify criteria, even within the diversity and great creative flexibility of any revolution. But we have to build the Commune as a revolutionary entity, as a territorial, social, political, and moral base, and if we don’t even articulate it, how are we going to build it?^[11]

Combating the metabolic reproduction of capital

It is clear that, from the moment Hugo Chávez Frías proposed promoting the communes and the Communal State, his thinking had reached its most radical point. Thus, in the Plan for the Homeland presented by him as a government program to the National Electoral Council (CNE) when he registered his candidacy for a second re-election, in Objective II, he said:

...Promote new forms of production organization that place the means of production at the service of society and promote the generation of a productive fabric under a new metabolism for the socialist transition. (Chávez, 2012a:51)

This approach must be assessed in its proper context: his thinking on the productive model points strategically toward overcoming the reproductive logic of capital (Mészáros, 2008). With it, Chávez and the Bolivarian Revolution made a contribution by helping to decipher and promote the development of keys to the socialist transition. This was a quest to overcome the shortcomings pointed out by Che Guevara, when he noted the lack of in-depth studies on the political economy of known socialist experiences.^[12]

Of course, this formulation is a result. A non-linear path of search and experimentation had already been traveled, with trials and errors, where welfare-oriented economic measures were practiced, guided by a sense of benevolence; capitalist-style productive ventures, support for small family businesses, nationalization of industries, and—most significantly—some productive trials where social ownership was promoted.

It was nothing less than ensuring that, alongside the various forms of property enshrined in the Bolivarian Constitution and the different ways of life that necessarily coexist during the transition, our socialism could find its effective space for realization in the commune. (Figueroa S., A., 2014:39)

The theoretical elaboration presented at the time dispelled fears about the isolation of communal experiences, based on the understanding that an

interconnected network of communes must gain space in the whole of social relations.

“Commune or Nothing!”—A battle cry in a space of balance

In real terms, the construction process was far from the theoretical formulation. The Commune was attacked from several flanks, and weaknesses and shortcomings in its development began to become apparent, at least not at the pace required by the socialist transition.

Alongside the growing siege of U.S. imperialism and, in general, of the capitalist system against the nation, and the internal reaction of bourgeois factions and the so-called “middle classes” who saw their privileges threatened by the possibility of significant structural changes, the lack of internal strength became palpable, expressed in a lack of clarity and/or commitment in collective terms, largely as a subjective factors, regarding the leader’s proposal to advance in overcoming the reproductive logic of capital.

The revolutionary figure called upon to lead the process did not take sufficient advantage of the 2001 Land Law, which made it possible to expropriate idle estates of more than 5,000 hectares, in order to expand the radius of the rural commune. This law recognized the historical struggle of the Venezuelan peasantry to gain land. However, it did not have the organic capacity to enforce it as extensively as it allowed. Peasant communes were established only in some recovered areas.

In addition, there was concern about the ways in which state structures related to the embryos of Popular Power, their hesitant decision to support the popular economy, and, above all, the limited understanding of where the search for transformation was headed. Hence Hugo Chávez Frías’ anguished battle cry, “Commune or Nothing!”, during the Council of Ministers meeting on October 20, 2012.

In his own words, it was necessary to form:

...a network that would spread like a giant spider web covering the territory of the new, otherwise it would be doomed to failure; it would be absorbed by

the old system, swallowed up by it, which is a giant amoeba, a monster called capitalism. (Chávez, 2012b:16)

Time of resistance and readjustments

Between that assessment in the Council of Ministers in October 2012^[13] and the present moment, there have been a series of circumstances that have shaped the development of the commune, its content, and its historical perspective. The change in situation is expressed in:

- *The systematic, escalating siege of Venezuela by U.S. imperialism, which is currently even considering direct military intervention, has had an impact on the nation's economy. We are facing the decision of the imperialist hegemonic elite to return to a fundamental axis of its policy: the Monroe Doctrine. This elite could not accept that, during the first decade of the 21st century, much of the continent slipped out of its control. In this sense, it has deployed a counteroffensive with a clear purpose (Bigott, 2010:19).*
- *Attempts at dialogue and normal trade relations with the United States are undermined, apart from its supremacist mentality, by the objective situation of its economic decline and the accelerated loss of the global hegemony it enjoyed until recently, the recovery of which, for them, requires the appropriation of the remaining reserves of strategic materials that the planet still possesses (Bigott, 2005:44). In this sense, the imperialists' motivation to take control of Venezuela's fossil fuel deposits and other materials is clear.*
- *The attack on the economy, the need to respond immediately to food shortages and meet the material needs of the population, together with the permanent threat of military aggression and a compromised balance of power, paved the way for the emergence of conservative positions, marked by conceptual and theoretical weakness. In the interests of national unity, the struggle of ideas and classes was suspended. This has contributed to the dilution of the anti-capitalist content of the process.*

- *Furthermore, it is necessary to understand that imperialist war, in recent decades, has introduced important changes in its modes of intervention (Beinstein, 2014:49), which is why it now has a cultural front-line element (López and Rivas, 2012:24). And, in this way, among other things, the capitalist system has managed to reposition individualism in many of our people, which is an element of great importance for the negation of collective pursuits. To this end, it has made use of an overwhelming campaign deployed through its formidable media apparatus.*

Therefore, we must be aware that, following the impact of the capitalist crisis on Venezuela, the fall in oil prices, the siege of capital, and, in general, the context of the Comprehensive War^[14] declared by U.S. imperialism against the Venezuelan nation, the conditions for deepening the collectivization of the economy were profoundly altered.

Nevertheless, the commune continued its march in a process of uneven development. On July 1, 2020, President Nicolás Maduro Moros announced a relaunch of the commune, revalidating its role in the socialist transition:

We must continue to build socialism in the territory; that is the goal. Why the communes? Why the communal councils? ... To build socialism in the territory, to build socialism in concrete terms... Socialism is built with the people, or there is no socialism; socialism is built in the commune. (Maduro, N., 2020)

Previously, on April 25, 2019, through Official Gazette No. 6,453, Nicolás Maduro Moros had decreed the founding of the Bolivarian University of the Communes.

Then, a renewed process began for the construction of the commune, where it is necessary to highlight that the almost 50,000 institutionally registered community councils are spaces where the exercise of direct democracy has advanced and, through a process of aggregation, form Community Circuits and Communes.

In line with this process, on December 30, 2024, the

Organic Law of the Communes was enacted, Extraordinary Gazette No. 6,872; legislation that marks the reforms promoted by the State for the Commune; and gives it its current form, incorporating elements such as the concept of a Commune Government, which synthesizes the forms of organization, administration, and articulation in the territorial space where it is based. It expands democracy by establishing that the Citizens' Assembly has the power to decide. It also establishes that the Commune Government must be structured with the following bodies: the Commune Parliament, the Commune Executive Council, the Commune Comptroller's Council, the Commune Justice of the Peace Council, the Commune Electoral Commission, and the Commune Bank.

The Commune Government is responsible for planning, administering, and executing Commune Management, establishing a kind of mediation between the State and the Commune for the implementation of public policies. For example, projects approved by the community, upon receiving resources from the State, are administered by the Commune Bank, with participatory democracy being exercised in both instances.

At the same time, the Commune Government establishes a hierarchical division by implementing a political vanguard, to which it grants the status of the Commune Executive Council, made up of commissions according to the needs and levels of organization within the Commune. Commissions are established for Planning, Economy, Supreme Happiness, Security and Peace, and any others as required by specific circumstances.

Thus, between the theoretical formulations achieved by 2012 and the guidelines for "the Commune that actually exists" in 2025, there is both continuity and change—an expression of uneven, complex, and contradictory development, where its presence has spread to almost the entire territory, most of them established in urban centers.^[15]

Now, although the Commune today discusses and votes on projects that, for the community, are financed by the State and, in addition, administers those resources through the Community Bank, if the

final say rests with the Citizens' Assembly, then we are facing progress in terms of democratic participation. The Commune is gaining ground in the conduct of public affairs, but where stagnation is evident is in the struggle for greater space for social ownership. On the contrary, the national and international counteroffensive, sustained by capital, has succeeded in preserving and strengthening its reproductive logic throughout Venezuelan society.

This has given rise to a fundamental problem for the socialist transition, which in Venezuela has the simultaneous tasks of overcoming extractivism (not only oil) in the economic sphere and moving towards a diversified productive economy, while at the same time fighting for the strategic goal of overcoming the alienation of labor.

Socialist embryos in the territory

Given this reality, the communes continued its march, now with new tasks imposed by imperialist interference, such as the Milicia Comunal (Communal Militia), a key component of the defensive strategy within the territory. In addition, emblematic communes have developed in various parts of the country, with two distinctive characteristics: productive capacity and the drive toward collectivization. A revolutionary subject remains determined to prefigure, from now on, embryos of a Communal Society—spaces where, in parallel with the exercise of direct democracy, the struggle for the emancipation of labor continues: "the assault on heaven," to paraphrase Marx^[16]. Below, I will describe some of these constructions, those whose development I have been able to follow up to date:

- *Comuna Agua de Obispo (Torres Municipality, Lara State): it has established itself as a national model of agricultural innovation and efficiency. Supported by funding from the Federal Council of Government and the Lara State Government, this commune experienced a qualitative leap in its onion production; diversifying its activities, it now includes sheep and goat farming. It encourages the creation of strategic alliances with other communes and economic circuits, promoting a model*

of comprehensive development that benefits the entire region.

- *Comuna Socialista 5 de Marzo Comandante Eterno*: located in the populous parish of El Valle in Caracas, it is an expression of the urban organization model. Its name, which commemorates the date of the death of President Hugo Chávez Frías (March 5, 2013) and honors him as “Eternal Commander,” reflects its deep roots in the ideology of the Bolivarian Revolution. Its development includes 2,035 families: 2,811 women (52.1%) and 2,584 men (47.9%). The Commune maintains national and international alliances with educational and social movements, standing out for its focus on public health projects, including an epidemiological surveillance system for Human Papillomavirus (HPV).
- *Comuna Ernesto Che Guevara (Tucaní, Mérida State)*: with the Direct Communal Social Property Company (EPSDC) of the same name, it is dedicated to cocoa cultivation and chocolate processing. It organizes coffee production through the Colinas del Mirador Cooperative (Colimir). With years of experience, it has managed to directly market its production to other regions of the country; it is a good example of direct democracy in action, with its Community Parliament.
- *Comuna El Panal 2021*, whose territory is located in the working-class neighborhood of 23 de Enero in Caracas and in the Miguel Peña Parish in southern Valencia, Carabobo State: it is an example of how community autonomy and the practice of assemblies are exercised. A commune established in an urban area that has managed to sustain various productive activities. It has advanced various initiatives, including a local currency for community exchange.
- *Comuna Junco Unido y Socialista (Cárdenas Municipality, Táchira)*: it emerges as a living expression of Popular Power in the heart of Táchira, standing out for its capacity for transformation through the active participation of its inhabitants. It has primarily promoted its Community Bank, a social and community financial

institution that supports productive initiatives, strengthening the local economy. It holds regular community assemblies where the organized Popular Power presents reports on the projects underway. This mechanism of accountability and collective planning ensures that initiatives are aligned with the real needs of the community and aim to strengthen the socioeconomic fabric of the territory.

We cannot conclude this overview without a brief review of what is undoubtedly an emblematic commune: El Maizal, the Commune-School, where the puzzle of the transition economy—increasing productivity—is reflected in the growth of its herds, dedicated to producing cow and buffalo milk, or in its corn crops for top-quality flour, alongside short-cycle crops such as beans and peas—production that involves some 3,500 families, members of 37 community councils. All this, with social ownership taking precedence. This line of work has been sustained since the moment the peasant families occupied the land. Its ongoing training schools for young community members guarantee its strategic projection. Its example radiates across many corners of the Patria Grande, from the municipality of Simón Planas, Lara State.

These are some examples of the constructions achieved by the working people, where social property proves its viability in the struggle against other types of property, especially in confronting hegemonic private property. It is necessary to spread awareness of its existence, recognizing its shortcomings, as stated on March 5, 2019, during the 10th anniversary of El Maizal, when the need to overcome isolation between communes and to interweave efforts was raised.^[17] (Figuerola, 2019)

Undoubtedly, the potential of the commune in these emblematic spaces, in terms similar to those described by Álvaro García Linera, is perceived as follows:

...the community will not only have to preserve itself, but will also have to recover its primary conditions of association and control of production by producers;

and, best of all, it will do so under new and superior conditions due to the existence of new productive forces and wealth as well as the global presence of the proletariat, which enables the incorporation of that wealth and its social, common, and community control by direct workers, thus overcoming the old conditions that for centuries had pushed the community toward its slow dissolution. (García Linera, A. 1989, "Introduction to the Kovalevsky Notebook -1879-" in Marx, Unpublished Texts, 2018:106)

By way of conclusion

When thinking about the future of socialism, we discover in Hugo Chávez Frías' proposal the idea of grafting social property onto a model where different types of property are juxtaposed—an approach that constitutes a reference point to be presented on the battlefield of ideas in today's world. Even though this thesis, due to real circumstances, has not achieved the necessary understanding, concreteness, and extension, the commune has served as the means through which an attempt is being made to prefigure the Venezuelan path to the construction of 21st-century socialism.

Building, from now on, spaces where socialism can be realized—rather than waiting to pass through multiple stages before finally reaching a new society—is a programmatic element to be promoted by revolutionary subjects during the crisis of hegemony that is upon us. It should be borne in mind that the global restructuring is undergoing rapid development, but, to date, it does not envision overcoming the exploitative, oppressive, and hierarchical essence of present-day society.

Therefore, it is up to community members, workers, and peasants, compelled by the magnitude of the crisis of systemic decline, to continue building an autonomous project, independent of class, whose substantive element is collective property. This is the role of the commune, with its specificities, in the present historical moment. In this sense, it is urgent to review this issue from the perspective of working humanity, which is none other than the socialist/communist perspective.

Similarly, proletarians from other regions of the planet will find, in the study of the collective experiences developed in Venezuela during the current process—even with its shortcomings—valuable lessons and elements for both theoretical and practical construction. Undoubtedly, this is an invaluable contribution to the purpose of reconstructing and updating a strategic horizon for humanity, insofar as the proliferation and/or extension of war, the over-exploitation of labor, and the destruction of nature, imposed by capitalism in its phase of historical decline, call for the emergence of a new civilization where the Commune, communal society, and communist utopia are called upon to resurface. Hence the emblematic importance of the embryos of socialism, which foreshadow such a society.

It is a debate that has been raised, where collective historical subjects will have the last word.

Notes

[*] Amílcar Jesús Figueroa Salazar is a historian and graduate of the Central University of Venezuela (UCV). He was President of the Municipal Institute of Publications (2000–2002) and Director General of the Mayor's Office of Caracas (2002–2006); Alternate President of the Latin American Parliament (2007–2009 and 2009–2011). His written works include: *El Salvador, elementos de su historia y luchas* (1932–1985) (1987); *La Revolución Bolivariana, nuevos desafíos de una creación heroica* (The Bolivarian Revolution, New Challenges of a Heroic Creation) (2007); *Reforma o Revolución en América Latina –El caso venezolano–* (Reform or Revolution in Latin America: The Venezuelan Case) (2009); *Chávez, la permanente búsqueda creadora* (Chávez, the Permanent Creative Quest) (2014); *Piar, la contradictoria lectura de la historia* (Piar, the Contradictory Reading of History) (2022). He has combined social and political struggle with editorial work and is currently the General Director of Editorial Trinchera.

[1] The United Socialist Party of Venezuela (PSUV) was founded on December 15, 2007.

[2] Hugo R. Chávez F.: Thesis presented for consideration at the Training Workshop, 12/7/2008.

[3] On February 16, 1881, Vera Ivanovna Zasulich questioned Karl Marx about the possibility of the Russian rural commune serving as a starting point for building socialism. Finally, on March 8, 1881, after several drafts, Marx completed a response intended for publication in the newspaper *Anales de la Patria*. In it, he summarized that the key to the development of socialism in countries that have resisted colonialism and industrial capitalism can be found in communal society, and that prior capitalist development is not necessarily a

prerequisite. (García Linera, A., “Introduction to the Kovalevsky Notebook –1879–” in Marx, Unpublished Texts, 2018:105).

[4] Of course, there were opinions that expressed doubts about the possibilities of the Commune. For example, in the column “Un Grano de Maíz” (A Grain of Corn) (9/29/2010), it was stated: “If they integrate society, they are good; if they contribute to its fragmentation, they are bad.”

[5] In 1781, the El Socorro communal rebellion took place, led by Manuela Beltrán Archila and José Antonio Galán Zorro, which spread across a significant portion of New Granada (today, the Republic of Colombia) and part of the Venezuelan Andes.

[6] Professor Leonardo Rodríguez, drawing on Rodolfo Quintero, stated in his as-yet-unpublished work *Primeros Congresos Obreros de Venezuela* (First Workers’ Congresses of Venezuela) that oil workers in Cabimas, amidst the wave of demonstrations that took place when the death of dictator Juan Vicente Gómez was announced (December 17, 1935), formed a commune in practice by seizing power (December 21) and appointing authorities from the proletariat. They were able to control power for only three days. The response of the representatives of the old state resulted in 37 workers being shot. (Figueroa S. A., 2014:34).

[7] The goals of the Bolivarian process can be summarized as follows: to develop a constituent process to refund the Republic, to change the quality of democracy, to dignify the political process, and to rescue the values that define the identity of the homeland.

[8] It was at the World Social Forum in Porto Alegre in January 2005 that Hugo Chávez Frías publicly acknowledged the need for socialism for the first time. However, the beginning of the transition can be traced back to the moment when it became state policy to transfer part of the oil revenue to the promotion of the social economy.

[9] Hugo Chávez Frías: cited document.

[10] This refers to Samuel Robinson, the name assumed by Simón Rodríguez on the passport that allowed him to leave the country for the United States of America after failed emancipation efforts that preceded the open process beginning with the proclamation of Venezuela’s independence in 1810. Rodríguez (or Robinson) was part of Hugo Chávez Frías’s guiding trilogy (Rodríguez, Bolívar, and Zamora) at the time of building the MBR-200. The depth of his thinking allowed him to develop a societal proposal for the peoples of America. His method of practical verification led him to formulate the axiom: “Either we invent or we err.”

[11] Chávez Frías, Hugo. (06/09/2009). *Todo Chávez en la Web*, Aló Presidente Teórico No. 1.

[12] See: Ernesto Che Guevara, *Algunas reflexiones sobre la transición socialista*, in *Retos de la transición socialista en Cuba (1961–1965)*, p. 220.

[13] The moment when the axiom was born: “Commune or Nothing!”

[14] The war currently being waged by imperialism in different parts of the world has been called by various names (Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth Generation Warfare, Multidimensional Warfare, Hybrid Warfare, Unrestricted Warfare, etc.). For the purposes of this work, the nomenclature used in the study by Angiolillo and Sangronis (2020) has been adopted, as it clearly reflects the attack to which Venezuela is

being subjected.

[15] The construction of the Commune in urban spaces is fundamental in a country where the majority of the population is concentrated in cities. However, to tell the truth, until now, the productive scope of most that have been formed is small-scale, focused on family and territorial self-consumption, and their impact on GDP is negligible. Nevertheless, their cognitive influence on communal reality is noteworthy: the process of moralization and repoliticization is greater than the nominal value of logistical and financial operations.

[16] For Marx: “The Commune was, in essence, a government of the working class, the result of the struggle of the producing class against the appropriating class—the political form finally discovered to carry out within it the economic emancipation of labor. Without this last condition, the communal regime would have been an impossibility and a sham. The political domination of the producers is incompatible with the perpetuation of their social slavery. Therefore, the Commune would serve as a lever to extirpate the economic foundations on which the existence of classes and, consequently, the domination of class rests. Once labor is emancipated, every man becomes a worker, and productive labor ceases to be a class attribute.” (Marx, C., 1971:62, 96—emphasis added).

[17] In 2022, a movement emerged in Venezuela from the communes themselves, with the aim of articulating and promoting communal social ownership of the means of production: *La Unión Comunera* (The Communal Union). With greater autonomy, the communal subject must take into its own hands the struggle for the construction of a new power.

Comuna

Communist Party of Armenia

Comrades, brothers and sisters in struggle, today we gather to affirm that the revolution lives in every conscious heart that does not accept oppression and does not renounce the freedom of the peoples.

We speak of the Commune as a living project, as a force of emancipation that unites workers, peasants, students, and militants in a single voice.

The first great experience of emancipation in our region was the Baku Commune in 1918. There, in the heart of the Caucasus, oil workers, peasants, and soldiers rose up to take their destiny into their own hands, led by Stepan Shahumyan, the Lenin of the Caucasus, and the 26 commissars who gave their lives rather than betray the proletariat—showing that total devotion to the people’s cause is the measure of those worthy of the revolution.

The Baku Commune was a heroic attempt to establish Soviet power—a true symbol of proletarian internationalism. There, radical social and economic reforms were set in motion:

- Nationalization of the oil industry and the banks.
- A decree establishing the eight-hour workday.
- Requisition of food to feed the poor of Baku.

These measures were not mere words but concrete actions aimed at improving the life of the people and challenging capitalist exploitation.

The Baku Commune faced extreme difficulties: hostility from imperialist powers, social division fueled by the bourgeoisie, scarcity of resources, and the betrayal of some of its own. Yet despite all this, they resisted and organized production, defense, and collective life—demonstrating that even in the most adverse circumstances, a conscious people can build power and hope.

And if Baku was the flame in the East, the Paris

Commune was the spark that ignited the world’s consciousness.

For 72 days, the Paris Commune set in motion a series of unprecedented reforms for its time: secular and free schools, separation of church and state, minimum wage, ten-hour workday, equality between men and women. It introduced measures that would later even be adopted by the bourgeois French Republic.

But the Commune did not only change laws—it introduced a new form of democracy: decentralized and direct. Every decision was made by the communal assembly, elected by direct universal suffrage, based on open and ongoing dialogue with the people of Paris through committees.

The Communards demonstrated that the people can govern themselves, that they can take the reins of their destiny and hold power in their own hands. Although it was crushed, its example teaches us that courage without strategy or organization is not enough; that revolution demands discipline, theory, and coordinated action; and that the lessons of history remain essential.

From these historical experiences would emerge the power of the Soviets.

The fundamental principle of the Soviets was direct power and real democracy. Originally, a Soviet—from the Russian совет, meaning “council”—was an assembly of workers, soldiers, or peasants directly elected by their peers. It was participatory democracy without intermediaries, the antithesis of bourgeois parliamentarism, always distant from the life of the people.

Local Soviets elected delegates to higher-level Soviets—city, region, republic—until reaching the

Congress of Soviets, the supreme organ of power. And the essential point: delegates could be removed at any time by their electors, guaranteeing that the people maintained permanent control over their representatives.

This system became the basis of Soviet democracy, ensuring free access to work, housing, education, and health. It always upheld the primacy of collectivity over individualism, because only through community can capital be defeated.

Today we must look at our reality in Armenia and in the world and recognize that we have not always succeeded in fully putting theory into practice; that our organization has sometimes been insufficient; that coordination among communes has faltered; and that discipline and political education have been weak.

This is not an empty reproach but constructive criticism, because recognizing our mistakes is the only way to strengthen ourselves and learn from history.

We must learn to organize popular power in every neighborhood, workplace, and community—building strong communes capable of resisting attacks and blockades and sustaining the life of the people.

Because attacks always exist, even if their form changes: in the past it was the rifle, occupation, direct imperialism; today it is economic blockades, media attacks, political and diplomatic pressure, corruption, disinformation, subtle sabotage, and even military interventions.

In Venezuela, we have seen attempts to destabilize organization and crush popular power, but the intention remains the same: to divide and weaken the people.

The enemy of yesterday and today is the same: capital, imperialism, the exploiters who refuse to let the peoples decide their own destiny. That is why our struggle remains the same—the struggle for the emancipation of the proletariat, for justice, for the construction of popular power, for the Commune as

the organ of real power in the life of the peoples.

In Venezuela, the Bolivarian communes show that even under constant attacks, blockades, and political, media, and military pressure, the organized people can advance, resist, and sustain direct action through unity and solidarity.

Here we must recognize the legacy of Hugo Chávez, who understood that the revolution is not limited to a government but must be built from the ground up—in neighborhoods, workplaces, and communities. Chávez taught that the communes are the concrete expression of popular power and that only through them can the people own their destiny and advance toward true socialism.

In Armenia, after the fall of the Soviet Union, our nation was reduced to a semi-colony of Western imperialism. The destruction of industry eliminated the material base of popular power, weakening our capacity for organization.

Faced with this situation, our task is to build communes in neighborhoods and workplaces, to rebuild the strength of the people, and to form a broad popular front that includes all layers of society.

Two years ago, we created a virtual commune, which we called Komuna as a starting point, where workers, peasants, students, and militants meet to discuss, decide, and act collectively—uniting those who remain in the homeland with those who live abroad. Because a nation is not only a territory, but a living community of conscious workers.

Every commune anywhere in the world is an example of all those who gave their lives for their ideology. It is the living tribute to the martyrs, the heroes, to Stepan Shahumyan, to the 26 commissars of Baku, to the Communards of Paris, to all those who fought for the emancipation of the working people.

To keep a commune alive today is to continue their struggle, to strengthen their legacy, and to demonstrate that revolution is possible.

That is why we must build alliances among com-

munes, exchange experiences, strengthen power structures, resist imperialist attacks, and ensure that the Commune ceases to be an ideal and becomes a concrete reality of organization, discipline, and collective action.

History teaches us that the contradiction between oppressors and oppressed remains the same, and that our task continues to be to resist, organize, and build popular power.

Finally, I wish to end with the words of Stepan Shahumyan:

“The waters of the world, wherever they spill, wherever they flow, will eventually come together and meet in the ocean.”

Every commune, even if it seems isolated, is like a drop of water joining others, forming an ocean of struggle, solidarity, and organization. Every effort, every militant, and every decision made by the people strengthens the collective power of the proletariat.

Just as the waters meet in the ocean, our communes, connected with each other, form an invincible international front, uniting all peoples who fight for emancipation and socialism.

Commune or nothing!

Honor and glory to Stepan Shahumyan and the 26 commissars!

Long live the communes in Venezuela, in Armenia, and throughout the world!

The People's Commune —The Path to Socialism in Venezuela

Baltic Platform

Dear comrades!

We are closely watching the progress of socialist construction in Venezuela with a sense of comradeship and solidarity. It is important for us to see how the leadership and the people of Venezuela strive to utilize the rich revolutionary experience of other countries and peoples. Moreover, they do this not by mechanically applying it to local conditions, but by deeply analyzing and extracting what is essential and can be useful, taking into account the current state of Venezuelan society while preserving national traditions.

Hugo Chávez was a passionate patriot of his country and wanted it to be truly sovereign. He clearly understood that in a country with such natural wealth, there should be no poverty, and the Venezuelan people love their homeland and are capable of being the power in their own country and skillfully managing its wealth.

Hugo Chávez came to the conviction that the prosperity of the country and its people can only be achieved through the construction of a socialist society. He saw the possibility of achieving such a great goal in the consolidation of the efforts of the entire society. To this end, Hugo Chávez put forward the unifying slogan “Comuna o Nada!” (“Communal or Nothing!”).

In our view, this became the key link, as V.I. Lenin said, by pulling which one can pull the whole chain, i.e., achieve the goals of the revolution. The Venezuelan people's commune was not proposed by Hugo Chávez by chance as the foundation of the entire system of power in the country. He thought a lot about this issue and consulted with many, including

Fidel Castro. As a result, Chávez firmly decided to follow the path of creatively developing the experience of the Paris Commune and the Councils born out of the revolution in Russia.

My speaking time is limited, so I will only address a few aspects of the political experience of the revolutionary Councils created by the Bolshevik Party in Russia, which has obviously been analyzed and proved useful for the people's communes in Venezuela.

Sometimes we hear that the desire to make the commune a unifier of all the people, not just its revolutionary part, contradicts the experience of the Russian Bolsheviks, who allegedly did not want to allow any other parties to work in the Soviets.

This is a deliberate lie propagated by those hostile to socialism. It aims to isolate the so-called “middle strata” of the population from Marxist parties in bourgeois countries, imposing a distorted view of the “totalitarianism” of the socialist revolution.

However, the facts of the history of the Great October Revolution, as well as the real strategy and tactics of the Bolsheviks during this period, completely dismantle this “concept.” This did not go unnoticed by Chávez and his comrades.

For example, what did the Bolsheviks propose during the struggle for power when V.I. Lenin returned from exile to Russia and presented his “April Theses”? They proposed that all power be transferred to the Soviets, where the majority belonged to the Mensheviks and the Socialist Revolutionaries, with the participation of the Bolsheviks. But the Mensheviks and the Socialist Revolutionaries rejected this proposal and formed a coalition with the bourgeois

parties.

As a result, the creation of a democratic government by the Soviets composed of Mensheviks and Socialist Revolutionaries, in which the Bolsheviks might not have been included, did not materialize.

A few months later, during the Kornilov uprising, the Bolsheviks again offered a compromise to the Mensheviks and Socialist Revolutionaries, who still held the majority in the Soviets. They were urged to reject the coalition with the bourgeois parties. This proposal from the Bolsheviks was also rejected.

In both cases, in April and September 1917, the acceptance of the Bolsheviks' proposals would have guaranteed the peaceful development of the revolution. As a result of the refusal of these proposals, the Bolsheviks had no other path to victory in the socialist revolution except for armed uprising.

But even after the victory of the October armed uprising, during the Second Congress of the Soviets, the Bolsheviks expressed their willingness (in response to L. Martov's proposal) to negotiate for the creation of a power that would be recognized by all of democracy. However, the Mensheviks and Socialist Revolutionaries sabotaged this opportunity as well.

Nevertheless, even after this, the Bolsheviks agreed to expand the composition of the government by including representatives of small-bourgeois parties and groups, but on the condition of recognizing the transfer of power to the Soviets and the first decrees of Soviet authority on peace and land.

Today, bourgeois propagandists conceal the fact that even after the Mensheviks and right Socialist Revolutionaries refused to recognize Soviet power, their party organizations and Central Committees continued to exist legally, and they enjoyed the freedom of assembly, discussion, and press. Representatives of these parties participated in various conferences, congresses, spoke in debates—including with “oppositional criticism”—and took part in elections to Soviet bodies. These circumstances required the Bolsheviks to engage in persistent and well-argued

ideological struggle against their opponents. And that is exactly what happened at that time. What talk can there be of totalitarianism here?

Thus, the Bolsheviks positioned themselves as active supporters of united action among all democratic forces, advocating for the creation of a genuinely democratic government based on a coalition with political parties capable of defending the interests of the working people.

Today, we see that this experience of the Bolshevik Party of Russia is evidently taken into account by the leadership of Venezuela. This explains their aim to unite all democratic forces of society around the people's communes and to establish, on this basis, a truly people's government.

The experience of the Russian Bolsheviks is also valuable in that it teaches how to apply diverse tactics of political struggle. To achieve the goals of the socialist revolution, the peaceful path should be utilized to the fullest extent possible. This is feasible on the condition of a correct assessment of the economic and political development of society, as well as the ability and readiness of counterrevolutionary forces to mount organized resistance against the popular masses supporting the revolution. It is important to understand the sentiments within the army and the state of relations among representatives of different national groups.

As a result of a thorough evaluation of these and other factors—which at the time demonstrated the overwhelming superiority of the revolutionary forces—the Bolsheviks managed to establish Soviet power peacefully in 79 out of 97 cities. Where the bourgeoisie refused to voluntarily hand over power to the revolutionary people, it had to be taken by force.

To conclude what has already been said, I would like to note that V.I. Lenin called for studying the experience of Russian Bolshevism, but under no circumstances copying it. Lenin aimed to make accessible to the international communist movement “that

which is universally applicable, of general importance, and obligatory in the history and modern tactics of Bolshevism” (Collected Works, vol. 41, p. 30). At the same time, Lenin emphasized that the general patterns of socialist revolution do not exist in a pure form but manifest themselves in specific particular forms in different countries.

We sincerely wish success to the movement toward socialism of the people of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela. We express unconditional confidence that the movement initiated by Hugo Chávez and continued by his successor, President Nicolás Maduro, the popular movement “Communes or Nothing!” will help defend the country’s sovereignty and make it prosperous.

Thank you for your attention.

The Paris Commune of 1871: The Homeland in Arms Against Treason

Aymeric Monville | International Committee for Democratic Rights in South Korea (CILD)

Introduction

The Paris Commune, which governed the French capital from March 18 to May 28, 1871, was much more than a mere municipal government or an uprising over working conditions. It was a patriotic cry, an act of legitimate defense of the French nation, betrayed by its own government. It arose from the convergence of a humiliating defeat at the hands of Prussia and the treason of a ruling class willing to capitulate rather than defend the honor and sovereignty of the people.

The Context: Defeat and Capitulation

The Franco-Prussian War (1870–1871) was a disaster for France. After Emperor Napoleon III was captured at Sedan, a new republic was proclaimed. However, the so-called “Government of National Defense,” installed in Versailles, was dominated by monarchists and conservative bourgeois whose greatest fear was not the Prussian army, but the armed people of Paris.

While the citizens of Paris endured a brutal siege and hunger, withstanding bombardments and defending their walls with incredible heroism, the government of Monsieur Thiers secretly negotiated surrender. The armistice of January 1871 was a disgraceful capitulation that disarmed France and allowed the Prussians to hold a military parade on the Champs-Élysées. For the Parisians, who had sacrificed so much, this surrender was a stab in the back.

The Uprising: The Homeland Rises Up

The final spark of the Commune was an act of provocation by the government in Versailles. On March 18, Thiers sent troops to seize the cannons

of the National Guard—cannons paid for by popular subscription from Parisians for their defense. This attempt to disarm the city, right after a national humiliation, was the spark.

But the reaction was not only one of anger; it was an act of patriotism. The soldiers sent refused to fire on the people and fraternized with the citizens. Thiers’s cowardly government fled to Versailles, abandoning the capital. Paris, having expelled the traitors, decided to govern itself.

The Commune: The Government of Resistance

The Commune rose up as the true representative of resistant France, in opposition to the France of capitulation.

- **Against the Capitulationists:** The “Versaillese” were not only the party of the bourgeoisie; they were the party of defeat. They were the men who had signed a humiliating peace with Bismarck and who now allied themselves tacitly with the invader to crush their own people. For them, the main enemy was not Prussia but the revolutionary people of Paris.
- **Patriotic and Social Measures:** The Commune issued decrees that reflected this spirit of resistance and national rebirth: the separation of Church and State, secular and free education, the abolition of compulsory military service and its replacement by the National Guard (the people in arms), and the democratic management of abandoned factories.

The Bloody Week: The Crime of the Victors

The response from Versailles was one of unprecedented brutality. With the tacit blessing of the Prussians, who released French soldiers from cap-

tivity for this purpose, Thiers's army assaulted Paris on May 21. What followed was the Bloody Week.

The Versaillese did not enter as liberators but as a foreign army of occupation. They massacred tens of thousands of Parisians—men, women, and children—in the streets. This bloodbath was not merely the suppression of a revolt; it was the punishment of a ruling class against the people who had dared to challenge its authority and remind it of its cowardice.

Conclusion: The Legacy of the Commune

The Paris Commune was physically crushed, but its legacy is imperishable. It embodied the struggle for popular sovereignty, social justice, and, above all, the uncompromising defense of the homeland against the treason of its elites. It demonstrated that true patriotism does not reside in the palaces of rulers but in the hearts of the people when they rise up to defend their dignity, their freedom, and their right to exist.

The Communards were not merely insurgents; they were the last and most consistent defenders of France's honor in a dark hour of capitulation and betrayal.

Of course, it is them whom I think of when I see many South Americans fighting against the imperialists of the United States.

Thank you for your attention.

“The Commune, far from being an episode frozen in Parisian history, is a living idea”

Anatole Sawosik | Pole of Communist Revival in France (PRCF)

When we talk about the Commune, most people immediately think of Paris, of the popular uprising that broke out in March 1871 and was crushed by the Bloody Week two months later. However, reducing the history of the communes to Paris means missing out on a whole dynamic that extended far beyond the capital. For the Commune was not only Parisian, it was also Lyonnais, Marseillais, Toulousain and, more broadly, a movement that affected the whole of France, albeit unevenly. Understanding this is essential to grasp the Commune not as an isolated episode, but as the expression of a deeper and more widespread desire: to give local populations the power to organize themselves, manage their affairs, and collectively build their future.

At the turn of 1870, the fall of the Empire and the proclamation of the Republic did not take place solely in Paris. In Lyon, Marseille, and Toulouse, on September 4, 1870, the Republic was proclaimed even before Paris did so. These were popular uprisings that expressed a desire to break with the Empire and heralded the aspiration for more local power, closer to everyday realities. When the Paris Commune was born on March 18, 1871, these cities did not remain indifferent. Marseille, Lyon, Saint-Étienne, Narbonne, Toulouse, Le Creusot, and Limoges in turn experienced communal experiments, sometimes lasting a few days, sometimes a few weeks. They were brutally repressed, but they demonstrated the same desire: to wrest from the central government the right to decide for themselves, to build a political space where residents were not spectators but actors. In the countryside, there was also an echo: trees of liberty were planted, committees were formed, and addresses of support for Paris circulated. But caution prevailed, as isolation, low politicization, and fear of

reprisals slowed the revolutionary momentum.

The important thing to remember about this history is that the Commune was not a purely Parisian event. It expressed a national aspiration for autonomy, local democracy, and social justice. Paris was its beating heart, but the provinces were its resonance and extension. The Commune was the idea that men and women, in their towns and villages, could unite to decide how they would live together, manage their resources, and transform society from the bottom up. This ideal, although shattered by the repression of 1871, continues to haunt history because it embodies a universal truth: the will of peoples to take control of their own destiny.

But this ideal does not stop at 19th-century France. Even today, in other contexts, on other continents, it is being reborn in new forms. Contemporary Venezuela is a striking example. There, the notion of the commune is not limited to a fleeting insurrection or a localized uprising. It refers to a mode of popular organization, a way of building power from the bottom up. It is a living fabric of solidarity, collective planning, and shared responsibility. The commune is poetry in action, the seed that germinates, the drum that calls for unity. It is the place where the people decide together, create together, transform together. Here we find, transposed to another time and space, the same idea that animated the French communes: the idea that collective life can and must be organized directly by those who live it.

In Venezuela, the communal project reached a turning point with Chávez’s “Golpe de timón” speech, when he stated that the construction of communes was not the responsibility of a single ministry but of the entire government and society. Today, under Maduro, this orientation is being vigorously pur-

sued. Concrete mechanisms have been put in place to bring the communes to life: popular consultations, assemblies where the future is debated, collective votes to choose priority projects, and above all, direct access to resources. It is the residents themselves, their neighbors, their comrades in struggle, who administer the resources with shared supervision. This changes everything: people no longer write to an inaccessible elected representative, they address the person who lives on the same street, who shares the same problems, and who is accountable to their community.

This experience is not without its difficulties. Building a communal state, as Venezuelan activists say, is a long process that will take decades. It is not just a matter of building new institutions, but of transforming human relationships themselves, breaking with the logic of domination and selfishness inherited from capitalism. That is why the communal state begins in everyday life: in the way we love, share, and care for one another. People who have been fighting for years to have water in their neighborhood finally get it thanks to collective organization and support for communal projects. These are stories of regained dignity, shared efforts, and concrete victories.

The Venezuelan commune is not just an institution: it is a school of democracy. In a living commune, dreams cease to be individual and become collective. This requirement for participation, this obligation to be an actor, creates a dense social fabric, a sense of belonging, a healthier society. Here again, we find a resonance with the Commune of 1871: the desire to break out of passivity, to break down the separation between rulers and ruled, and to build a truly popular power.

In 19th-century France, as in Venezuela today, the commune thus appears as a historical response to imperial invasions and oppression. In France, in 1871, it was a way of resisting the crushing of a people by a centralized and conservative state and the Prussian invasion. In Venezuela, it is a way of building a new state, not on the basis of distant institutions, but on the basis of the daily practices of the inhabitants in

a context of terrible threat from Yankee imperialism. In both cases, the commune expresses the same conviction: that freedom and justice cannot be given by any force other than the people themselves.

Beyond its insurrectionary aspect, the Paris Commune sketched out the contours of a genuine socialist society, in which the commune was to constitute the basic cell of the new state. This transition required a radical transformation of economic relations, which the Communards began to implement through concrete measures: the socialization of the means of production through the reactivation of workshops abandoned by their owners under cooperative management, the organization of collective work through the abolition of bargaining and the prohibition of night work in bakeries, and the first steps towards the abolition of capitalist private property through a moratorium on rents and the requisitioning of vacant apartments. These experiences, although brief, demonstrated a consistent desire to build a social republic where political democracy would be based on economic democracy, with each commune becoming the place where popular sovereignty would be exercised in all areas of social life.

We can therefore conclude that the Commune, far from being an episode frozen in Parisian history, is a living idea. It spans eras and continents, reborn in various forms, adapting to different contexts. In France, it was brief but intense; in Venezuela, it is unfolding over a long period of time. But in both cases, it embodies a universal aspiration: that of peoples to organize collectively, to decide for themselves, to transform the world by transforming their own lives. The Commune, the world's first experiment in the dictatorship of the proletariat, is both memory and future; it is the link that connects yesterday's struggles to today's hopes. And that is why, when we talk about the Paris Commune, we must always remember that communes are everywhere where women and men decide to unite for their common ideals of social justice and popular sovereignty.

The Paris Commune Is Not Dead —It Is Reborn Through the Bolivarian Revolution

Paule Djiane and André Fadda | Union for Communist Reconstruction (URC, France)

On September 25, 2025, at the Majestic Passy Cinema in Paris, a screening took place of the documentary by Thierry Deronne and Victor Hugo Rivera, “How Venezuela Moved a Mountain”, which focuses on the communal self-governments at the heart of Venezuela’s participatory democracy.

The event, which gathered around fifty people, was attended by Mr. Rodolfo Humberto Pérez Hernández, Ambassador of Venezuela to UNESCO in France, along with his wife (Consultant for the Permanent Delegation of Venezuela to UNESCO), representatives of the Venezuelan Embassy, and members of several associations—including the Friends of the Paris Commune (Les Amis de la Commune de Paris).

The screening was followed by a lively and warm off-media discussion with Maurice Lemoine, former editor-in-chief of *Le Monde Diplomatique*, journalist, and writer, who has been traveling across Latin America—particularly Venezuela—for more than fifty years.

This initiative met with real success, one that calls for further similar events in the near future. The discussion was politically rich and highly instructive, especially since many of the participants were not previously aware of the existence of the *Comunas* in Venezuela.

Several attendees expressed a desire to organize another screening under similar conditions, this time of another film by Thierry Deronne, “*Nostalgiques du futur*” (Nostalgic for the Future), which highlights the role of women in the communes of Venezuela.

This Parisian initiative came to life thanks to the dedication and involvement of Paule Djiane, militant of the Union for Communist Reconstruction (URC), and, together with comrade André Fadda, in charge

of relations with Latin America for the URC.

The screening of the documentary by Deronne and Rivera generated particular interest, as the Paris Commune remains deeply rooted in collective memory. In this regard, Paule—a long-time member of the Friends of the Paris Commune association—has been working with its members to introduce and promote the innovative experience of participatory democracy represented by the Venezuelan *Comunas*, made possible by Commander Hugo Chávez and President Nicolás Maduro, so that this example may become known in Paris and throughout France.

Today, thanks to Venezuela, the Paris Commune of 1871 is not dead—it is, in a sense, reborn from its ashes, though in a different form, since this new project is driven by the Bolivarian government “for the people and by the people.”

In this same spirit, the anniversary of the Commune, celebrated on Sunday, September 28, 2025, in the historic working-class neighborhood of La Butte aux Cailles in Paris, provided another meaningful opportunity to introduce this commemorative and festive event to representatives of the Venezuelan Embassy in France.

During this celebration, discussions between leaders of the Friends of the Paris Commune and the Venezuelan ambassador to UNESCO, his wife, and other guests made it possible to outline promising perspectives regarding the historical and political connections between the legacy of the Paris Commune and the “*Comuna o Nada*” experience initiated by Commander Hugo Chávez.

This outreach effort toward the Friends of the Paris Commune is all the more relevant because it helps to highlight the legacy of the Communards while link-

ing it to the construction of socialism in present-day Venezuela.

Aware of the importance of this convergence, the URC team responsible for relations with Latin America has included, in its action plan, the strategic objective of publicizing and popularizing in France the vibrant and innovative Venezuelan experience of Popular Power, in order to compare it with other efforts that have existed or are currently emerging, in diverse forms, across Latin America and other parts of the world.

Hasta la Victoria siempre
¡Venceremos!

The Communal Organization as a Condition for the Emancipation of Humanity

Miguel Ángel | Unión Proletaria (Spain)

In the tumultuous course of the Third World War driven by crisis-ridden imperialism, and following the electoral victory of the Great Patriotic Pole of Venezuela on October 7, the Bolivarian Revolution prepares to fulfill the testamentary mandate of Commander Hugo Chávez Frías: “Independence or nothing, commune or nothing.” Ultimately, the sovereign organization of the working people is the bulwark that guarantees their freedom and prosperity in the face of imperialist aggression. As explained in the Pyongyang Declaration, signed since 1992 by hundreds of workers’ and progressive parties: “The guarantee for the advancement of scientific socialism lies in the popular masses becoming the true masters of society.”

After Chávez’s death, the imperialists launched against Venezuela a barrage of sanctions and aggressions in support of the internal counterrevolution, but they failed thanks to the hard work and wisdom of the organized people, with President Nicolás Maduro Moros at the forefront. Now, as they prepare to intervene with their own armies, they will once again crash against a people who feel themselves to be the rightful owners of their country. Hence the importance and urgency of developing the communal structure—from the bottom up—firmly united with the revolutionary vanguard, which scientifically illuminates the path from above.

This dialectic is what all the great revolutionary experiences in world history—particularly the socialist revolutions—have endeavored to construct.

The Venezuelan Revolution has its own particularities, even though it is subject to the same general objective laws that have manifested in the expe-

riences that preceded it. Undoubtedly, one of its differences lies in the relatively parliamentary and peaceful path it has followed up to now. This lower degree of violence against internal and external parasitic forces was achieved because within the armed forces, the patriotic sector led by Commander Chávez prevailed.

In our humble opinion, in the current context of the high internationalization of the productive forces and of the class struggle, every national revolution must rely on its historical international precedents with scientific rigor and class solidarity: it is as wrong to attempt to copy them as it is to caricature them negatively. We must learn from Soviet power with the same spirit with which the Soviets learned from the Paris Commune. Every revolutionary experience is a step on the path toward the emancipation of humanity.

The Paris Commune of 1871, inspired by the insurrectional Commune of 1792–1793 and by the experiments of utopian socialists, was the first experience of popular power led by the workers, and arose from the need to confront the national betrayal of the bourgeois institutions that had delivered France to the Prussian invader.

The Russian soviets, or workers’ councils, likewise emerged as insurrectional organs elected by the working masses to overthrow and replace the power of the Tsarist autocracy. They adopted the characteristics and goals of the Paris Communards, but carried them to completion—beyond what the latter had achieved in their brief revolutionary experience of two months and ten days. They took production into their own hands, implemented measures of

social justice, and workers elected their deputies and judges—revocable, bound by imperative mandate, merging legislative and executive functions into a tiered structure from bottom to top, and so on.

However, Soviet power corrected the weaknesses that had contributed to the defeat of the Paris Commune—particularly its excessive leniency toward the exploiters, its lack of an alliance policy with the peasantry, and the absence of a disciplined leading party grounded in the scientific theory of Marxism–Leninism. As a result of this heightened consciousness, and also of the more advanced development of Russian society, they replaced the territorial constituency with the factory constituency, to reinforce the leading role of the working class, which is the most revolutionary class due to its identity with the social character of modern productive forces and its antagonism to all forms of human exploitation and private property.

Because this power was genuinely popular and democratic, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics twice defeated foreign intervention (1918–1922 and 1941–1945—not to mention the conspiracies and sabotage in between, and the nuclear blackmail of the “Cold War” thereafter), industrialized, mechanized, and collectivized urban and rural production, planned it centrally, improved the life of the population, eradicated illiteracy, liberated and developed the various national cultures of the country, advanced toward overcoming class, gender, and national antagonisms, and contributed to the progress of the revolution on an international scale.

But these advances could not fail to be contradictory within an imperialist international context characterized by: 1) the centralization of resources in the hands of a handful of monopolists; and 2) the growing inequality of living conditions between workers of the oppressor countries and those of the oppressed countries.

This new reality explains the strength that reformist social democracy and fascist reaction acquired,

managing to weaken the social base of the world revolution and, between 1935 and 1947, forcing it into a political compromise with bourgeois parliamentary democracy. This temporary alliance helps explain, along with other factors, why the new 1936 Soviet Constitution replaced the Congresses of Soviets with a Supreme Soviet elected by direct suffrage. Later, the nearly 30 million lives—including over 3 million communists—sacrificed for the Soviet victory over Nazi-fascism contributed to the ideological and political deterioration of the USSR, the anti-Stalin revisionist turn of the 1950s, and the widening separation between the people and the organs of power.

Thus, the soviets were not always the same, but evolved throughout their history according to the correlation of class forces in struggle. The socialist revolutions after World War II (China, Korea, Cuba, etc.) sought ways to continue developing communal forms of power amid the suffocating imperialist encirclement.

Precisely in the course of this struggle against foreign imperialists and their domestic lackeys, one can discern the true commitment to national sovereignty and social progress held by the various classes into which society is divided. The proletariat is the class most faithful to the revolution, and in alliance with other popular classes, it must direct its dictatorship against the traitors—otherwise, society risks returning to slavery and misery for the majority, which is where the restoration of capitalism and neocolonial dependence inevitably lead. Therefore, the question of communal power from below is also the question of strengthening the political leadership of the working class.

It is likewise a contradictory process, shaped by adverse internal conditions—such as the insufficient development of the productive forces inherited from capitalism, and the resulting corrupting influence of monetary-mercantile relations and the social division of labor (particularly between manual and intellectual work), which forms the basis of class

division. These adverse conditions cannot be abolished by decree, but only through a long process of entrenching socialist transformations. Meanwhile, it is necessary to learn to master them through the control and vigilance of the organized people under the leadership of the working class.

Today, imperialism is weakened by its own contradictions, which are driving it toward a Third World War. At the same time, the national liberation movement is uniting and growing stronger. The forthcoming defeat of the imperialists thus opens a window of opportunity for the definitive emancipation of the oppressed of the earth. We must seize it to promote the organization of communal popular power and its leadership by the proletariat, the class that is objectively capable of carrying the communist transformation of society to its ultimate conclusion.

Commune

Taimur Rahman | Mazdoor Kissan Party (Pakistan)

The fundamental question Marx was concerned with as he studied the history of the class struggle was how to end exploitation of man by man. His critiques of capitalism and all preceding systems as well as his observations of the Paris Commune revolution revealed to him that the path of ending exploitation of working people by other classes would one day lead to a society without classes, which he deemed to be a Communist society. This was not mere philosophizing but contained a call to action, since Marx wanted to change the world. He saw in the Paris Commune an inspiration for that change and how it might be achieved.

But how truly does exploitation end? Different socialist states have addressed the issues of self-government and democracy in different ways, but equally varied was their progress with respect to that question. The answer Marx provided to this question was “abolition of property”. Not all property mind you, but the property that can be used to exploit people for the enrichment of others. If this seems like an unimaginable concept, it needn’t be. It can be as natural as walking on a public street without so giving so much as a thought to whether it might be owned by someone or controversial in anyway.

As Marxists, we must be clear: this is our primary mission. We must transfer this property out of the hands of the exploitative capitalist class and put it under control of the working classes; that is, the people. Failure to do so puts one on the path of what Hugo Chavez once referred to as “Capitalism with a human face”.

Why do we wish to belabor this point especially on the subject of communes and no other? For two reasons in particular.

First: communes, self-government, and their associated democracy do not always imply the absence of capitalism. Otherwise, there are communes even

in the United States.

Here is what Marx said of the Paris Commune with respect to property:

“Yes, gentlemen, the Commune intended to abolish that class property which makes the labor of the many the wealth of the few. It aimed at the expropriation of the expropriators. It wanted to make individual property a truth by transforming the means of production, land, and capital, now chiefly the means of enslaving and exploiting labor, into mere instruments of free and associated labor. But this is communism, “impossible” communism! Why, those members of the ruling classes who are intelligent enough to perceive the impossibility of continuing the present system—and they are many—have become the obtrusive and full-mouthed apostles of co-operative production. If co-operative production is not to remain a sham and a snare; if it is to supersede the capitalist system; if united co-operative societies are to regulate national production upon common plan, thus taking it under their own control, and putting an end to the constant anarchy and periodical convulsions which are the fatality of capitalist production—what else, gentlemen, would it be but communism, “possible” communism?”

Thus, there can be no talk of communes without their being revolutionary at the same time. A true revolutionary commune or cooperative society in the Marxist sense also owns and manages its productive forces. We feel this is an important point to make with respect to communes.

The second reason for our emphasis on the property question: How and when communes shape up in every society, what they will look like or how they will operate is determined by the unique circumstances and histories of those societies. Predictions and prescriptions on the subject of communes in that sense can make things difficult. That is why we

stress the importance of the class character of the Communes.

Hugo Chavez recognized the importance of differences between societies where one solution will not work for all. He wisely remarked in 2005 at the Gigantinho Stadium in Brazil:

“In Venezuela at the beginning of my presidency, many of my supporters criticized me and asked me to go at a faster pace [to implement changes], and be more radical, but I considered that it was not the right moment because each process has several phases and different rhythms that not only have to do with internal situations in each country, but with the international situation at the time.”

This is similar to the view Marx held on the Paris Commune. He warned against taking a dogmatic or formulaic attitude to the concept of Communes. He remarked:

“The working class did not expect miracles from the Commune. They have no ready-made utopias to introduce par décret du peuple. They know that in order to work out their own emancipation, and along with it that higher form to which present society is irresistibly tending by its own economical agencies, they will have to pass through long struggles, through a series of historic processes, transforming circumstances and men. They have no ideals to realize, but to set free the elements of the new society with which old collapsing bourgeois society itself is pregnant.”

What this means is that each country treads a different path. This will not be a copy of the path of Soviet Russia, or China where they fought a peoples’ war, or Vietnam or even Cuba. A commune will not emerge out of the imagination of any individual, but from real, lived events. The uniting theme however, as and when the countries reach that point, will be on whether they are revolutionary.

In Pakistan, we face different circumstances indeed. Whereas Venezuela is 97% literate, our literacy rate is barely 60%; there is abysmal ignorance and religious fanaticism. We are a country of several nations that speak different languages and have different cultures. There is incredible unevenness in economic

and social development between our provinces. Our economy is dominated by petty commodity and agrarian production. And we are ever at risk of falling back into military rule. We are far behind Venezuela in the state of our revolutionary progress. The Left movement is in its early growth phase, and there has not been much success with the “Broad Left”, which we have seen tends to dilute or abandon revolutionary principles in favor of chasing larger activist numbers.

In short, we are very far from communes of a revolutionary sort, but this does not mean we cannot learn from and derive inspiration from those who have advanced ahead of us in the class struggle. Looking upon Venezuela, we have much to learn from their democratic, people-centric experiments. We converge for example on the necessity of class alliances, particularly between the workers and the peasants, as Pakistan may very well have to go through its own national democratic revolution as a step towards Socialism. We have the opportunity to learn and apply from the Bolivarian project some important tactics to build connections with the people. And Venezuela’s experiences in building communes is one of the most important lessons.

With regard to Communes, we take note of the institutionalization of neighborhood power and funding via communal councils by the Venezuelan leadership. Although this was done after the Chavismo movement acquired power, this is nonetheless an important step in setting permanent changes in place for the transformation of society.

These councils or communes are local forums where residents plan, learn basic administration, and hold officials to account. And when need be, they can be relied upon in times of national-defense from an aggressor country. Venezuela is able to showcase this through their militias as they offer a robust defense response to the US aggression in 2025. The defense of the revolution is a basic principle, it is the highest ideal, and Venezuela shines in this regard.

On their long journey, Pakistani Socialists will study Venezuela’s contributions to the Commune mode of society.

An Organized People Cannot Be Defeated!

Mücadele Birliği (Struggle Unity, Türkiye)

For a quarter of a century, Bolivarian Venezuela has had to withstand unimaginable attacks. Maintaining a revolution that defends the interests of the working people right under the nose of the imperialist beast, with a clear socialist orientation emerging step by step, and doing so despite imperialist pressure and attacks that trample on every kind of international rule, law, and diplomacy, is a great achievement of the Venezuelan people and the Bolivarian government.

The intuition of the working classes is deep and powerful. The poor people of Venezuela saw in Chávez one of the uncompromising heroes of the proletarian world, embraced him and stood by him. In 2002, when an imperialism-backed military coup arrested Chávez and imprisoned him in a barracks, the working people, with deep intuition, grasped the powerful connection between Chávez's destiny and their own, and, to defend their hero, they surrounded Miraflores, the Presidential Palace, and defeated the coup. Later, the Comandante would say on a television program that from that moment on, he had made the firm decision to devote his entire life to the working people.

The Venezuelan workers and laborers, who pulled their hero out of the fire, successfully overcame one of the most difficult obstacles facing the Bolivarian Revolution with this mass heroism. After that stage, the Bolivarian government always relied on the revolutionary initiative of the working people. It established and spread grassroots organizations. Committees grew into communes. Authority, in economic and political terms, spread to the grassroots through these communes. The people were armed and organized in the form of militias. The bourgeoisie's "representative democracy" was overcome, and

an example of proletarian democracy began to be built. The Bolivarian Revolution, which turned its face toward socialism, sought to find its own path.

It is well known that every proletarian revolution, or popular revolution turning its face toward socialism, overcomes bourgeois "representative democracy" at its very first step and implements the unity of the legislature and the executive. The Paris Commune, the Russian Soviets, the Italian Councils, the Cuban Revolutionary Defense Committees, the Iranian Shuras, and many others... Their fundamental characteristic is that they serve as both legislative and executive organs. They do not merely make laws and take decisions; they directly implement laws and decisions. Moreover, these structures, organized directly from the grassroots upward, ensure that the will and initiative of the people are firmly grounded through the ability to recall their representatives at any time.

The first workers' government, the Paris Commune, which lasted only 72 days, had a profound impact on the entire world. It influenced all subsequent workers' and popular revolutions and made tremendous contributions to Marxist theory. Neither the Commune, nor the Soviet, nor the Council or Shura was a tool derived from the research of theorists. Every real popular revolution mobilizes the collective genius of workers and laborers. The masses combine the accumulated knowledge filtered through their historical memory with their collective genius and create together the tools suited to the needs of the revolutionary moment. Theory studies and examines the tools created by the collective genius of the masses in practical life, gives them their due value, and puts the most appropriate tools at the service of the proletarian revolution.

The Venezuelan people created communes (comu-

nas) during the Bolivarian revolutionary process. The leaders of the revolution, with theoretical foresight, realized the vital importance of the commune for the development of the revolution and embraced this product of the collective genius of the people. Comandante Chávez attached such importance to these tools that he declared, “Comuna o Nada” (Commune or Nothing). Venezuelan workers and laborers gathered widely in communes. An entire community of workers created a “network of communes” that spread across the country. In this way, they organized and defended themselves, the economy, and the revolution. They repelled the most brutal attacks of imperialism, the coups carried out by internal collaborators, and the attempts at coups and invasions.

What we have witnessed over the last quarter century is essentially nothing more than a conflict between the Venezuelan workers and the Bolivarian government, striving to develop the revolution toward socialism by relying on communes and militias—the direct armed force of the people—and imperialist aggression, attempting to strangle the Bolivarian Revolution through its counterrevolutionary bases within the country. To be more precise, what we have witnessed is a civil war in the Marxist sense of the word: a civil war that has been ongoing without interruption for a quarter of a century. On one side of this war are the revolutionary Bolivarian government, the working class, the laboring and poor people; on the other side are the bourgeoisie, the reactionary forces, and the imperialist states that support and organize them in every way.

Just look at what has happened since Commander Chávez was elected president: coups, coup attempts, economic sabotage, assassinations, the kidnapping and murder of chavistas, embargoes, the appointment of “puppet presidents,” the seizure of assets abroad, and attempts at invasion with mercenaries... These are manifestations of the civil war waged against the Bolivarian Revolution by the imperialists and their collaborators within the country.

Recognizing reality as it is constitutes the first step in dealing with it. The reality is that US imperialism, together with the European imperialists behind it, has been waging a relentless civil war for a quarter of a century to strangle the Bolivarian Revolution, relying on the Venezuelan collaborationist bourgeoisie. Having lost the war on many fronts so far, the imperialists are now intensifying their efforts to escalate the situation to a de facto occupation under the current conditions. They have maximized pressure by deploying their navy off the coast of Venezuela. They are waiting for an opportunity to launch a de facto occupation.

The widely accepted thesis in Washington these days is this: Overthrow Venezuela, and Cuba will be economically strained and enter a crisis with no way out! Nicaragua is already being shaken by violent actions. It too will not be able to hold out and will fall. The last bastion, Cuba, will thus become vulnerable to attack. And this time, it will face crises without an ally. This is roughly the “roadmap” of the murderous warmongers in the White House!

It is clear from this point of view that the struggle of the peoples to save their own future is inextricably linked. The enemy is common: Imperialism! The imperialists, led by the US, are spreading their wars in order to win the global civil war they have launched against the working class and laboring peoples of the world in order to survive. And in Latin America, the “backyard” of this monster, socialist and socialist-oriented countries are, of course, always the target. This is the meaning of the US Navy off the coast of Venezuela.

US imperialism has declared to the world that it will stop at nothing, including military occupation, to achieve its goals. The danger is great. Imperialist occupation is lurking just across the border. The working people of Venezuela are armed and actively waiting. But time is passing. Let us not forget that imperialist financial capital plays to win by buying people, blackmailing them, and forcing individuals

in certain positions to change sides through subversion and conspiracy. They make their plans not to win over the peoples, but to crush and control them. Therefore, the faster and more energetically the revolution moves, the higher its chances of success.

The US, the European imperialists behaving like lapdogs, the puppet states in the Lima Group, and the Venezuelan bourgeoisie are preparing for war not to reconcile with the revolutionary government, but to destroy it.

However, despite this picture, the balance of power in Venezuela still favors the revolutionary government. When the civil war is won, the external war will also be prevented. The condition for shattering the warmongering resolve of US imperialism is to resolutely destroy the imperialists' bases in Venezuela, to crush these bases with military force.

The bases of the US and world reaction in Venezuela, as we saw in the example of the puppet Guaidó, are, contrary to what is believed, extremely weak and extremely rotten. First and foremost, they have no working class or poor people behind them. The army, which relies on the working class and the poor working people, is behind the revolutionary government. The widespread militia force has the capacity to crush the counterrevolutionaries.

The way to prevent an external war is to win the civil war. The way to win the internal war is to seize all the wealth, money, banks, factories, and land of the bourgeoisie, to accelerate the march toward socialism, and to crush the main pillar of the counterrevolution by relying on the power of arms.

This is the only way to prevent the imperialists from having any power to rely on "domestically" for their invasion. If this base is dismantled and crushed, the imperialists will not have the courage to start a foreign war.

The Bolivarian Revolution has successfully repelled the enemy's attacks to date. It has managed to survive by directly arming the people, knowing how to mobilize the masses at every critical juncture, and

conquering the streets with the revolutionary energy of the toiling masses. It responded to the enemy's protests by mobilizing incomparably larger masses. The militia forces and the army put on a show of force and successfully defended the borders. Now it is time to go further, to advance toward socialism by dismantling the enemy's entire economic base.

A revolution based on the working class and the revolutionary advance of the working people cannot be easily defeated. All that is needed is for the collective genius of the workers to be unleashed and for them to march forward with determination.

Down with US imperialism and its collaborators!

The Bolivarian Revolution will win!

Victory will belong to the Venezuelan working class and the laboring people!

¡El Pueblo Unido Jamás Será Vencido!

¡Venceremos!

“Comuna o Nada” and the 21st Century Revolution

Stephen Cho | Coordinator of the Korean International Forum

1. Testament of Hugo Chávez: “Comuna o Nada”

“Comuna o Nada (Communes or Nothing)” is moving since it is revolutionary, and all the more moving in that it was his testament. In the final days of his life, on October 20, 2012, during the first and last meeting of his newly formed cabinet, Chávez spoke these words as if they were his last will, engraving them into the consciousness of his revolutionary comrades. Humanity has long remembered similar words of truth: “Liberty or nothing,” “Independence or nothing,” “Revolution or nothing,” “Socialism (or communism) or nothing.” At its core, “Comuna o Nada” shares the same essence. For Chávez, the comuna was liberty, independence, revolution, and socialism. This means the comuna shares the same essence as liberty, independence, revolution, and socialism. More precisely, the comuna embodies the revolutionary capacity, while liberty, independence, and socialism embody the revolutionary goal. In the sense that the revolutionary goal can only be fulfilled through strong revolutionary capacity, the comuna is both the revolutionary capacity and the revolutionary goal.

The comuna is the government, the organ of power. More concretely, it refers to both the legislative and executive branches, to both decision-making and implementing bodies, to both the government and the assembly. “Government and assembly” encompasses both the central and local levels. Thus, the comuna represents the system of people’s democracy and centralism—the institutions and order of democratic centralism. In perspective, the exercise of Democratic Centralism must be understood as dependent on the advance of the comuna. In short, the comuna is people’s democracy itself; it is the people themselves. This is what Chávez entrusted to his revolutionary comrades—as his final testament,

and as his most precious legacy.

The comuna is founded upon the front. The people’s government presupposes a people’s front. Not the power of any single class or stratum, but the united front that embraces all the classes and strata that make up the people—this people’s front of the masses is the essential foundation of the people’s government. In other words, the comuna is a people’s government that includes not just one class or stratum, but all the classes and strata that constitute the people. Although Hugo Chávez did not state it explicitly, the idea of the united front is contained in the comuna.

Why is it not the party, but the front and the government? This is where Chávez’s distinctiveness lies. This explains why Chávez emphasized Simón Bolívar, rather than a communist representing Venezuela or Latin America. This is also why Chávez did not join the Communist Party of Venezuela (PCV), but instead founded the United Socialist Party of Venezuela (PSUV). During Chávez’s time, the PCV was a close ally of the PSUV. The fact that the PSUV included various political forces with different ideologies and positions, including the PCV, means that this party was essentially not a vanguard party but a mass party—not a class party, but a united front party. In the course of revolution and construction, a vanguard party may broaden its class base to the masses and develop into a mass party, while a mass party can deepen its revolutionary and class character to become a vanguard party. Revolution and construction require that organizational building be carried out creatively in accordance with the demands of the people and objective conditions. It is therefore logically consistent that Chávez—who from the beginning pushed forward the Bolivarian Revolution and founded the PSUV—emphasized the government rather than the party, and the people

rather than comrades, in his final testament.

Of course, it is the party that leads the government, and comrades and vanguards stand at the forefront of the people. In this sense, the importance of the party, comrades, and vanguards cannot be overstated. However, humanity has not forgotten the historical lesson that, in the course of revolution and construction, parties often fell into revisionism and dogmatism, committed errors in their lines and policies, and became bureaucratic and ultimately alienated from the people. As revolutionaries, we reflect painfully on why the communist parties of the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe lost their ruling status and were abandoned by the people. In that sense, even if the party leads revolution and construction, we must deeply internalize a truth that may seem ordinary yet is profound: the highest position in society belongs not to the party, but to the people. And when we emphasize the people and their government, the importance of the party as a political leadership organ is naturally emphasized as well. The conclusion is that it must be the people, not the party. This truth is embodied in “Comuna o Nada.” It should be seen as reflecting Chávez’s summation of past revolutionary history.

Although Chávez once nearly lost his life in a counterrevolutionary coup after the revolution, his revolutionary forces never lost control of state power—not even once. This was not only because Chávez’s party was strong, but also because the people’s support for Chávez’s movement and party was unwavering and resolute. Chávez placed emphasis not only on the party, but also on the comuna as a united front and as a form of government. He continuously reflected on how to strengthen the comuna, to enhance its functions, and devoted himself wholeheartedly to that endeavor. It was precisely this steadfast commitment that enabled the Chavista forces to lead the revolution and construction with the unyielding support of the people. For this reason, the Bolivarian Revolution continues to be inherited, deepened, and developed under its faithful successor, Nicolás Maduro, even after Chávez was assassinated by imperialist forces. Maduro said, “The comuna is

the great center of direct democracy and the shield against imperialism.” The reason Chávez did not die—even in death—and continues to live vividly among the people is embodied in his words: “Comuna o Nada.” The spirit of Che Guevara’s slogan, “Hasta la victoria siempre (Until victory, always),” finds its continuation in Chávez’s call, “Comuna o Nada,” which continues to guarantee the victory of the Venezuelan people and the Bolivarian Revolution.

2. The Paris Commune, the Russian Soviets, and the People’s Government of the DPRK

Venezuela’s comuna is, of course, rooted in the long history of the people’s life and struggle in Venezuela, while at the same time it is connected to the broader historical experience of people’s governments shared throughout world history. Of particular importance are the Paris Commune of 1871, the world’s first proletarian government, and the Soviets of the Russian Revolution of 1917, the world’s first victorious socialist revolution. These two historical experiences provided revolutionary inspiration to national liberation revolutions, people’s democratic revolutions, and socialist revolutions in many countries, including the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea (DPRK), and became classical historical experiences—paradigms of people’s governments—creatively embodied in each country.

The most important feature of the Paris Commune was that it was a government of the urban working class. Observing this, Marx put forward the idea of a worker-peasant alliance, stressing that the urban working class and the rural peasantry must unite—laying the foundation for the theory of the united front. Revolutionaries also drew from the lessons of the Commune the importance of the vanguard party, its leading core, and a guiding ideology. Based on this historical summation, Leninism emerged as the guiding idea, the Bolshevik Party as the vanguard party, and the Soviets as the organizational form of the united front. The first successful socialist revolution in human history—the October Revolution—was made possible, on the subjective side, by

the decisive role of these three elements.

The common feature of the proletarian government and the people's government lies in the leadership of the revolutionary party of the working class. Among all victorious national liberation revolutions, people's democratic revolutions, and socialist revolutions, there has never been a case in which victory was achieved by the power of a single class alone. In other words, the theory of the united front—that all classes and strata supportive of the revolution must be embraced as one—has, without exception, proved to be of decisive importance. Historically, the implementation of this strategic organizational line has been possible only under the wise leadership of the revolutionary party of the working class. The united front line has thus been theorized as one of the essential conditions for revolutionary victory.

In other words, under the leadership of the revolutionary party of the working class, the proletarian government and the people's government are essentially one and the same. The working class of the Paris Commune was the people, just as the workers, poor peasants, and soldiers of the Russian Soviets were the people. Yet the working class of the Paris Commune alone proved insufficient to defend the proletarian government—the gains of the revolution. From this grave lesson, the Russian Soviets—formed through the alliance of workers, poor peasants, and soldiers—emerged as a far firmer mass foundation, capable of consolidating the revolutionary victory and advancing toward socialist construction.

In developed capitalist countries, the revolutionary party of the working class must lead the uninterrupted revolution that advances from the lower to the higher stages after the victory of the socialist revolution, ultimately progressing toward a communist society. In colonies, meanwhile, it must lead the uninterrupted revolution that advances from the anti-imperialist, anti-feudal democratic revolution—or national liberation democratic revolution—to the socialist revolution. If the revolutionary party of the working class commits leftist or rightist deviations in the transitional stage from the lower to the higher

phase, the socialist revolution itself, in extreme cases, can be shipwrecked—a fact confirmed by the experience of the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe at the end of the 20th century.

Unlike in developed capitalist countries, in colonial countries the primary contradiction—and thus the foremost revolutionary task—is national liberation: the elimination of national oppression. The task of popular liberation—eliminating class oppression and socio-economic exploitation—is pursued simultaneously during the process of national liberation, but is fully carried out only after national liberation has been achieved. This entails two objective factors: the liquidation of anti-national and anti-popular forces on the human aspect, and the restriction of their ownership of the means of production on the material aspect. In short, this legitimate restriction of the political and economic power of anti-national and anti-popular forces is what has historically been referred to, since Lenin, as the “dictatorship of the proletariat.” As is well known, dictatorship is a dialectical concept—the other side of the same coin as democracy. In opposition to bourgeois dictatorship, Lenin clarified the revolutionary truth of proletarian dictatorship. He identified one of the key reasons for the failure of the Paris Commune in its lack of thorough implementation of this revolutionary principle—and he did not allow it to be repeated in the Russian Revolution.

Based on its experience with the “People's Revolutionary Government” in guerrilla zones—liberated areas—during the anti-Japanese struggle, the DPRK established a people's government in the northern half of Korea after the liberation on August 15, 1945, without falling into either leftist or rightist deviation. As a result, the anti-feudal democratic revolution following the anti-imperialist national liberation revolution was accomplished rapidly and smoothly. After carrying out a national liberation war against imperialism for three years (1950–1953), the DPRK swiftly advanced the task of socialist revolution—the establishment of socialist relations of production—in the three years from 1956 to 1958. Without resorting

to violent methods, this task was achieved quickly and smoothly. Upon the ruins of colonial underdevelopment and war, the DPRK, based on the power of its subjective forces firmly united around the Party and the leader, succeeded in achieving the transformation of production relations into socialist ones, which entails the complete socialization of all means of production, even prior to the development of the productive forces through industrialization—an unprecedentedly creative revolutionary process in history. On the basis of the political strength of single-hearted unity and the transition to socialist relations of production—that is, the favorable condition in which the capitalist class no longer existed—the DPRK, in just 14 years, accomplished the great task of socialist industrialization by 1970. It is no coincidence that the DPRK, today armed with hydrogen bombs and hypersonic missiles, has joined the ranks of the world’s most powerful nuclear-missile states, standing firm against US imperialism. It is no exaggeration that the DPRK declares that, in the event of an emergency, it will assuredly accomplish “the independent and democratic development of society on a nationwide scale”—the task set forth at the 8th Congress of the Workers’ Party of Korea in January 2021—that is, the cause of national liberation and territorial integrity.

A notable aspect of the DPRK’s experience in building a people’s government is that the revolutionary party of the working class, while firmly establishing the working class as the leading class within the people’s government, correctly implemented a revolutionary and popular united front policy that consistently bound together all the people who shared common interests at every stage of the revolution and construction. And that, in this process, by maximally elevating the educational and organizational role of the revolutionary party of the working class, both the anti-feudal democratic revolution and the socialist revolution were smoothly carried out as processes grounded in popular consensus. The DPRK has a unique historical experience of having carried out the transformation from private ownership of

the means of production to popular collective ownership, and further to socialist collective ownership, by thoroughly prioritizing ideological education and advancing it through rational and voluntary methods—to the extent that it refers to itself as “one great family.” It is undeniably an outstanding revolutionary achievement, realized through the political strength of single-hearted unity—built upon a strong revolutionary party of the working class that, under its leadership, has established the working class as the leading class, taken the worker-peasant alliance as the social-class foundation, and steadfastly strengthened the united front of the entire people.

3. The 21st Century Revolution: People-Centered Plus Cutting-Edge Science

Defining the 21st century as a new era requires compelling justification. For us, the “21st Century” conveys a crucial lesson from the collapse of socialism in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe in the late 20th century, and it demands that future socialist revolutions and constructions must avoid both leftist and rightist deviations. More specifically, it is a historical reflection underscoring that the errors committed by socialist ruling parties must never be repeated. These errors include dogmatic stagnation and revisionist degeneration, bureaucratism, and great-power chauvinism and flunkyism.

Ultimately, this can be condensed into establishing the correct view of the status and role of the people in revolution and construction. In short, the people are the masters of revolution and construction and play a decisive role in them. Revolution and construction are undertaken for the people and by the people. The goal of revolution and construction is from the people’s independent demands, and its means and methods are from the people’s creative capacity. The people’s independent demands constitute the people’s cause, their creative capacity constitutes their strength and role. Only when the people’s cause is rightly defined and their strength and role are duly exercised can revolution and construction advance swiftly and powerfully without deviation.

The process of defining the people's cause, strengthening their capabilities, and elevating their role is precisely the system of democratic deliberation and centralized implementation—democratic centralism. The decision-making and implementation systems of the people's government must always safeguard this principle as the very pupil of their eye. Even as times change, the principles of democracy and centralization in decision-making and implementation remain immutable. When the people's independent demands are democratically incorporated into government policy, and their creative capacities are centrally mobilized to implement that policy, the people become the true masters of power and can continuously enhance their role.

The regime, as the state-level decision-making and implementation system, can build a solid mass base only when it is founded on a people's front that embraces all strata of the masses. If this people's front—this people's regime—is a train, then the revolutionary party is its locomotive. The revolutionary party of the people is the revolutionary organization of the people, formed by the vanguards of the people, firmly united under the people's revolutionary ideology. It is both the revolutionary party of the working class the mass party of the working people, armed with the revolutionary ideology of the working class and united with the vanguards of the people, including the working class itself. This is why communist parties throughout the world often exist under the name "Workers' Party," alongside Communist Party.

The people's independent demands are their consciousness of independence, and the people's creative capacity is embodied in science and technology. This creative capacity has been developing at an accelerated pace, particularly since the 21st century, with the rapid advance of cutting-edge science—including AI—being nothing short of dazzling. In the establishment of a people-centered government, when policies are formulated for the people and implemented by the people, we are living in an era in which advanced science is assuming ever-greater importance. Science and technology are directly tied to the productive

forces, and their accelerated development is so profound that it even calls for a reinterpretation of the law of the tendency of the rate of profit to fall, as described in *Capital*.

As experts warn, imperialist forces seizing control of AI technology is as dangerous as imperialist USA being the sole nuclear power immediately after World War 2. In the current situation, where the imperialist camp is driving toward World War 3, the anti-imperialist camp must secure an unconditional and decisive victory, setting the direction and standards to ensure that cutting-edge science—advancing at the speed of light—is employed not by imperialist forces but by anti-imperialist forces, and not for the profit of a tiny handful of monopoly capitalists but for the benefit of the overwhelming majority of the people.

In 21st-century revolutionary theory, the industrial revolution of advanced science is as vital as the people-centered political revolution of the 21st century. The revolutionary task of inheriting and creatively renewing Lenin's classic formulation, "Communism is Soviet power plus electrification (of the whole country)," in accordance with the conditions of our era—the 21st century—cannot be overstated. Today, the Soviet power is the comuna—the people's government—and electrification is advanced science.

Imperialism and Popular Resistance

Carolus Wimmer | Committee for International Solidarity (Venezuela)

“The superstructure of any economic-social formation is always based on a specific mode of production, which it reflects in some way. Family, class, political, military, religious, educational, and other institutions are always oriented by the type of relations that dominate the production process. However, the development of each of the superstructural levels does not depend exclusively on the economic structure: there is interaction between the two, that is to say, they influence each other. Furthermore, each of the superstructural elements acts, albeit with unequal force, on the others; simultaneously, they act as causes among themselves, although, in the long run, it is the economic structure that prevails and conditions them all.”

This reflection by Venezuelan Marxist historian Arturo Cardozo, in his work “Colony, Class Struggle and Independence,” must be incorporated into the study of a new phase of imperialism and neocolonialism in the 21st century.

At a time when the number of imperialist aggressions and wars is increasing, we must examine their nature and causes in order to prepare ourselves in an organized manner for resistance. In Latin America and Venezuela, we emphasise that wars of expansion and ethnic expulsions are not anomalies of capitalism, but a consequence of the desire to accumulate capital for profit (Monroe Doctrine).

According to Lenin, “Imperialism, the highest stage of capitalism,” is characterised by several fundamental features:

Concentration of production: Capitalist production has become concentrated in a few large monopolies, leading to the socialisation of production in its most varied aspects.

The new role of banks: The merger of banks with

industrial capital has created a financial oligarchy that has acquired a decisive role in the economy of capitalist countries.

Capital export: The export and import of capital have become extremely important, facilitating the penetration and plundering of less developed countries by the great powers.

International capitalist associations: The formation of international capitalist associations that divide up the world has resulted in the territorial division among the most important capitalist powers.

These features reflect the development of the productive forces under capitalism and are essential to understanding the phenomena of war and imperialism today.

Imperialism essentially involves a nation’s desire and ability to dominate, subjugate, or persuade other nations to act in the interests of the empire itself. Imperialism is not a new phenomenon, but today it can be said to include a new form of colonialism. This type of neocolonialism does not necessarily take over large areas of territory from peoples or nations militarily, but seeks to destroy the sovereignty of established states, weaken them, and impose tutelage on them in its search for natural resources, advantages, and hegemonic power, as we see in the case of Venezuela. Furthermore, today, military warfare has been joined by a new form of warfare: hybrid warfare, which is economic, diplomatic, legalistic, cognitive, and media-based—and equally lethal.

Currently, there is only one empire in the world: the United States of America, and its goal is to remain so—to be the only hegemonic power, the only “Make America Great Again” superpower—with the help of its staunch allies in Europe, Asia, and Canada.

The United States is the only nation with approximately 800 military bases around the globe and fleets in all seas. It has the largest armed forces in the world and is the largest manufacturer and seller of weapons on the planet.

War has been its main instrument and business for much of the 20th century and now the 21st. As a result, Washington's foreign, economic, and financial policies no longer differ from its military objectives.

The private and public spheres in the United States have become largely intertwined through the militarisation of its foreign policy, which masks a deep class struggle, both nationally and internationally, supported by the formidable power of the corporate media.

Empires have always tried to mask their military power behind their narrative façade of courage, quality, superiority, the need to protect, and benevolence. This provides an apparent reason for their domination over other peoples and nations that do not possess these “virtues.”

The American empire cannot maintain its power by force alone, as this would be prohibitively expensive; it needs to convince other nations to submit. An empire achieves this through its ideology, its superstructure, which masks, sustains, and promotes its military infrastructure.

American society—historically, culturally, and psychologically—is steeped in racism and classism, both integral parts of its hegemonic ideology.

However, today, Washington has lost much of its hegemonic aura and its narrative of manifest destiny and as saviour of the world, following a series of failures and lies such as the “domino theory” of the Vietnam War or the claim of the existence of “weapons of mass destruction” used to justify the invasion of Iraq.

The series of futile wars, endless coups, interference in the governments of other nations, and the US government's disregard for international law have not helped either.

In other words, the ideology of US imperialism has worn thin. Whether Washington likes it or not, a multipolar world is emerging economically and politically, and the US justifications are no longer credible.

Savage Capitalism: An Undemocratic System Dominated by Finance

The economic system of imperialism is capitalism, which in its current stage is known as corporate capitalism, once also called “savage capitalism.” Washington is its main exponent.

This system is characterised by a preponderance of corporate finance and speculation. It is only marginally oriented towards production and the satisfaction of citizens' needs; labour and its representatives have been undermined and marginalised by speculative economic activity.

The corporate market largely determines political decisions in this system, thereby undermining democratic institutions such as parliaments, political parties, laws, and the judiciary.

We are witnessing the unbridled power of corporations, which has led to widespread inequality and political polarisation, as economist Thomas Piketty clearly pointed out in his 2013 book *Capital in the Twenty-First Century*.

‘Internal authority’ is also fractured in the United States. Author Chris Hedges even considers that Washington is now “in the final stage of the rise of corporate totalitarianism.”

Financial capitalism contributes nothing of value to the real economy; it is casino capitalism made possible by the degradation of institutions that serve the common good: education, health, trade unions, and families.

A new colonialism has emerged, camouflaged with all kinds of deception: “free trade” (which is not free), promises of “trickle-down” investments (which never trickle down), and supposed “humanitarian interventions” to protect human rights (only some).

Governments in the Global North claim to help countries in the South develop (only when it suits their companies), teach other nations the supposed “rule of law” (based on their own standards), and even promote NGOs to supposedly protect democracy and the environment (while these organisations act as spies and saboteurs).

Venezuela is a case study. Between 2002 and 2012 alone, the National Endowment for Democracy (NED), a CIA entity, donated \$100 million to create 300 NGOs that opposed the Bolivarian Revolution led by President Hugo Chávez.

The forms and consequences of imperialist aggression against Venezuela, in its quest to seize its vast wealth, were masterfully pointed out in Foreign Minister Yvan Gil’s speech at the United Nations General Assembly in September 2025:

“From the first day of his term, President Hugo Chávez courageously adopted a nationalist and sovereign oil policy and embarked on a historic journey to restore the Organisation of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) as a great multilateral instrument and guarantor of global energy security.

Today, 26 years later, world public opinion and the peoples of the world are well aware of everything that US imperialism did to overthrow President Chávez and put an end to the historic liberation project, which was successively endorsed and affirmed by the Venezuelan people in 32 elections.

With the physical departure of President Chávez, the people ratified in multiple electoral and political events the historic project of the emancipation of Venezuela, now led by President Nicolás Maduro. The war waged against us in all forms is well known and widely documented—the criminal aggression that has been carried out against Venezuela over the last decade to seize its natural resources and bring about regime change.

There have been countless attacks against Venezuela, including destabilisation efforts, conspiracies, an assassination attempt using drones, and economic

warfare—the cruelest expression of which is the 1,042 sanctions that have been criminally imposed on the nation’s oil industry and productive sectors—as well as several incursions by mercenaries.

Added to all this is now an absolutely illegal and immoral military threat that violates the United Nations Charter, Venezuela’s rights as a sovereign state, and even the laws of the United States itself. Venezuela thanks this assembly for its solidarity.

It is time for the Global South, it is time for that long-awaited new world order, it is time to consolidate that new multipolar and multicentric world of peace and economic prosperity, free from hegemony. It is time to rescue the principles expressed in the Charter of the United Nations and to honour the fact that this organisation is at the service of the peoples, as stated in its preamble. Venezuela places its Bolivarian diplomacy of peace at the service of humanity to advance in that direction... These are the principles of free peoples, such as solidarity and complementarity.”

The farce that the United States is some kind of “defender” of Latin America against European threats, as proclaimed by the Monroe Doctrine, was exposed, for example, when Washington supported the United Kingdom’s colonial war against Argentina over the Falkland Islands.

The last word on imperialism comes from the eternal guerrilla Che Guevara, who stated: “It is the nature of imperialism to turn men into beasts, into bloodthirsty animals, ready to slaughter, to kill, to destroy the last image of the revolutionary, of the supporter of a government that has fallen under its boot or that is fighting for its freedom.”

Che warned that “imperialism cannot be trusted for a single minute—not even a little.”

There are too many examples to cite—in Latin America, Africa, the Middle East, Asia, and even in the less powerful nations of Europe—all of which have felt the boot of the Yankee empire on their

throats.

The opposite of today's imperialism lies in the social movements and forces that defend Socialism of the 21st Century. It represents the hope for the future of Latin America and the world against the criminality of imperialism.

Attempts at destabilisation, economic blockades, and criminal sanctions have failed to defeat the Bolivarian people, who today:

- Resist through popular, military, and police organisation;
- Advance with socialist-minded innovation;
- Prepare for new challenges toward building the communal state.

As Commander Chávez said: "For now and forever, the revolution will continue on its path." Today, under the leadership of President Nicolás Maduro, that promise is being fulfilled day by day.

Socialism or Barbarism.

We shall overcome.

Sources

Cardozo, Arturo: "Colony, Class Struggles and Independence," Carabobo Bicentennial Collection.

Monal, Isabel: "Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism," Marxist Library, Havana, Cuba.

Piketty, Thomas: "Capital in the 21st Century," Economic Culture Fund of Argentina.

Hedges, Chris: "The Dark Rise of American Fascism," YouTube.

Paez, María: "How the Imperialist System Works, and How Venezuela's Bolivarian Revolution Resists It," RT.

Presidential Press, Miraflores, Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela.

New Right-Wing Movements, Neo-Fascism, and Counterinsurgency

Néstor Kohan (Argentina)

Capital's Responses to the Crises of Capitalism

Contrary to various trends circulating in the social sciences, we begin with a question that places us within a wide-angle perspective—no ‘micro’ cuts or minimalist decorations that seek to evade or ignore the history and context of the debates. We question the era in which we (sur)live, openly discussing the much-talked-about, promoted, and completely false “crisis of grand narratives.”^[1]

As a premise of this work, we maintain that the contemporary emergence of the “new right” is not rooted in the human soul, is not “inherent to our species,” and does not respond to an unfathomable evil or the cruel nature of humanity. We are suspicious of supposed “original sins” and any other kind of metaphysical essence. The rise of neo-fascism is intrinsic to the historical crisis of the global capitalist system.

It is true that planetary “disorder” is not entirely spontaneous. It is fostered, cultivated, and encouraged by large capitalist corporations and their counterinsurgency strategists, known as “the engineers of chaos.” But this engineering of social control (big data, lawfare, fake news, hybrid wars, etc.) is not applied out of mere boredom. It is not just another harmless or innocent way to occupy one’s free time. It is implemented out of a sense of social urgency—the need to confront the crisis of global capitalism.

Our era is marked by a coexistence of diverse antagonistic contradictions within the capitalist social order, converging on the horizon of a long-term structural crisis. This crisis is far more acute and explosive than those of 1929, 1973–1974, and 2007–2008.

We are witnessing not only the crisis of the global capitalist economy in the productive, commercial, and financial spheres; we are also suffering crises of

the environment and ecosystem, demographics, food, health, and of the historical forms of postmodern subjectivity and the commodified culture that gave rise to them. Added to this is a geopolitical crisis of the unipolar world, among many other facets of the complex reality in which we live.

To defend themselves and cope with such a structural and multidimensional crisis, the forces of imperialism and capital are desperately and aggressively thrashing about. In pursuit of this goal, they do not hesitate to bring humanity to the brink of the precipice—even dragging us into the risk of an increasingly imminent third world war.

In the face of each structural crisis, the capitalist system has attempted to deploy various responses, always aimed at ensuring its survival: the reproduction of the system. These responses take economic, political, cultural, and even politico-military forms.

The notorious emergence of furious and extreme “new right-wing” movements is part of a larger whole: the counter-revolutionary attempt to manage the crisis, slow down the decline of Western Euro-North American imperialism, and reduce as much as possible the global tendency for the rate of profit to fall.

In other words, the emergence and development of the “new right” is part of a global counter-revolutionary attempt that is not driven by the “evil” or “madness” of a few powerful individuals. On the contrary, the “new right” constitutes an attempt to shape a capitalist response to the crisis. This response takes different forms, always within the spectrum of the “new right”: fascism and neo-fascism, counterinsurgency, and neo-colonialism.

Discussing the Categories

Before addressing the capitalist counter-revolution in the 20th century and in the current century, let us briefly pause to consider the sphere of categories.

Among many other sacred cows and prestigious names in the social sciences, we highlight, for example, that of Chantal Mouffe. This writer states, with complete levity, that: “I maintain that categories such as ‘fascism’ and ‘far right’ or comparisons with the 1930s are not appropriate [...]”^[2]. To replace them, this essayist of great academic renown invites us to use the slippery term “populism,” which she explored together with Ernesto Laclau.

Can Javier Milei’s far-right experiment in Argentina—recently adopted as an example to follow by various extremists worldwide—or Benjamin Netanyahu’s regime in the Middle East be characterised as “populist”? The negative answer to this question is obvious.

Unfortunately, conceptual ambiguity is not the exclusive property of Chantal Mouffe. Another famous essayist who is currently in vogue, Enzo Traverso, stumbles as he attempts to climb the theoretical slope to grasp the specificity of contemporary right-wing extremism. If “populism” is too loose, indeterminate, and polysemic a category, Traverso can think of no better idea than to replace it with “post-fascism,” which not only explains nothing (except that the political and cultural phenomena of recent times are taking place decades after the regimes of Mussolini, Hitler, Franco, and Salazar), but also represents an unnecessary capitulation to “post-” fashions (post-structuralism, postmodernism, post-Marxism, post-workerism, postcolonial studies, etc.), to which we can now add... post-fascism.

In Traverso’s case, moreover, the vagueness and theoretical eclecticism are exacerbated when he attempts to oppose, in the face of supposed “post-fascism,” nothing less than “democracy” (sic)—thus, in general, without qualification, without social determinations.^[3]

Further adding to the ideological confusion and fuelling the theoretical eclecticism that seems to

reign in the field that perceives itself as “emancipatory” or “progressive,” Jean-Yves Camus and Nicolas Lebourg expound at length, appealing to this mixed bag of categories, with the sole distinction that these two essayists at least attempt to differentiate between “radical populism, of a neoliberal, even libertarian nature,” and “authoritarian national populism.”^[4]

Do we then accept the limitations of this type of purely nominal definition, without any anchoring in socio-economic and historical determinations or any theoretical problematisation?

To avoid falling into such conceptual misunderstandings, ambiguities, and inaccuracies—so often cultivated by postmodern essay writing (and its “post” derivatives)—it is advisable first to agree on the precise content and specific meaning of the central categories used here: “counter-revolution,” “fascism,” and “counterinsurgency.”

The social phenomenon of counter-revolution constitutes that type of reaction by capital against the labour force and oppressed peoples that occurs when the global capitalist system is undergoing an acute crisis and the subaltern classes become undisciplined and refuse to passively accept their subordination to the “normal” order of capitalist hegemony. This reaction consists of the response of capital to a fundamental threat, where its historical mode of production, reproduction, and domination is endangered.

Its manifestations are diverse and broad, united by a common denominator: the counter-revolutionary offensive of capitalism and imperialism as a whole, guided by a strategic defence of the system.

This is not a “passive revolution,” as Antonio Gramsci calls the partial reforms carried out “from above,” which molecularly modify the balance of power between classes by making concessions under the control of capital with the aim of preserving the socio-political order. Unlike such processes, which often coexist with counter-revolution, the latter takes on a much more radical, generalised, violent, and strategic character—characterised by a global

impulse confronting the workforce and all rebellious peoples who do not meekly obey the despotic dictates of capital in various fields (economic, social, cultural, political, and even military).

Every deep crisis of the system of capital's domination produces a capitalist response—not the periodic crises of overproduction or stagnation, but long-term, global structural crises in which previous social stabilities explode due to their multiple contradictions. The aim is to reorder society, generating social ruptures—separating and fracturing in order to reunite—thus reactivating the processes of extreme violence that characterised the so-called “primitive accumulation” of capital, while recomposing and reinforcing capitalist domination.

Fascism and Its Multiple Forms

According to the widely known definition formulated by the Bulgarian communist leader Georgi Dimitrov in the reports to the Seventh Congress of the Communist International in 1935, fascism consists of “the open terrorist dictatorship of the most reactionary, most nationalist, and most imperialist elements of finance capital.”^[5]

Other Marxists, such as the Russian Bolshevik leader Leon Trotsky and the Peruvian Marxist José Carlos Mariátegui, have emphasised that although fascism undoubtedly benefits big capital due to its class character, its main mass force and base of manoeuvre—for example, in the personnel of the shock troops and the members of its gigantic repressive police—is drawn from the petty bourgeoisie, since fascism benefits big capital not directly through the economy but through political mediation. In this form, state repression of the working class (its trade unions and political parties, replaced by a corporate order completely subordinate to the capitalist state) and its potential allies becomes partially independent from its main beneficiaries, taking on “Bonapartist” forms (a category that Karl Marx devised to explain the counter-revolutionary coup d'état of December 1851 in France, a country then shaken by a workers' and popular rebellion stemming from the insurrec-

tion of 1848).

For his part, the Italian communist Antonio Gramsci added that fascism, essentially counter-revolutionary, also takes on “Caesarist” political forms, with an apparently unstable balance between the disputing classes (even persecuting Freemasonry in order to replace its personnel in the state administration with its own). Ultimately, however, it directly benefits big capital, since, in his view, bourgeois democracy and fascism divide the tasks in their struggle against the working classes.^[6]

Reducing the characterisation of “fascism” exclusively to a single national reality and a single historical experience (for example, Italy between 1922 and 1945) implies an illegitimate restriction of the category. The same would happen if the notion of “Bonapartism” were used exclusively to refer to France between December 1851 and 1870.

The categories of Marxist critical theory are not limited to a purely descriptive, linear snapshot of a single economic-social formation at a given moment. They have a broader explanatory scope—much to the displeasure of Lyotard and his followers. Even Dimitrov himself, one of the first to systematise this notion in his attempt to rethink the counter-revolutionary forms of imperialist capital, clarifies that “the development of fascism and its dictatorship takes different forms [Dimitrov's emphasis, N.K.] in different countries, depending on historical, social, and economic conditions; according to national particularities and the international position of the given country.”^[7]

This variety of conceptual characterisations of fascism becomes even more complex if the category is used to explain Latin American civil-military dictatorships—equally genocidal and promoters of capitalist counter-revolution—not in the metropolitan centres of the imperialist countries, but in the dependent capitalist peripheries.

For example, in a debate held in Mexico four decades after Georgi Dimitrov's thesis was formulated—more precisely on 20 July 1978—at a permanent seminar on Latin America (SEPLA) entitled “The External Sources of Fascism: Latin American Fascism and

the Interests of Imperialism,” Ecuadorian Marxist researcher Agustín Cueva, while maintaining strong sympathy for Dimitrov’s definition, argued that the Latin American military dictatorships of the 1970s (Pinochet, Videla, Stroessner, Somoza, etc.) had directly fascist forms.

Brazilian Marxist theorist Theotonio Dos Santos responded to this conceptualisation by arguing that, if the capitalist response with fascist connotations predominated in Latin America in the face of various emancipatory and revolutionary processes, this fascism took on specific forms, different from those of Europe in the 1930s and 1940s (which Dimitrov had in mind), noting that in Our America, a “dependent fascism”^[8] predominated.

In his response to Agustín Cueva, Theotonio Dos Santos—without having read or known him—nonetheless converged with the reflection that, four decades earlier (in 1938), had been formulated by the Argentine Marxist thinker Ernesto Giudici.

Giudici, linking Latin American anti-fascism (which identified Nazi Germany as the main enemy) with anti-imperialism (which focused its strategy on the struggle against British and American domination over Our America), sought to problematise and deepen Dimitrov’s reflection in various directions.

On the one hand, Giudici argued that fascism is not only “the terrorist dictatorship of big monopoly capital” but also “the totalitarian, terrorist, and permanent dictatorship of the bourgeoisie dependent on finance capital, whatever the degree of its capitalist development” [emphasis added by N.K.]^[9].

In this way, Marxist critical theory could explain a phenomenon of universal scope—not only European—but also including the counter-revolutionary forms that periodically reappear in different societies of the Third World or Global South. Furthermore, Giudici, while still a member of the Communist International, reproached Dimitrov for limiting his theoretical definition by overemphasising the economic dimension (centred on monopoly capitalism), adding that fascism expresses itself not only economically but also politically, assuming specific cultural

forms and combining these three dimensions differently according to each socio-economic formation and specific situation of class struggle.^[10]

Giudici’s Marxist reflection remains extremely useful for rethinking and analysing the dissimilar and specific characteristics assumed in each society by the global emergence of the “new” counterinsurgent far right in our own day—both in Europe and the United States, and in Latin America.

In turn, Bolivian theorist René Zavaleta Mercado added that in Our America, fascist and crypto-fascist regimes are not born or developed as the result of a national project, but under U.S. hegemony and direction,^[11] a thesis with which Theotonio Dos Santos^[12] would agree.

Returning to the debate in Mexico in 1978, Brazilian Marxist Ruy Mauro Marini (an internationalist activist, like Theotonio Dos Santos, in Chile during the Salvador Allende era) added a supplementary characterisation to the theories of Cueva and Dos Santos, proposing that the capitalist counter-revolution of the 1970s in Latin America be understood as a global process aimed at establishing, on a continental scale and under U.S. imperialist domination, “counterinsurgency states.”^[13]

At this point, having sought to explain the precise content and fundamental attributes of two political categories—counter-revolution and fascism—we encounter difficulties in specifying the content of a third: counterinsurgency.

Counterinsurgency in the Era of Imperialism

Irregular forms of combat between asymmetrical forces (where insurgents fight against an invading army or vastly superior forces in numbers, equipment, and resources that wage a counterinsurgency war) are very old and certainly predate the 20th and 21st centuries.

Suffice it to recall, for example, the irregular resistance of the Spanish guerrillas against Napoleon’s armies in the first decade of the 19th century in Europe. The same is true of the black slave guerrillas in Haiti against the invading French troops (from the

last decade of the 18th century until their victory in 1804); the indigenous insurgency in Upper Peru (now the Plurinational State of Bolivia) led by the guerrillas of Juana Azurduy and Manuel Ascencio Padilla against Spanish colonialism in the early decades of the 19th century; and the irregular forces of the Venezuelan llaneros led by Páez, Arismendi, and Piar under the leadership of Simón Bolívar, as well as the guerrilla forces of Warnes, Arenales, Martín Miguel de Güemes, and Juana Azurduy, fighters of the anti-colonial forces led by San Martín, during the American wars of independence in the second decade of the 19th century.

Faced with all these insurgent forces, the political-military enemy—whether from another invading capitalist power (as in the case of Napoleon in Spain) or from European colonialism (as in the case of the South American guerrillas)—developed forms of counterinsurgency warfare.

However, modern counterinsurgency has specific attributes, qualities, and modalities that only reached full development from the end of the 19th century onwards, with the rise of capitalism in its fully developed phase of imperialism.

A contemporary definition of insurgency—by no means scholastic or speculative, but fully operational—can be found in Field Manual 3-24: Counterinsurgency (written under the direction of Generals David H. Petraeus and James F. Amos, 2006, Washington: Department of the Army):

“Insurgency is an organised, protracted, political-military struggle designed to undermine the control and legitimacy of an established government, an occupying force, or another political authority, while increasing insurgent control.”

It adds that it is “typically a form of internal warfare, one that occurs primarily within a state, not between states, and one that contains at least certain elements of civil war. Counterinsurgency refers to military, paramilitary, political, economic, psychological, and civic actions carried out by a government to defeat the insurgency.”^[14]

As a political-military means of fighting rebel

forces, counterinsurgency became widespread on a global scale after the Second World War.^[15]

In this historical phase of capitalism, where imperialism predominates, the category of counterinsurgency helps explain and account for:

(a) the general capitalist response to the crisis of the system of accumulation and reproduction;

(b) the political form assumed by the state when it becomes partially independent from the dominant classes it claims to defend, in the face of the insurgent threat of labour and the popular camp;

(c) the specifically political-military and counterinsurgent character assumed by class struggle when the capitalist counter-revolution sets out not only to resolve the crisis of the system and repress the popular camp, but also to crush the insurgent revolutionary movement—usually through annihilation and genocide, far beyond mere police repression.

Counterinsurgency becomes genocidal and adopts the decision to annihilate when it faces an enemy social force that is organised, morally and materially prepared for confrontation, equipped with a defined strategy aimed at revolution and the seizure of power, and capable of flexibly managing different fronts and forms of struggle (legal, semi-legal, clandestine; economic, cultural, political, and military—all at once, within a global insurgency project).

Conversely, counterinsurgency remains preventive when its historical enemy exercises rebellion and indiscipline in a series of spontaneous protests, whether of an economic-corporate nature (for stable employment, wages, health, education, housing, etc.) or in defence of special rights as distinct social groups (sexual freedoms, legal rights, freedom of the press and information, etc.). In this latter case, the enemy has not yet structured itself into a long-term belligerent force, due to political or ideological weakness, social fragmentation, or the absence of a coherent strategy for the seizure of power.

In this sense, Ruy Mauro Marini’s conceptualisation can be refined by differentiating between counterinsurgency states where the military objective focuses primarily on annihilation, and those where counter-

insurgency remains at a preventive, “low-intensity” level—exercised even under republican forms, with periodic elections and a functioning parliament, but framed within a clearly counterinsurgent strategy.

Why would there be counterinsurgency if there is no active political-military insurgency? Because the forces of capital do not wait until the last minute—until “civil war breaks out”—to begin identifying, registering, classifying, monitoring, and subjugating their enemies. Annihilation is prepared years in advance, during which prevention still predominates.

If we accept this complexity of categorisation and refine our conceptual definitions, then we can not only differentiate between two types of counterinsurgency (active-operational and preventive), but also understand that fascist and neo-fascist forms do not always depend on mass mobilisation as a defining characteristic. There may be forms of fascism that relied from the outset on mass mobilisation (as in Italy and Germany until their defeat in the Second World War at the hands of the Red Army and the communist partisans), but there may also be others where counter-revolutionary terror—using methods copied from Nazism, such as torture, extermination camps, and anti-Semitism—was exercised by police and military forces without mass mobilisation, or even against it.

Furthermore, fascist and neo-fascist movements and regimes are not exclusively “political” in nature. They are economic, political, cultural, and politico-military phenomena. The archetypal case of German fascism, known as Nazism, is highly illustrative. In books, articles, films, and documentaries, it is often reduced to a purely political and military phenomenon. Little attention is usually paid to its economic and social structure, which remained largely intact after its crushing defeat in 1945 at the hands of the Red Army. In Nuremberg, priority was given to the trial of genocidal perpetrators in brown uniforms, while the capitalist companies that made fortunes from Nazism and enabled its rise remained largely unpunished (Muchnik, 1999). Most of them continued to operate, recycled after 1945 under new

names—many still active to this day.

The Dead End and Capitulations of the “Anti-Totalitarian” School

Why is it so difficult, complex, and elusive to conceptualise, theorise, and reflect on the new extreme right and neo-fascism of the 21st century? Because there is a vast jungle of ideological justifications that present themselves as “anti-totalitarian” and, therefore, anti-fascist, when in reality they are covert apologists for the extreme right.

To the shameful list of mandarins of imperialist power—clearly denialist—who write freely in an attempt to sweep under the carpet, cover up, diminish, and even justify the genocidal practices of Nazi imperialism, we must add a neighbouring and adjacent school, scandalously close to the shameless apologists of the German Führer and his uniformed butchers of Italian fascism and Spanish Francoism.

This is the “anti-totalitarian” current, so obsessed with combating any possible resurgence of social revolution or red communism that its members—refined swindlers who have abandoned any semblance of historiographical seriousness—end up equating, through circus juggling and fairground sleight of hand, the triumph of the Bolshevik Revolution and the mere existence of the Soviet Union with Hitler’s Germany and its “Final Solution” (a euphemism used to justify one of the greatest genocides in human history, comparable only—as Aimé Césaire warned in 1955 in his *Discourse on Colonialism*—to what European colonialism had previously done to the African and Indigenous peoples of Our America).

In this neighbouring school, equally infected by the anti-communist rage of pro-Nazi deniers, the fauna is varied and diverse. It includes a few academics who pose as defenders of “ultra-neoliberal” Western conservatism (from whose coordinates they strive to minimise the Nazi massacres, shielding them under the frayed umbrella of the “European civil war” and the most fanatical anti-communism), to media buffoons—less attached to academic norms and more attentive to the staging of McCarthyist show busi-

ness.

Among the former is François Furet, a French historian (once prestigious), a former Marxist turned pitiful crusader against communism, a movement he had belonged to between 1949 and 1956. Disappointed with communism, as was the epistemologist Karl Popper—initially a communist activist in Austria and later a guru of fundamentalist neoliberalism—Furet ended up fighting against the red flag without shame, sowing the seeds of what he now claims as the leitmotif of the international coordination of the most extreme new European right.^[16]

His pathetic German co-pilot is the historian Ernst Nolte (ultra-Catholic by training, a direct disciple and friend of Martin Heidegger, as could hardly be otherwise), who competes with his French colleague to see who wins the European cup of the most deranged anti-communism.^[17]

Furet commented on Nolte's libel, to which Nolte responded with a letter. The correspondence between the two, originally published in the magazine *Commentaire*, comprised eight letters in total between 1997 and 1998 and was later published as a single book under a title that unequivocally leads us to an identification that is, in itself, absurd and delusional: *Fascism and Communism*.^[18]

Both historians ended their intellectual careers as radical right-wing extremists. But Nolte, in particular—though he assumes the exaggerated appearance of a supposed “liberal” character for obvious opportunistic academic reasons—comes remarkably close to the revisionists and neo-Nazi deniers, casting doubt on the number of people annihilated in the Nazi extermination camps or giving the benefit of the doubt to the columns of smoke from the crematoria at Auschwitz, which revisionists characterised as... “an optical illusion” [sic].^[19]

The mockery of all serious historiographical research is devoid of intellectual honesty, even from the most recalcitrant right-wing standpoint. Following his own logic: could the mushroom clouds from the nuclear bombs in Hiroshima and Nagasaki have been smoke from a barbecue organised by disoriented

Japanese tourists at a summer campsite? Only an intellectual lumpen like Ernst Nolte could afford to mock and degrade fundamental and emblematic elements of the Nazi genocide with impunity—because he is German. If a Paraguayan, Guatemalan, Mexican, or Argentine historian did the same, they would be thrown in jail or invited to appear on a tasteless, low-brow comedy show.

Nolte added to this extremist and counter-revolutionary constellation one of the propaganda ideas that has since become a mantra: Islamophobia—even going so far as to equate the political tradition of Islam with fascism. This nonsense, without evidence, logic, or coherence, has unfortunately been adopted by the international coordination of the extreme right, even in countries once governed by tolerant, pro-capitalist social democracies.^[20]

Neither Nolte nor Furet are alone in their respective countries in this counterinsurgency crusade of the Knights Templar—half grotesque, half pathetic—that obsessively seeks to eradicate and bury once and for all any trace of anti-capitalist insurgency, Marxism, and communism, while diluting, diminishing, justifying, and, when possible, outright denying the Nazi genocide.

Nolte is accompanied, as he proudly notes whenever possible, by a pitiful team that panics every time it imagines seeing, from afar, through binoculars and a window, a tiny red flag: the insufferable Klaus Hildebrand, Andreas Hillgruber, and Michael Stürmer. All of them have happily thrown overboard the justified “guilt” once expressed by the existentialist philosopher Karl Jaspers on behalf of the German people for having enthusiastically supported Hitler.

And Furet, poor man, was luckier—he had a chorus of companions even more frivolous, banal, and superficial than Nolte's boring, fascist, and unbearable German associates. These are the bombastic and histrionic “New Philosophers,” who are neither new nor philosophers. Among them are Maurice Clavel, Jean-Marie Benoist, André Glucksmann, Jean-Paul Dollé, and Gilles Susong, among other sellers of black-and-white televisions and promoters of raffles

for trips to Disney in shopping malls.

But the most media-savvy of them all is undoubtedly Bernard-Henri Lévy—a fanatical Zionist, promoter of France’s neo-colonial adventures in North Africa (for example, NATO’s imperialist intervention in Libya and the assassination of its president), and a tireless gladiator legitimising the “right to intervene” of U.S. imperialism anywhere on the planet.

Many of them came from the Parisian university elite and briefly showed their faces at the student assemblies of 1968 purely by chance—the year the famous protests erupted. But they became “disenchanted” with Marxism faster than it took them to change their underwear. In one of his few honest writings, Bernard-Henri Lévy confessed that he had betrayed himself many times... before he turned thirty! A complete renegade at such a young age, before even becoming an intellectual—a confession that speaks for itself.

None of these pampered children of the most reactionary elements of the French right—racist, colonialist, pro-Zionist, and xenophobic—ever endured decades of militancy before switching sides in old age out of “maturity” or exhaustion. Had that been the case, their retreat from Marxism might be debatable but, at least, understandable.

This is absolutely not the case with the self-styled “New Philosophers”! Bernard-Henri Lévy engaged in a brief season of ideological tourism in the Maoism of the Gauche Prolétarienne [Proletarian Left], then lived for decades off his unrestrained anti-Marxism and blatant Zionism—for which he was handsomely paid. A lucrative, risk-free business. A lifetime of holidays guaranteed—through Zionism—in Israel, the colonialist and genocidal spearhead of Western imperialism in the Middle East. Had he been born in Latin America, he would surely have enjoyed holidays in Miami or in Colombia, the counterinsurgency narco-state historically known as “the Israel of Latin America.”

His rapid transition—what Samir Amin ironically called “the religious spirit of extreme intellectuals who swing from one extreme to the other without

a problem” (Amin, 2008: 221)—resembled a change of shoes or hairstyle more than the development of a coherent theoretical corpus. Perhaps it is no coincidence that his Spanish counterpart, less “chic” and more grey, the best-selling publicist and current admirer of Generalissimo Francisco Franco, Pío Moa, also passed through that curious and exotic phase of “European-style Maoism” during his acne-ridden youth.

Bernard-Henri Lévy’s tireless defence of the colonialist, racist, exclusivist, Islamophobic, and pro-American policy of the State of Israel—whether in the French press or in the Spanish *Prisa* group, where he is a regular columnist—reached such a point that in January 2006, during a lecture at the Council on Foreign Relations in New York (founded by David Rockefeller), he declared that “Anti-Americanism is the new anti-Semitism,” equating criticism of U.S. imperialism with anti-Semitic ideology. What nonsense! According to this shameless and arbitrary logic, the American Jewish thinker Noam Chomsky—who has published dozens of works criticising U.S. imperialism—would be... an anti-Semite!

If such arguments—and his brazen defence of Western racism, neocolonialism, and imperialism—were shouted by a drunk in a pub, they would provoke laughter or mockery. But their promoter, applauded by the French far right and the official European establishment, is none other than the anti-communist Bernard-Henri Lévy, who lends himself prestige by posing as a disciple of... Jacques Derrida, the father of “deconstruction.” Oh, what a coincidence!

That is why old François Furet had such bad luck in his anti-communist career, even though he tried hard to ally himself with his German squire. With such co-drivers and such an unserious team of mechanics, no one is going to win a rally—no matter how many prestigious diplomas they hold from the conservative academies of the old 19th-century capital, as Walter Benjamin called it.

In terms of intellectual history, both Nolte’s German anti-communist school and his gang of unscrupulous accomplices, as well as Furet’s anti-Marxist clique—

Bernard-Henri Lévy and his French cohorts—fed on what is commonly known as the ideological current of “anti-totalitarianism,” which lightly equates communism with Nazism.

Hannah Arendt, exiled in the United States, published *The Origins of Totalitarianism* in 1951, at the height of McCarthy’s witch hunt—when Charles Chaplin, Bertolt Brecht, and Howard Fast were persecuted, and shady trials targeted anyone suspected of “progressivism.” The labour movement, trade unions, and film industry were harshly repressed. More than 30,000 books were censored or banned in the United States, while private conversations, family gatherings, and meetings between friends were monitored... and many people who had never read two pages of Marx ended up in prison “just in case.”

All this was legitimised through rigged trials, false accusations, anonymous denunciations, and secret interrogations—crowned by the infamous blacklists. A veritable witch hunt that inspired Arthur Miller’s play *The Crucible* (1952).

Of course, in the field of racism and apartheid against African Americans in the southern United States, McCarthy innovated nothing new. The Ku Klux Klan and its heirs had long been lynching, segregating, and persecuting Black people without anyone being horrified. Everything continued—and continues—as “normal” in the United States. That is not an “anti-American invention,” as Bernard-Henri Lévy would claim. Someone as far from anti-imperialism as former U.S. President Bill Clinton was forced to apologise publicly in 1997 for the Tuskegee syphilis experiments, in which more than 400 Black men were deliberately left untreated as human guinea pigs.

Yet neither Hannah Arendt nor the “anti-totalitarian” school she inspired in the United States and Western Europe ever dared to focus their analyses on Senator McCarthy’s persecutions and anti-communist, xenophobic, racist abuses aimed at total population control. When Arendt mentions them—in a 620-page tome—it is only in a microscopic footnote of just three lines!^[21] Quite simply: embar-

assing.

It is no coincidence that the historian of ideas and political culture Domenico Losurdo characterised this “anti-totalitarian” crusade as a direct product of the Cold War and anti-communism, dismantling its claim to equate communism and Nazism as “artificial,” “contrived,” and “an adaptation to the Cold War.”^[22]

A similar intellectual imposture and ideological capitulation befell other European intellectuals exiled in the United States, who suddenly became “anti-totalitarian,” denouncing “Eastern despotism” and focusing on the crusade against communism. A lesser-known but telling case is that of the former German communist Karl August Wittfogel, once a member of the Frankfurt School—later co-opted in the U.S. for the most fanatical anti-communist crusades.

In *The Origins of Totalitarianism*, Arendt’s reflection on anti-Semitism is central—but there is not a single mention of Henry Ford, one of Hitler’s idols and a key inspiration for Goebbels and Himmler.^[23] Not a single line, not even a footnote! And yet Arendt was writing in the U.S., with every library and archive available to her. Was it too difficult to find and analyse Ford’s legacy in American political culture? Hardly.

Antonio Gramsci, who never set foot in the U.S., focused his attention on “Fordism” when reflecting on “Americanism” in his *Prison Notebooks*—written almost two decades before Arendt’s book (Notebook 22, 1934).

When it comes to judging the racist, supremacist, and anti-Semitic traditions of the United States, Arendt’s supposedly “anti-totalitarian” work is conspicuously silent.

Those blank pages, those deafening silences, make *The Origins of Totalitarianism* creak. The omissions do not stem from ignorance but from complicity.

Did Wittfogel suddenly forget everything he researched in Frankfurt when he denounced his former comrades as communists during the McCarthy witch hunts? Was Arendt not struck by the fact

that Henry Ford—an icon of American industrial culture—was honoured by Hitler himself?

To understand Arendt’s ideological compromises, one might argue she had to “negotiate” with the prevailing U.S. ideology of the early 1950s. But half a century later, it is indefensible to maintain that same hermeneutic line—yet Enzo Traverso, in *Totalitarianism: A History of a Debate*, still insists on the homology between communism and Nazism, ignoring the genocides committed by Britain, France, and the U.S. throughout the colonial world.^[24]

From Arendt through Wittfogel to Traverso, the “anti-totalitarian” school—perhaps even against its own intentions—is accompanied by certain undesirable friendships.

We must not forget that Ludwig von Mises, in his anti-communist hatred and opposition to “totalitarianism,” did not hesitate to defend the supposed merits of Mussolini’s fascism. In one of his “classics” of the Austrian school, *Liberalism* (1927), reprinted countless times until 2015 without alteration, von Mises declared:

“It cannot be denied that fascism and all similar dictatorial tendencies are animated by the best of intentions, and that their intervention has saved European civilisation for the time being. The merits acquired by fascism will remain forever in history.”^[25]

Let us remember that, in the name of “anti-totalitarianism,” the Austrian economist wrote this five years after Mussolini took power and one year after Antonio Gramsci was imprisoned.

Through the paradoxes of cultural history, both the French convert (Furet) and his German anti-communist associates (led by Nolte), inspired by Cold War “anti-totalitarianism,” ended up wallowing in the same mud as the neo-Nazi revisionists—without distancing themselves from the neoclassical economists, the fathers of neoliberalism, even in its most extreme “Austrian” version. All of them were unbridled right-wingers, defenders of big business and the single party of imperialist capital.

In their furious crusade against any real or imagined

memory of communism and the red flag, Furet and Nolte are undoubtedly much closer to the neo-Nazi denialist camp than they themselves imagine—for in many of their works they tried to minimise Hitler’s genocide, extravagantly attributing it to supposed “Asian influences.”

Neo-Nazism and Denialism

Over the last few decades, openly and violently pro-imperialist geopolitical strategies and practices have played a fundamental role among the think tanks and the ruling and dominant classes of Western Europe and the United States of America. It is no coincidence that these strategies and practices have abandoned previous pacifist, republican, and liberal gestures and postures to flirt openly with neo-fascist and apologetic positions that attempt to minimize Nazism—or even openly sympathize with this movement.

It is by no means random that, in recent years, traditional Nazi groups, updated neo-Nazis, Falangists, Francoists, fascists, and the entire supremacist chorus surrounding them have achieved social visibility, electoral legality, absolute “tolerance” on the part of the bourgeoisie previously identified with bourgeois republicanism, and brazen media promotion. This is true both in Western Europe and in the European countries and republics of the former Soviet orbit that have fanatically converted to anti-communism (with euphoric entry into NATO), as well as within the United States, the main gendarme of Western imperialism and the cradle of McCarthyism.

This alarming resurgence of supremacism and neo-Nazism—which justifies or even openly defends imperialist, colonialist, racist, xenophobic, and genocidal policies—was historically preceded, in the American case, by the old fundamentalist theories of Manifest Destiny and the Monroe Doctrine, by the supremacist apologetics of the Western and North American white race in Henry Ford’s *The International Jew*, as well as by the more contemporary trends of denialism and revisionism. The latter attempt to deny, question, or, if unavoidable, justify

the fierce and brutal Nazi–fascist–Franco genocide perpetrated first during the Spanish Civil War and then during the Second World War.

Among the strict deniers, cover-ups, and justifiers of German Nazism, the following stand out: Harry Elmer Barnes, David Hoggan, Austin App, and Willis Carto in the United States; Louis Darquier de Pellepoix, Robert Faurisson, and Jean-Marie and Marine Le Pen in France; and David Irving in England—among many other intellectual frauds, all of whom are fanatical anti-Marxists and uncontrolled anti-communists. To all of them can be added the Spaniard Pío Moa, an exotic yet pitiful former leftist turned vulgar writer of commercial literature, who has achieved fame by disseminating popular hagiographies of Generalissimo Francisco Franco. A staunch denier of the massacres in Spain, Moa is a degraded and peripheral, second-rate version of the Nazi deniers.

These literary representatives of the intellectual Lower Paleolithic are accompanied by more media-recognized “stars” of the political Parnassus, such as Matteo Salvini in Italy, the neo-fascist Vox group in Spain, the far-right Frauke Petry in Germany, the extremist Geert Wilders in the Netherlands, and Jörg Haider (now deceased) of Austria—himself the son of a Nazi and a neo-Nazi in his own right—among many other devoted admirers of the swastika, black leather, and brown shirts.

While the former attempt to perfume and soften Nazi filth with their writing—which is impossible to hide and stinks even if we close our eyes and cover our noses—the latter strive to modernize and update the old fascist forms of social reorganization in the realm of state politics and large media monopolies. In both cases—writers and political representatives—the goal is the same: to defend and promote counterinsurgency in a vain attempt to “save” the imperialist system of twilight capitalism in the face of the undeniable crisis of the unipolar world.

The “New” Neo-Fascist Right

In publications promoting German Nazi denialism,

Italian neo-fascist revisionism, Spanish neo-Francoism, and the militant anti-communism of various “anti-totalitarian” schools (whether French, German, American, etc.)—all historically preceded by the pro-imperialist doctrines of Monroe and the Manifest Destiny of the United States, as well as by Ford’s anti-Semitic newspapers and volumes—although often delusional and quasi-psychedelic, the crusaders’ arguments attempt to weave together a minimal “theoretical” discourse (in multiple quotation marks). With no small amount of eclecticism and an abundance of pragmatic opportunism, Zionism joins this ghost train, accompanied by the pro-Nazi sympathies allegedly shown by Zelensky in Ukraine (who publicly honors Stepan Bandera, a collaborator of Hitler) and the neo-Nazi exaltation of the Croats (who praise Ante Pavelić, another pawn of the Führer). In a disjointed and fragmented manner—uttering sloppy platitudes and falsified historical data, sinking knee-deep into the most primitive and reactionary atavistic prejudices—these movements share a common basis: an extreme right-wing ideology that seeks to legitimize the neo-colonial domination of the great Western powers and the super-exploitation of the working class in the Global South.

Following this nauseating thread, in the so-called “new Europe” of the 21st century, an extremist mass conservatism has emerged—brutally xenophobic, Islamophobic, and unashamedly nostalgic for the fascist, Nazi, and Francoist counter-revolutions of the first half of the 20th century.

The “bait” used to justify xenophobia and supremacist aspirations lies in the claim that millions of Africans, Arabs, Muslims, Hindus, and Asians (accompanied by no few “Sudacas” from Latin America) have flocked en masse to the capitalist metropolises of the West, fleeing hunger, super-exploitation, wars of conquest and plunder, and various genocides in their peripheral societies of origin.

Let us not forget that the “civilized” and “democratic” former German Chancellor Angela Merkel declared in Potsdam, a few days after meeting with the Prime Minister of Turkey in October 2010:

“In the early 1960s, our country [the Federal Republic of Germany—N.K.] invited foreign workers to come and work in Germany, and now they live in our country [...] We have deceived ourselves. We said, ‘They won’t stay; they’ll leave at some point.’ But this is not the case [...] And, of course, this vision of a multicultural [society], of living together and enjoying each other’s company [...] has failed completely.”

“Aryan” and “white” Europe felt offended, displaced, and even socially and culturally invaded by this massive dark-skinned workforce—good for cleaning toilets and sweeping floors, as well as for rough factory work, but not for sharing citizenship in the European community. At best, they manage to achieve second-class citizenship. This applies both to the Muslims and Africans arriving in France and to the Turks and Syrians migrating to Germany.

Official Europe, Western-oriented and Eurocentric to the core, for decades believed it had finally left behind Nazi eugenics and ethnic cleansing as an embarrassing “sin of youth,” yet it never abandoned its claims of “racial purity.” Today, it asserts them publicly and without much embarrassment. The masks and pretenses have fallen away. It is disturbed by the smell of Muslim-style roast meat and by the sight of metros full of dark faces, when the immigrant workforce dares to leave the suburbs of the big cities (where it is clearly marginalized) and—often with fear—ventures into urban spaces traditionally reserved for “whites.”

The rebelliousness of immigrant youth manifests itself socially in recurring waves, and the forces of repression (police and military) do not hesitate to adopt clearly counter-insurgency strategies of containment and confrontation. The role of the so-called “French school” of counter-insurgency warfare in the colonies, and the fierce repression suffered by extra-parliamentary insurgencies within Western Europe itself (in Germany, Italy, France, Great Britain, and Spain) from the late 1960s through the 1970s—and, in some cases, particularly in Spain and southern France, until just a few years ago—remains

well remembered.

Thus, hand in hand with linguistic, religious, and ethnic discomfort in the face of dark-skinned immigration—or in response to the rebellions of nations without their own state—the omnipresent specter of neo-fascist political reaction reappears once again: sometimes presented in its fierce and rudimentary original guise, and sometimes with an updated air of commercial “efficiency” and cold parliamentary “modernity.” It is no coincidence that these extreme right-wing forces, which never completely disappeared but have now gained mass support, combine everything from excessive street violence and shock groups to institutional participation in conventional parliamentary regimes (such as the European Parliament or the U.S. Congress), often with the barely concealed approval of the old parliamentary formations and traditional political representations of the post-war period.

The “New Right”: A Hybrid of Neo-Fascism and Extreme Neoliberalism

Without abandoning conceptual and categorical precision but moving closer in time to the “new” extreme right-wing movements of the last two decades (that is, placing ourselves in the heart of the 21st century), we may observe counterinsurgency fascisms that are once again attempting a capitalist response to the systemic crisis by promoting discourses and practices centered on xenophobia, racial supremacism, and national exclusivism (for example, in Spain and France, where Islamophobia and anti-Semitism are combined in an eclectic and even contradictory manner, without much concern for logical consistency or political coherence); others where localist and secessionist rhetoric predominates (for example, in northern Italy, where anti-immigrant xenophobia has re-emerged in the foreground and has today [2025] become state policy in Italy); and still others where neo-Nazi propaganda invokes an idealized and melancholic “New European Order” (mainly in countries that previously belonged to the Soviet sphere of influence and currently culti-

vate a nostalgic anti-communism reminiscent of the Third Reich and its collaborationist regimes, with the geopolitical intention of being accepted into the European Westernism of NATO).

In the latter case, the aim is a capitalist response to the crisis that is continental in nature, not merely local. Always, of course, beyond all these nuances, attributes, and differentiated models, these movements rely on a shared foundation: counterinsurgency—a capitalist shock “reaction” against communism and the legacy inspired by Karl Marx—that is, directing this response of capitalist imperialism against the organized workforce and the anti-imperialist and anti-colonialist liberation movements of the Global South.

And while neo-fascists, neo-Nazis, and the extreme “new right” vary significantly in tone, rhetoric, marketing, staging, and the priority axes of their political propaganda, their economic projects are not very different. All share, we reiterate, the same axis of capitalist response to the crisis: the promotion of counterinsurgency measures (active or preventive) against social movements and rebellious political forces, as well as a policy of “shock” against the historical rights of the workforce (promoting employer-led “labor reforms,” the planned destruction of pensions, and the dogmatic elimination of all state subsidies not directed at large companies and banks).

This wide-ranging zoological fauna weaves together pragmatic alliances around this “program,” both in Europe and the United States and in dependent and peripheral capitalist countries. However, these ultra-right extremists maintain an extremely opportunistic flexibility when it comes to discussing which specific type of capitalist response to promote on a strictly economic level.

Some forces on the extreme right appeal to ideological confusion by calling themselves “libertarians.” Anyone even minimally informed knows that the term “libertarian” is synonymous with “anarchist,” a cousin of communism with which it once shared the International Workingmen’s Association (IWA or First International). However, just as the German

Nazis happily used the term “socialist” to identify themselves while mercilessly massacring all the Reds—without making any distinction—the “new” extreme right of the 21st century has no problem using a term of anarchist origin to defend the employer policies of large companies against the workforce, promoting an exclusively repressive state that nevertheless strictly guarantees the super-exploitation and savage, unbridled extraction of surplus value without any form of law or legal code.

This is pure “economic freedom” (for capital) combined with little or no political freedom (for the popular majorities and the workforce). Alongside these supposed “libertarians” (in reality, ultra-neoliberals and fundamentalist defenders of market asymmetries, fetishes, and irrationalities) coexist the extreme right-wing “protectionists” (for example, the neo-fascist wing of the U.S. Republicans led by the supremacist magnate Donald Trump, or, in the French case, the National Front, now institutionalized under Marine Le Pen).

In most of these cases, this seemingly “protectionist” stance—critical of globalization—mainly conceals a great-power geopolitics aimed at countering the global rise of China, together with xenophobia directed against a super-exploited workforce of Latin American origin in the United States or African, Arab, and Muslim origin in France.

To these theoretical specifications and descriptions of the multiple nuances and attributes within the neo-fascist counterinsurgency arena—all of a “macro” nature, to which the Marxist tradition and its critical theory contribute to understanding the responses of Western capitalist imperialism to the crisis of the system—it is also worth adding other types of complementary reflections and theorizing formulated on another scale.

Such were the attempts in Austria and Germany first, and later in the United States, by the Marxist psychoanalyst Wilhelm Reich, who studied family structure and the politics directed at the unconscious, thereby explaining how submissive and obedient personalities were constructed—personalities that

allowed fascist forms to triumph over the working classes, their political organizations, and their emancipatory projects.^[26]

These are historical-social processes in which the victims—not reading rationally a logically articulated program of specific measures but through imaginary and unconscious processes—identify with their perpetrators (not only voting for and supporting repressive and genocidal forces but even militating in organizations that attack their own class with virulence and hatred).

The same applies to the reflections of the Argentine philosopher and psychoanalyst León Rozitchner, who draws on the more “social” works of Sigmund Freud, as well as on the theoretical bodies of Karl Marx and Karl von Clausewitz, to delve into the most intimate subjective folds—often despised or ignored by the political culture of the traditional left—that allow, not in the visible field of political programs and explicit slogans but at much deeper, unconscious levels, identification with atavistic, reactionary, fascist, and counter-revolutionary forms in the social arena of class struggle.

To the works of Reich and Rozitchner, we should also add the research of Erich Fromm, who investigates the unconscious motivations that lead segments of the working classes to militate in favor of Nazism and fascism, even against their own class, finding the answer in the tendency to seek secondary bonds as substitutes for the primary ones that have been lost.^[27]

Capitalist responses to crisis and counter-revolutionary offensives of the 20th and 21st centuries never operate in the abstract, within the stylized and skeletal orbit of “pure” social classes (in the style of the ideal types imagined by Max Weber), without historical anchoring in the various social formations specific to the world system.

Here we explain another of our starting points, often overlooked by publicists who use “Marxist” jargon and slang without thoroughly understanding Karl Marx’s dialectical methodology. The capitalist regime, since its very inception as a world system, has

never been flat, horizontal, or homogeneous. It has historically unfolded through uneven development, structuring a system of asymmetries, dominations, and dependencies, where some social formations (and their nation-states) have played a catalytic role in metropolitan capitalism in its imperialist phase, while others have been relegated—since the very birth of the global system and its international division of labor—to the role of colonial, semi-colonial, or dependent peripheries subordinated to the colonial domination of capitalist imperialism.

Therefore, counter-revolutionary offensives have not only attempted to keep the global system of exploitation and oppression afloat by attacking the workforce on a global scale but have also lashed out against the insurgent social forces of the colonies and former colonies, as well as against the dependent societies and subjugated nations and communities of the Global South.

The capitalist counter-revolution in the imperialist phase has had as its adversaries and enemies not only the rebellious labor force but also the insurgent national anti-colonial liberation movements. Hence, counterinsurgency has invariably been accompanied by rabid racism and supremacist ideologies, pseudo-scientific justifications about alleged “inferior peoples” and “nations destined to disappear,” atavistic misogyny and patriarchy, primitive and parochial contempt for other cultures (Orientalism, anti-Semitism, Islamophobia, underestimation and humiliation of native, indigenous, and Afro-descendant peoples), and theocratic fundamentalisms (Protestant or Catholic, but also Zionist) cloaked in the deceptive garb of an exclusionary, Westernized, and genocidal modernity.

All these serve as justifications for imperialist and colonialist projects, legitimizing their class wars and rampant ethnocentrism—against, for instance, the dark skin of the immigrant masses who in recent years have flowed into the United States or European countries, not to mention the massacred Palestinian people—as well as their genocidal practices and the various offensives of capital.

Are these latter connotations, these “extras” that have accompanied each of the counter-revolutionary attempts, part of the DNA of imperialist, neo-Nazi, and neo-fascist counterinsurgency? Or are they simply fortuitous and casuistic accidents—that is, accidental and dispensable epiphenomena?

Historical experience suggests that their repeated and systematic reappearance and reproduction in each of the capitalist responses to crisis, and in the various global offensives of the counter-revolution of imperialist capital, constitute an integral part of the social form we know as the capitalist regime. Neither genocide, nor racism, nor misogyny, nor the Western apologia for deranged and delusional “white supremacy” constitutes a “fortuitous accident” or a “singular and unrepeatably anomaly.”

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Amin, Samir (2008): *Memoirs*. Madrid, El Viejo Topo.
- Arendt, Hannah, [1951] (1999): *The Origins of Totalitarianism*. Madrid, Taurus.
- Bonavena, Pablo and Nievas, Flabián (2022): ‘Today’s counterinsurgency war’. In *Pacarina del sur. Revista de Pensamiento Crítico Latinoamericano* No. 49, Mexico.
- Camus, Jean-Yves and Lebourg, Nicolas (2020): *The Far Right in Europe. Nationalism, Xenophobia, Hatred*. Buenos Aires, Le Monde Diplomatic-Capital Intelectual.
- Dimitrov, Jorge [1935]: ‘The Offensive of Fascism and the Tasks of the Communist International in the Struggle for the Unity of the Working Class Against Fascism’. In Dimitrov, Jorge (1974): *Fascism and the United Front*. Buenos Aires, Nativa Libros.
- Dimitrov, Jorge [1935]: ‘The offensive of fascism and the tasks of the Communist International in the struggle for the unity of the working class against fascism’. In *Seventh [VII] Congress of the Communist International [AA.VV.]* (1984): *Fascism, democracy and the popular front*. Mexico, Pasado y Presente.
- Ford, Henry [1920] (1961): *The International Jew*. Barcelona, Mateu.
- Fromm, Erich [1941] (1968): *The Fear of Freedom*. Buenos Aires, Paidós.
- Furet, François (1995): *The Past of an Illusion. Essay on the Communist Idea in the Twentieth Century*. Madrid, Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Furet, François and Nolte, Ernst (1999): *Fascism and Communism*. Buenos Aires, Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Giudici, Ernesto (1938): *Hitler Conquers America*. Buenos Aires, Acento.
- Gramsci, Antonio (1979): *On Fascism [Anthology]*. Mexico, ERA.
- Gramsci, Antonio [1932-1934] (2000): *Prison Notebooks*. Mexico, ERA. Volume 5.
- López y Rivas, Gilberto (2015): *Studying US Counterinsurgency. Manuals, Mentalities and the Use of Anthropology*. San Carlos de Guatemala, University of San Carlos de Guatemala.
- Losurdo, Doménico (2019): *Western Marxism. How it was born, how it died and how it can be resurrected*. Madrid, Trotta.
- Lyotard, Jean-François [1979] (1993): *The Postmodern Condition. Report on Knowledge*. Barcelona, Planeta-Agostini.
- Marini, Ruy Mauro; Dos Santos, Theotonio and Cueva, Agustín (1978): ‘The Question of Fascism in Latin America’. In *Political Notebooks* No. 18, Mexico, Editorial ERA.
- Mises, Ludwig von [1927] (2015): *Liberalism*. Madrid, Unión Editorial.
- Mouffe, Chantal (2017): ‘Heirs of Neoliberal Globalisation’. In Chomsky, Noam et al (2017): *Neofascism. From Trump to the European Far Right*. Buenos Aires, Le Monde Diplomatic-Capital Intelectual.
- Muchnik, Daniel (1999): *Business is Business. The Businessmen Who Financed Hitler’s Rise to Power*. Buenos Aires, Norma.
- Nilsen, Remi (2017): ‘Islamophobia Takes Hold of “Exemplary” Norway’. In Chomsky, Noam et al (2017): *Neofascism. From Trump to the European far right*. Buenos Aires, Le Monde Diplomatic-Capital Intelectual.
- Nolte, Ernst (1995): *After Communism*. Buenos Aires, Ariel.
- Reich, Wilhelm [1933] (1972): *The Mass Psychology of Fascism*. Buenos Aires, Editora Latina.
- Traverso, Enzo [2001] (2016): *Totalitarianism: A History of a Debate*. Buenos Aires, EUDEBA.
- Traverso, Enzo (2018): *The New Faces of the Right*. Buenos Aires, Editorial Siglo XXI.
- Zavaleta Mercado, René (1976): ‘Fascism and Latin America’. In AA.VV. (1976): *Fascism in America [Anthology-Special Issue]*. In *Revista Nueva Política* No. 1, Mexico, Fondo de Cultura Económica.

Notes

- [1] Lyotard, Jean-François [1979] (1993): *The Postmodern Condition. Report on Knowledge*. Barcelona, Planeta-Agostini. pp. 9–10.
- [2] Mouffe, Chantal (2017): ‘Heirs of Neoliberal Globalization’. In Chomsky, Noam et al. (2017). *Neofascism. From Trump to the European Far Right*. Buenos Aires, Le Monde Diplomatic-Capital Intelectual. p. 19.
- [3] Traverso, Enzo (2018): *The New Faces of the Right*. Buenos Aires, Siglo XXI Publishing House. pp. 13, 131–132.
- [4] Camus, Jean-Yves and Lebourg, Nicolas (2020): *The Far Right in*

Europe. Nationalism, Xenophobia, Hatred. Buenos Aires, Le Monde Diplomatic–Capital Intellectual. p. 65.

[5] Dimitrov, Jorge [1935]: “The Offensive of Fascism and the Tasks of the Communist International in the Struggle for the Unity of the Working Class Against Fascism.” In Dimitrov, Jorge (1974): *Fascism and the United Front*. Buenos Aires, Nativa Books. p. 9.

Dimitrov, Jorge [1935]: “The Offensive of Fascism and the Tasks of the Communist International in the Struggle for the Unity of the Working Class Against Fascism.” In *Seventh [VII] Congress of the Communist International [AA.VV.] (1984): Fascism, Democracy and the Popular Front*. Mexico, Pasado y Presente. p. 154.

[6] Gramsci, Antonio (1979): *On Fascism [Anthology]*. Mexico, ERA. pp. 167–169.

Gramsci, Antonio [1932–1934] (2000): *Prison Notebooks*. Mexico, ERA. Vol. 5. pp. 65–68.

[7] Dimitrov, Jorge, in *Seventh [VII] Congress of the Communist International [AA.VV.] (1984): Fascism, Democracy and the Popular Front*. Op. cit. p. 155.

[8] Dos Santos, Theotonio (1978): “The Question of Fascism in Latin America.” In *Political Notebooks No. 18*, Mexico, ERA Publishing. p. 30.

[9] Giudici, Ernesto (1938): *Hitler Conquers America*. Buenos Aires, Acento. p. 145.

[10] Giudici, Ernesto (1938): Op. cit. pp. 148–150.

[11] Zavaleta Mercado, René (1976): “Fascism and Latin America.” In *AA.VV. (1976). Fascism in America [Anthology–Special Issue]*. In *New Politics Magazine No. 1*, Mexico, Fondo de Cultura Económica. pp. 191–192.

[12] Dos Santos, Theotonio (1978): Op. cit. p. 32.

[13] Marini, R.M. (1978): “The Question of Fascism in Latin America.” In *Political Notebooks No. 18*, Mexico, ERA Publishing. pp. 21–29.

[14] Petraeus, H. and Amos, J.F. (2006): *Counterinsurgency Field Manual No. 3–24*. In López y Rivas, Gilberto (2015): *Studying United States Counterinsurgency. Manuals, Mentalities and the Use of Anthropology*. San Carlos de Guatemala, University of San Carlos of Guatemala. pp. 40–41.

[15] Bonavena, Pablo and Nievas, Flabián (2022): “Today’s Counterinsurgency War.” In *Pacarina del Sur. Journal of Latin American Critical Thought No. 49*, Mexico. p. 9.

[16] Furet, François (1995): *The Past of an Illusion. Essay on the Communist Idea in the Twentieth Century*. Madrid, Fondo de Cultura Económica.

[17] Nolte, Ernst (1995): *After Communism*. Buenos Aires, Ariel.

[18] Furet, François and Nolte, Ernst (1999): *Fascism and Communism*. Buenos Aires, Fondo de Cultura Económica.

[19] Furet, F. and Nolte, E. (1999): Op. cit. p. 78.

[20] Nilsen, Remi (2017): “Islamophobia Takes Hold of ‘Exemplary’ Norway.” In Chomsky, Noam et al. (2017): *Neofascism. From Trump to the European Far Right*. Buenos Aires, Le Monde Diplomatic–Capital Intellectual. pp. 75–82.

[21] Arendt, Hannah [1951] (1999): *The Origins of Totalitarianism*. Madrid, Taurus. p. 442, footnote 36.

[22] Losurdo, Domenico (2019): *Western Marxism. How It Was Born, How It Died, and How It Can Be Resurrected*. Madrid, Trotta. pp. 113–114.

[23] Ford, Henry [1920] (1961): *The International Jew*. Barcelona, Mateu.

[24] Traverso, Enzo [2001] (2016): *Totalitarianism: A History of a Debate*. Buenos Aires, EUDEBA. pp. 22–30.

[25] Mises, Ludwig von [1927] (2015): *Liberalism*. Madrid, Unión Editorial. p. 87.

[26] Reich, Wilhelm [1933] (1972): *The Mass Psychology of Fascism*. Buenos Aires, Editora Latina.

[27] Fromm, Erich [1941] (1968): *The Fear of Freedom*. Buenos Aires, Paidós.

“Forward with socialism!”

Aleksandar Đenić | New Communist Party of Yugoslavia (Serbia)

Dear comrades,

In these turbulent times, the unity of the revolutionary party of the working class, its commitment to internationalist principles, and the struggle against imperialism must send a strong message of determination to preserve peace, independence, and resistance to wars and occupations. Therefore, today it is important to express our solidarity with the people of Venezuela, President Maduro, and the government of this freedom-loving country, which is under attack by the United States.

We live in an era of aggressive imperialist policies that have provoked wars in Ukraine, Iran, and Yemen, are committing genocide in Palestine and West Asia, and are threatening to extend the conflict to the Caribbean and exert pressure on the people of Venezuela. We must not forget the genocidal sanctions against socialist Cuba, the constant threats to the people of Nicaragua, the US occupation of the Korean Peninsula, and the provocations toward the People's Republic of China, particularly through puppet regimes in Taiwan.

Today, the EU and the United States are displaying unprecedented hypocrisy: while describing the suffering of civilians in war zones, they ignore the fact that the use of civilians as human shields has become a practice carried out by their “allies.” In Ukraine, Nazi ideology is being instilled, and World War II fascists are being proclaimed national heroes. The Communist Party of Ukraine has been forced underground, while threats, intimidation, and murders of politicians and journalists are commonplace. Monuments to Lenin and anything reminiscent of life in the USSR are being systematically destroyed.

While Western politicians and media openly side with the neo-Nazis, countries in Asia, Africa, the

Middle East, and Latin America, with experience of European and US neocolonialism, see the events in Ukraine as part of Russia's struggle against a unipolar world led by the United States. NATO and Western imperialism pose the greatest threats to peace, and the US, EU, and NATO pursue aggressive policies against Cuba, Venezuela, Nicaragua, and progressive movements in Latin America. Similarly, the US constantly provokes North Korea and China, while Western imperialism is responsible for the wars and plunder of Africa.

The hypocrisy of Western imperialism is also evident in its support for Israel's genocide against the Palestinians. Similarly, the West propagandizes about human rights violations in Iran, while remaining silent about human rights abuses in the Gulf monarchies, which are allies of the US. The degree of imperialism's interest in human rights and democracy is perfectly demonstrated by the fact that, with its support, Al Qaeda took over Syria, committing crimes against its own people.

The peoples of the Balkans, especially in the former Yugoslavia, know imperialism well. Yugoslavia did not disappear on its own, but was violently dismembered by Western capital and monopoly interests, which are still active today. NATO is the armed wing of Western imperialism: an aggressive military alliance that provokes wars and unrest around the world. NATO bombed Yugoslavia with banned weapons, such as depleted uranium and cluster bombs, causing tens of thousands of deaths each year.

However, all the peoples of the former Yugoslavia are victims of Western imperialism and the violent disintegration of the state. Political and economic dependence, pressures, and conditions are evident, and the region has become easy prey for Western eco-

conomic and military interests. The urgent duty of the people is to reject the policy of “divide and conquer” and prevent the creation of weak and servile puppet states, as exemplified by the situation of the fake state of Kosovo. The imperialists seek to establish governments obedient to their dictates, deepening capitalist exploitation and tying the countries to NATO and the EU.

The southern part of Serbia, Kosovo and Metohija, is occupied by NATO. The puppet regime in Pristina constantly provokes Serbs and non-Albanian populations, while the US and the EU support it. The largest US military base in the region, Bondsteel, is located there, controlled by mafias and war criminals with NATO support. Negotiations between Pristina and the pro-imperialist government of Serbia serve to continue the disintegration of Yugoslavia. Russia and China support Serbia’s sovereignty in the UN, and Serbia depends on Russian energy.

The Serbian government does not want sanctions against Russia, but the EU, the US, and NATO are putting pressure on Serbia, fueling conflicts and tensions in Kosovo and Metohija and pushing Serbia to recognize Kosovo.

Although the Serbian government pursues a pro-European policy contrary to the interests of the people, the so-called student protests, which arose after the tragedy in Novi Sad, are led by liberals hiding behind the students. Their demands are neoliberal and contain no progressive goals. Our party, while understanding the justified anger of the people, cannot support protests that defend anti-popular policies and serve the interests of the US and the EU, openly opposing cooperation with China, Russia, Belarus, Cuba, and other progressive and socialist countries.

The deterioration of workers’ living standards, the strengthening of imperialist organizations, and the repression of anti-imperialist movements through-

out Europe require an organized and coordinated struggle through anti-imperialist, anti-NATO, and workers’ movements.

In these historical circumstances, anti-imperialist forces must unite all progressive forces and fight against imperialism. We believe that socialism is a stage in the development of human society and that the 21st century will be the century of socialism.

Forward with socialism, comrades!

Long live the anti-imperialist struggle!

“Steps for the Triumph of Socialism Worldwide”

Valerii Novikov | Communist Party of Kyrgyzstan

At the international conference of the World Anti-imperialist Platform, held jointly with the Simon Bolivar Institute and the Venezuelan government in support of the anti-imperialist, anti-fascist position of Venezuela, Cuba, North Korea, and other countries, as well as the forum in support of communism.

Dear comrades! The anti-imperialist, anti-fascist forum has brought together people who care about the fate of their countries and our planet! The communists of Kyrgyzstan fully support this event and are happy to welcome you all to this beautiful and proud country—Venezuela!

You have repeatedly held events that are very important for the world community! Thank you to hospitable and friendly Venezuela.

Communist and socialist forces around the world are coming together in the name of preserving humanity on Earth and building a just socialist legal order. At the present stage, the world of capital is leading all of humanity toward self-destruction at cosmic speed, and only the most progressive forces are capable of stopping the current lawlessness and leading all of humanity toward the transformation of the world!

These forces are primarily communist and socialist forces, for they are the ideologues of present and future civilization, who will lead humanity along the path of survival, and this is what the leaders of Venezuela, Cuba, North Korea, and some countries in Africa and Asia, the successors of Simón Bolívar, are calling us to do.

In today’s predominantly capitalist-imperialist world, the irresolvable contradictions between the productive forces and productive relations on a global scale have come to a head! Workers all over the world are engaged in production, but global capital appropriates everything that is produced for itself. Only

the exploiters receive profits; only they dispose of all property and, naturally, consume most of it themselves, leaving only crumbs for the working masses!

This unfair distribution exists not only within capitalist states but also between rich, super-rich states and developing, poor states around the world! Moreover, imperialist states brazenly seize the natural resources of developing countries through both neo-colonialism and military means, as we have seen in recent years in Iraq, Libya, Syria, Afghanistan, Mali, and Palestine! As the President of Mali said at the UN meeting, “The imperialists, the neocolonialists, are building us a well in the village, supposedly to help us, and at the same time they are taking all the water from the river to create their own prosperity.”

After destroying the Soviet Union, the most profitable enterprises were seized by the US and European states, and moreover, through the IMF, they shut down all industrial enterprises in the republics of the Soviet Union, and the agricultural sector was destroyed and divided up! What Hitler’s fascist Germany could not do in World War II was done by the fascist imperialism of the West. The same methods are being attempted today in relation to states on other continents!

Of course, the destruction of the Soviet Union and socialism in Eastern Europe halted the advance of socialism across our planet and allowed fascism and genocide against the peoples of the world to flourish under the ruling powers such as the US and European states led by the UK, France, and Germany. They felt like they were the masters of the entire planet! They imagined that they could do anything! They began to dictate their perverted will to other states, telling them who to be friends with and who to fight!

They set up their non-governmental organizations, with the help of which they wanted to pursue their policies in republics and countries! We can clearly see this in the example of Venezuela, where they wanted

to install their “anti-people president” through proxies, but the people and the communes they had created did not allow them to do so. Now they are trying to change the government by force, blowing up ships and offering a reward for the betrayal of the democratically elected president. They have set up NATO biological laboratories all over the world to destroy undesirable states! In countries where Islam is spreading, they have created their own specific NATO troops of Islamic terrorists and extremists from among Muslims, such as Al-Qaeda, Wahhabis, ISIS, Ansarullah, Jabhat al-Nusra, and many others!

They have established their military bases, especially around countries that pursue their own independent policies in the interests of their people! The appetite of the imperialist powers comes with eating! Having destroyed the Soviet Union and plundered our riches, as well as those of Russia, they have now decided to seize Russia itself. Since 2014, a war has been waged against Russia and the Russian people. The entire West—more than 50 countries—is unabashedly and unscrupulously waging war against Russia on Ukrainian territory!

How terrible that they have started a shameless war and destroyed independent, prosperous Libya, seizing its natural resources, and that they are carrying out Israel’s genocide to destroy the Arab people of Palestine! They are bombing Iran, Syria, Lebanon, and Yemen, which disagree with this. NATO has begun large-scale military exercises with aircraft carrying nuclear weapons! This speaks volumes! Considering that the Western elite have long since lost their minds from the lawlessness of owning the world’s wealth, their private ownership psychology is playing a very cruel joke on them! They are losing their bearings in the world; they think they can do anything and bring everyone to their knees! They are not thinking about tomorrow at all! We can say with certainty that humanity is on the brink of a nuclear catastrophe!

If we turn to the Far East, Japan is also highly equipped with ultra-modern weapons, and South Korea is constantly provoking North Korea! Natu-

rally, China is watching both Taiwan and the whole world closely!

1. If we turn to the social sphere of workers around the world, excluding war-torn regions, the workers of the African continent are in a very difficult situation! Africa has untold riches! For years, it has not been the African people who have benefited from these riches, but the colonizers from the US and Europe! But the workers of Africa are constantly fighting for their freedom and a decent life! And in this regard, they have achieved a great deal! It is gratifying that all African states remember the Soviet Union and think fondly of it! At the Russia-Africa Forum, many African leaders spoke with great respect about the Soviet Union! South Africa is now a member of the BRICS countries! Ethiopia has also joined!

Many African countries are fighting for a decent life and have done a lot to achieve this! We also include Latin American countries among these states, especially Venezuela and Cuba. We see the great work being done by the government and the socialist party to create, develop, and prosper communes where there are real positive successes. The Bolshevik communists, led by Lenin, once began with the creation of such communes. These communes achieved a great deal and made an enormous contribution to the victory over fascism in World War II. We wish our Venezuelan friends further success in the social transformation of their country!

2. The sphere of ideology! Unfortunately, the ideology of the criminal bourgeoisie still dominates the world! In the post-Soviet state, not a single republic has yet proclaimed communist or socialist ideology as its own! They are all searching! They are looking for it in national ideology, in religious ideology! One can understand the bourgeoisie; they only want bourgeois ideology! But for the working masses, only Marxist-Leninist-Stalinist ideology should prevail! Naturally, with national specifics!

So China has communist ideology—socialism with Chinese characteristics! After the destruction of

the Soviet Union, during the most powerful attack of imperialism against socialism, China chose this tactic, introducing a multi-quality economy and surviving! It was an adaptation to the counterrevolution against socialism! Today, the PRC is the most advanced country in the world in terms of economic development! Keep in mind that this is not due to the dollar, as in the US, but due to the development of its own economy! Let's see what happens to the US when the dollar loses its function as a global currency! Moreover, in the People's Republic of China, Marxism functions holistically as Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism!

The General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, Comrade Xi Jinping, is making great efforts to reduce private enterprises and strengthen public ownership of the means of production! At this turning point in history, they will make a worthy contribution to the establishment of socialist civilization throughout the world!

North Korea—the DPRK! It does not allow the US or the IMF anywhere near it! Kim Il-sung, Kim Jong-il, and Kim Jong-un have stood firm on communist positions! After the betrayal of the Soviet Union's leadership headed by M. Gorbachev, it stood its ground and did not give up! Well done! They also have Marxism with a specific feature—Juche! Communist Cuba impressed everyone with its heroic steadfastness! The great Fidel Castro—leader of the revolutionary proletariat and the communist movement in Latin America!

Today, the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, led by Hugo Chávez—Chavism—and the current courageous and combative leader Nicolás Maduro, is heroically fighting and defending its socialist path of development! All the attributes of socialism are there! All state-forming industries are in the hands of the state: free education, medicine, housing for all communards, and work! And the US is still meddling there, as brazenly and arrogantly as ever!

Specifics: they call it the Bolivarian revolution! Bolivia and Nicaragua are fighting for socialism and Marxist ideology! Vietnam is a socialist country, and

one that is developing steadily! The communist and socialist forces have a base where they are at the helm of states, and the states themselves are building socialism and flying the banner of Marxism-Leninism!

3. What steps do we need to take for socialism to triumph across the entire planet Earth?!

a) Understanding and realizing that humanity is facing self-destruction due to the tangle of insoluble contradictions of capitalism-imperialism, and that the only way out of them is socialism across the entire planet! Scientists have already found technologies to achieve this within a few years!

b) The looming ecological crisis of planet Earth! Previously, the purity of the Earth's water resources made it possible to resist it! Now this possibility no longer exists due to the pollution of water resources. A creative society—people and state leaders—must be aware of this and work together to take measures to overcome these problems! Without socialism, experts say, they will never be solved!

c) In Caracas, Venezuela, under the leadership of N. Maduro, an international anti-fascist movement was created in November. We must make every effort to attract various forces, including those for the dissemination of the ideas of Simón Bolívar, Hugo Chávez, Fidel Castro, and Kim Il-sung.

To this end, we believe it would be right to create a women's organization based on an anti-imperialist, anti-fascist platform. This will give new impetus and momentum to our movement.

d) Help BRICS to create a new world currency more quickly, so that states can move away from the dollar, thanks to which their masters, the US and Britain, are fascist and pursue a lawless, anti-popular, colonial policy in the world!

e) Strengthen the organizational, propaganda, and theoretical activities of communist parties in countries!

Dear comrades! Good luck and success to all!

Patriotism and Internationalism: Between Eastern Europe and Latin America

Stefan Petrov | September 23 Movement (Bulgaria)

First of all, I would like to express my gratitude and joy for the opportunity to finally be in Venezuela. A country located very close to the United States—the main imperialist power of our time—but nevertheless standing up for the principles of its independence and social justice. We are aware of the difficulties and the high price Venezuela has been forced to pay for defending these principles—provocations, embargoes, coup attempts, black propaganda, etc. That is why I believe that this country deserves respect and international support for its cause.

In fact, the fate of all countries that in some way oppose imperialism, defend their independent development, and build a different socio-economic model is similar. At the same time, anti-imperialist movements and organizations in countries under imperialist rule are being persecuted and repressed because they are seeking a better future for their countries. This is precisely what makes it necessary to seek unity among anti-imperialist forces around the world at this historic moment, when a window of opportunity is opening for more nations to break away from the tyranny of the global oligarchy.

I cannot also not note some obvious similarities between the region I come from and the countries of Latin America. I am from Bulgaria, a country in the Balkans and Eastern Europe where, after decades of bloody struggle against the fascist government, the people won the right of socialist development after the end of World War II. Decades of rapid modernization and industrialization followed, and the people gained access to world-class education and healthcare. From a backward peasant country, Bulgaria transformed itself in about four decades into a modern industrial state with advanced science and technology, with a practically entirely literate popula-

tion, and even capable of sending people into space. A strong economy and armed forces were built up, capable of defending the sovereignty of the People's Republic.

However, after the fall of the Berlin Wall and the restoration of capitalism in Eastern Europe in 1989, most of these achievements were wiped out. Industry was privatized and destroyed. Cultural and educational institutions were dismantled. Privately funded non-governmental organizations took the place of the state in these areas. Cultural and moral decline set in. Anti-human fascist ideas began to be instilled among young people. A terrible demographic crisis is developing in the country, with the Bulgarian population declining from 9 million to about 6 million in about 30 years. Bulgaria was brought into the imperialist military alliance NATO and the European Union. US military bases were established on our territory. The country practically lost its independence and became a satellite of the most aggressive imperialist power. The fate of most former socialist countries in Eastern Europe is similar.

This is where I see the main similarity between the countries in our region and Latin America. Here, as there, the economic destruction, social disintegration, and exploitation of the people go hand in hand with imperialist oppression. And vice versa—the struggle for social justice and opportunities for the comprehensive development of the individual go hand in hand with the struggle against imperialism and the agents of international finance capital. For this struggle to be successful, it requires the unity of the peoples.

The comprador elite that has been in power in Bulgaria since 1989 is on the way to destroying the last remains of the country's national sovereignty by

preparing for entry into the eurozone on January 1, 2026. This will mean the final transfer of economic decisions on Bulgaria's development into the hands of the imperialist European institutions and further impoverishment of the Bulgarian working class.

This goes hand in hand with preparations for Bulgaria's involvement in a future full-scale war against the Russian Federation. The country's military factories are working at full capacity. According to European Commission President Ursula von der Leyen, one-third of all European military aid to Ukraine came from Bulgaria. Mrs. von der Leyen herself had the opportunity to hear the opinion of Bulgarians on this issue firsthand. During her visit to military factories in Bulgaria, she was met with large demonstrations. Protesters surrounded the military factories she was supposed to visit, forcing the European Commission President into the humiliating situation of having to be transported by helicopter to avoid meeting the discontented Bulgarians.

The attitude of the majority of Bulgarians is clear: *No to war! No to monetary imperialism! No to the euro!* The connection between the aggressive insistence that Bulgaria should join the eurozone at this particular moment and the upcoming war with the Russian Federation is now obvious to everyone. According to official statistics, Bulgarians are the people in the European Union who least support military aid to Ukraine. According to other official statistics, 60% of Bulgarians are against Bulgaria joining the eurozone.

Our country is ruled by an aggressive minority that hates the rest of the people and owes its dominance to the patronage of imperialist institutions. All the illusions of democracy, human rights, and people's power with which people were fooled after the restoration of capitalism in 1989 turned out to be empty slogans. The countries of Eastern Europe have been turned into semi-colonies and raw material annexes for Western imperialism. Now they are being prepared as cannon fodder in the imperialist war against Russia that is being prepared. This destructive policy

will inevitably give rise to more and more opponents of the current system and will push more and more people to seek a different path of development for their countries. This is precisely where the opportunity lies for the peoples of our region to break out of the shackles of oppression in which they found themselves 35 years ago.

In Europe, when it comes to the aggressive policy of the United States, people often talk about "American imperialism." However, we know very well that this expression is inaccurate and that the government and oligarchic corporations of the United States cannot represent the entire continent. We know that besides the America of Wall Street and the CIA, there is another America, "Our" America (Nuestra América)—America of José Martí, Fidel Castro, and Che Guevara, America of Simón Bolívar and Hugo Chávez, America of the working people, the peasants, and the revolutionaries.

In the same way, we must remember that Europe does not belong to Ursula von der Leyen, the European Commission, the European Union, and Brussels. Europe belongs to the peoples of Europe, with their struggles, problems, and dreams.

The peoples of the world are brothers and have similar interests at heart—to live free and independent, to develop their traditions and cultures, to build their future. The main obstacle to this is imperialism. Their main weapon is unity and internationalism. There is no contradiction between people's patriotism and proletarian internationalism. On the contrary, for the peoples fighting against imperialism, they are inseparably linked and equally important for the successful conduct of the struggle. That is why today, more than ever, we must be guided by principles that will never lose their relevance in the era of imperialism:

Down with imperialism!

Workers of the world, unite!

Motherland or death!

We will win!

The New Constitution —A Stage in Venezuela’s Advance Toward Socialism

Baltic Platform

Dear organizers and participants of the conference! On behalf of the Baltic Platform, allow me to warmly greet the freedom-loving people and the courageous President of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, Nicolás Maduro.

We take part in the work of the conference with a feeling of ardent solidarity with your country, which is ready to give a decisive rebuff to the growing imperialist threat from the United States. Our comrades, like all people of good will, are outraged by Washington’s attempts to intimidate and subjugate the people of Venezuela.

It is clear that the political course pursued by the leadership and supported by the people of Venezuela has become an open challenge to U.S. imperialism. Their reaction has surprised no one. As many times before, the American administration has once again put forward its favorite slogan: “Does your country have oil? Then wait—we’re coming to establish democracy for you!” And no one should be deceived by the reasons with which Washington tries to cover up its aggression.

Back in 2020, the administration of then-U.S. President Donald Trump baselessly accused Venezuelan President Nicolás Maduro of drug trafficking. The Cuban newspaper *Granma* wrote on this matter: “... in a fit of imagination they invented a ‘Cartel of the Suns’ in the style of the worst narco-series.”

Nevertheless, the Trump administration moved from words with false accusations to actual military threats. On August 19, Reuters reported: “Within the next 36 hours, the United States will deploy three Aegis-guided missile warships off the coast of Venezuela as part of countering threats from Latin American drug cartels.” And in practice, the Amer-

icans have already used their military force in this region.

One of the sources cited by the agency stated that a total of about 4,000 sailors and marines would take part in the operation. Additional military forces in the region would include several P-8 reconnaissance aircraft, warships, and at least one attack submarine.

In response to Washington’s aggression, Venezuelan President Nicolás Maduro announced the decision to mobilize 4.5 million civilian militia members across the country to confront the threats of war from the United States. Venezuela declared its firm determination to fight for its sovereignty.

Speaking at a meeting with governors and mayors from his ruling coalition, the President of Venezuela announced plans to strengthen rural and urban militias, as well as to organize combat groups in factories and workplaces.

We have no doubt that the path of development already traveled by Venezuela under the leadership of Presidents Hugo Chávez and Nicolás Maduro has made the country an impregnable fortress against any imperialist aggression. We firmly stand by your side and wish the people of Venezuela a decisive victory in this confrontation.

Today, together with you, we recall how in December 1998, after winning more than 56 percent of the vote in the presidential elections, Hugo Rafael Chávez Frías became head of the Republic of Venezuela. This was the first time that a politician who did not belong to the traditional bourgeois parties—the ones that in 1958 signed the so-called Pacto de Punto Fijo, which secured their right to alternate in power in the country—came to power in Venezuela.

Venezuela is rightfully considered one of the potentially richest countries not only in Latin America, but in the world. In addition to its main wealth—a hardworking and talented people who love their homeland—the country possesses truly colossal natural resources. Relying mainly on this potential, and with the favorable international situation at the time, the country rose in the 1970s into the ranks of the twenty wealthiest nations of the world. By GDP indicators of that period, Venezuela surpassed such countries as Spain, Greece, and Israel.

However, the politicians who ruled the country during that period failed to direct the wealth, earned by the hands of the entire people, toward long-term structural economic development and the improvement of the population’s well-being. The bulk of this wealth flowed into the pockets of a narrow circle of the chosen few. And then, inevitably, what was bound to happen did happen. Favorable oil prices came to an end, and the one-sided economy collapsed into stagnation. The authorities could not cope with managing the country’s economy under the conditions of cheaper oil. It was the ordinary people who suffered most. Unemployment and poverty fell upon the majority of the population.

With the rise to presidential power of Comandante Hugo Chávez, Venezuela embarked on a path of profound political, economic, social, and constitutional transformations. Their objective necessity was dictated by all the circumstances of the chosen path of the country’s and society’s development.

It is remarkable that President Chávez and his circle had the opportunity to consult with Fidel Castro. Their strong friendship began in 1994, which later allowed Hugo Chávez to declare: “The Venezuelan people are moving toward the shores of happiness, where the Cuban people already are.”

With the election of Hugo Chávez as president, Venezuela carried out a profound social and political transformation. Over the past 25 years, this has become a continuous process of development in the

interests of the majority of the people.

Under President Chávez’s leadership, Venezuela rewrote its constitution, adopting a form of democracy that allowed the people to participate more directly in decision-making. The transformations led to the eradication of illiteracy, the reduction of inequality, and the expansion of support for the poor. Social programs were implemented in such areas as healthcare, education, and housing. Poverty and malnutrition declined, while the people gained the opportunity to exercise the full potential of democracy—to recall elected officials or vote on issues of national importance.

President Chávez was able to prove that success in the fight against poverty depends not so much on the programs proposed by the IMF and the World Bank as on strengthening the country’s sovereignty and ensuring the social orientation of its economy. In other words, over the past 25 years, the revolutionary project initiated by President Chávez and continued by President Maduro has embodied the political will of centralized authority and the enthusiasm of popular communes in the interests of the majority of Venezuelan society.

An important factor in consolidating the changes taking place in the country has been the constitutional process. In Venezuela, it began in 1830 with the adoption of the first constitution. That constitution was built on principles common to all the first Latin American constitutions, which included norms alien to local national traditions.

Subsequently, the country’s constitution was amended many times until a fundamentally new period of Venezuela’s constitutional and legal development began. This started with the drafting and adoption of the new Constitution of 1999, which remains in force to this day.

This constitution gave the country a new name—the “Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela,” instead of the former “Republic of Venezuela.” It was drafted and proclaimed by the National Constituent Assembly

on December 20, 1999, in the 189th year of independence and the 140th year of the establishment of the federation in the country. The constitution entered into force on the date of its official publication in the *Gaceta Oficial* on December 30, 1999.

The current Constitution of Venezuela is the most democratic of the more than two dozen constitutions that have been in effect during the period of the country's independent statehood.

Today, Venezuela already lives under a constitution that declares its adherence to the teachings of Simón Bolívar, the Liberator. The country's fundamental law proclaims as the inalienable rights of the nation its independence, freedom, sovereignty, the inviolability of territorial integrity, and national self-determination.

Under the 1999 Constitution, Venezuela is proclaimed a democratic and social state based on law and justice. Life and the freedom of citizens are recognized as supreme values. The most important principles on which state power must rely are justice, responsibility, and democracy, with full respect for human rights, ethical norms, and political pluralism.

The most important goals of the state are the protection and comprehensive development of the individual, respect for human dignity, the democratic exercise of the will of the people, and the building of a just and peace-oriented society.

In its foreign policy, Venezuela promotes the concept of the "socialism of the 21st century," focusing on social justice, equality, and anti-capitalism. This course is rooted in the ideas of Simón Bolívar, aimed at the political and economic integration of Latin American countries. The implementation of these ideas led to the creation of organizations such as ALBA (the Bolivarian Alliance for the Peoples of Our America).

In addition, the country actively opposes the interference of Western states both in the internal affairs of Venezuela itself and in those of Latin America as a whole. This anti-imperialist orientation, along

with the pursuit of a multipolar world as opposed to unipolarity and U.S. dominance, constitutes an important part of the ideological platform of the Venezuelan government.

The forthcoming adoption of a new constitution will further consolidate the achievements already made and create the conditions for the country's continued confident development toward strengthening political sovereignty, economic prosperity, and the growth of the people's well-being.

The Socialists of Latvia, like all progressive forces of the world, are firmly convinced that American imperialism will not succeed in intimidating or forcing the leadership of Venezuela to abandon the chosen path of building a socialist society based on popular communes.

Long live the great ideas and achievements of Comandante Hugo Chávez!

Long live the courageous fighter against American imperialism, President Nicolás Maduro!

Long live the freedom-loving people of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela!

What Unity Should We Establish Between Anti-Fascism and Anti-Imperialism?

Miguel Ángel | Unión Proletaria (Spain)

Today, no government or mass political party recognizes itself as fascist. But if we stick to the facts, the fascist nature of the Ukrainian regime and the Venezuelan extremist opposition is evident. On the other hand, there is a conservative, right-wing, or far-right wave that is manifesting itself with varying degrees of force across the globe and which shares, at least partially, the classic characteristics of fascism. It is so heterogeneous and contradictory that, for example, the alternative or “Trumpist” right supports Zionism and the violent opposition in Venezuela but does not support Zelensky’s government as much as the Democratic Party and social democracy do. It even seems to have some affinity with the Russian government, whose solid and strategic allies are the socialist states of China and Korea.

To guide the working class in the face of these contradictions, it is necessary to clarify the economic basis from which they arise. Today’s world is unfolding in the imperialist stage of capitalism. In this stage, imperialism is a consequence of the domination of monopoly and financial capital over the mode of production. The monopoly and financial oligarchy of the oldest and most developed capitalist countries dominates their own peoples and other nations, except for those that manage to free themselves from this domination.

Hence, “the political characteristics of imperialism” are not the freedom and progress of society, but “reaction across the board and the intensification of the national yoke.”^[1] In both the oppressor and oppressed countries, political regimes may vary between liberal parliamentarianism and fascism, but all of them have the task of supporting the domination of a bourgeois class that has entered the reactionary stage of its exis-

tence and is subject to its monopolistic upper layer. The bourgeoisie, as a social class, has already fulfilled its progressive role of freeing producers from the fetters that the old forms of property imposed on the development of the productive forces; it has replaced them with its capitalist regime, and the domination of a handful of monopolists and financiers now hinders the further development of those productive forces, whose nature is immediately social. Consequently, their political regimes can no longer be liberating but, on the contrary, tend toward reaction and oppression.

Fascism is the extreme expression of this tendency. The Communist International defined it as “the open terrorist dictatorship of the most reactionary, most chauvinistic, and most imperialist elements of finance capital.”^[2] Throughout the modern imperialist stage, and even before that, the most liberal and republican capitalists have behaved in a reactionary, chauvinistic, and imperialist manner toward workers and the peoples they colonized. But what characterizes the fascists is that they turn these episodes into a systematic terrorist dictatorship of the most aggressive sector of finance capital.

This terrorist dictatorship is not a permanent ideal for the financial oligarchy because:

- 1. it hinders competition among commodity owners (which remains the basis of the mechanism by which it obtains its profits),*
- 2. it hypertrophies the state bureaucracy, and*
- 3. it minimizes its ability to dominate through deception, creating enemies even among the broad lower strata of its own class.*

For these reasons, the financial oligarchy only

resorts to fascism when its regime of domination and enrichment enters into a deep crisis—a crisis such as the current one, which forces it to move to a policy of war against sovereign nations, imposing it also on its own population. This is what the imperialist powers of North America and Europe are doing by attacking Russia, Venezuela, the Arab and Muslim peoples, etc., in order to dominate the world. We are witnessing an erosion of democratic rights in Western regimes, which is part of their process of fascistization, along with their falsification of the history of the anti-fascist Second World War and their more or less explicit support for Ukrainian, Israeli, Venezuelan, and other fascists.

Although the foundation of fascism lies in imperialism, the working class and the oppressed peoples should not always fight primarily against it. In 1935–45, the main task was to unite all possible forces—including liberal imperialists—against fascism, because fascism had conquered the state forces necessary to assault the only existing socialist country and to enslave peoples for the benefit of a few “races.” Victory in the anti-fascist world war was possible thanks to this tactic. And this result weakened imperialism as a whole to such an extent that socialism spread to a whole field of countries and the colonial system began to crumble.

Today, the situation is not the same as on the eve of the Second World War—at least not yet. Although there is still a difference between fascist bourgeois forces and more liberal or social-democratic ones, the collusion of all of them—under the iron command of the United States—against free nations now prevails (in addition, the imperialist powers still maintain some political rights that were inconceivable under fascist terror). In any case, we must not forget that, also in the 1930s, the Communist International first had to wage a frontal struggle against pro-capitalist and anti-communist social democracy in order for the broadest masses to understand the need for a united anti-fascist front. And even then,

social democracy agreed to this popular demand only three years after Nazism had taken hold in Germany.

Right now, the main target of our struggle is the imperialist powers and their agents in other countries, not the political forces that merely share some reactionary traits with the fascists. In many cases, the worst warmongering comes from fascist parties, but there is one globally important case where this is not so: in the United States, it is the Democratic Party that most endangers the survival of humanity by provoking war against Russia, while the Republican Party—which is more fascist—prefers to strengthen Yankee imperialism first, at the cost of subjugating weaker countries.

Of course, these are only different tactics in the service of the same goal: to defeat and subjugate sovereign nations, especially China, which is most capable of preventing this. However, this tactical difference is very important at a historical moment when the imperialist powers are decomposing and independent nations are strengthening. The spontaneous course of events plays in our favor and, as the USSR did in the 1930s, it is in the interest of the proletariat and the peoples to postpone the collision between the great powers for as long as possible, developing the mass force of anti-imperialism, particularly in the oppressor countries (as is already happening through solidarity with Palestine).

There are also important contradictions within the anti-imperialist camp. The DPRK and China are socialist, while the Russian government is influenced by bourgeois nationalist forces that share interests and ideas with the pro-fascist right: idealization of the nation and the traditional family against the democratic rights of minorities, confessionality, stigmatization of immigrants, rejection of the left and communism, etc.

The tactic of the working class must prioritize the unity of all those who fight against the imperialist powers and for a multipolar world, above other democratic issues.

Above all, we must reject a united front with that “left”—including social democracy—that supports the collective West, even though we may be closer to it on secondary democratic demands such as the reduction of economic inequalities, secularism, republicanism, civil rights, immigration, and progressive traditions. Furthermore, in order to continue serving monopoly capital by deceiving the working class, this imperialist “left” has promoted an irrational caricature of those democratic demands that distorts them (postmodern ideology, “wokeism,” etc.) and turns them into a mockery of fascist demagoguery.

At the same time, we would betray our strategic objectives and engage in tactical opportunism if, from our class independence, we did not combat the reactionary features of other forces that claim to oppose Western imperialists. It is not true that the opposition between left and right, between progress and reaction, has disappeared. What is disappearing—because it was always more apparent than real—is the opposition between the right and the false left. We must strongly defend the cause of the true left, of democracy, and of socialism.

The formation of a united front with anti-Western forces that exhibit reactionary traits may be necessary within oppressed countries and on an international scale. However, it is not appropriate within oppressive countries, where the process of fascistization promoted by growing sectors of the financial oligarchy is aided by ultra-right forces that disguise themselves as patriots in order to meanly promote chauvinism, the ethnic division of workers, their submission to capitalists, corporatism, and, ultimately, the formation of cannon fodder for imperialist war.

In oppressor countries, joint actions with partially reactionary forces are admissible, but only on a case-by-case basis and for the main cause of confronting the imperialist bloc. Similarly, joint actions with the forces of the imperialist “left” are admissible only for other democratic causes that are secondary.

We must be fully aware that the fate of the anti-impe-

rialist struggle does not depend on these forces but on the proletariat and the oppressed masses, who spontaneously tend toward democracy and socialism. To the extent that the false left dominates this desire, we communists must participate in their mass actions in a permanent and persistent manner, from a consistently democratic and socialist position, denouncing the opportunism of their leaders and prioritizing the need to confront the Western imperialist bloc. The united front needed in the dominant countries is one that brings together the forces that consistently fight for democracy—that is, concentrating their fire on the imperialism of the collective West.

In this way, we will be able to resolve the contradictions that confuse the masses and clarify the path to their liberation from fascism and imperialism.

Notes

[1] Lenin, *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*, Chapter IX.

[2] Georgi Dimitrov, *The Offensive of Fascism and the Tasks of the Communist International*, 1935.

“Faced with the rise of fascism in Europe, we must unite as never before”

Anatole Sawosik | Pole of Communist Revival in France (PRCF)

Faced with the rise of fascism in Europe, we must unite as never before, in line with the Seventh Congress of the Comintern, proletarian internationalism with popular patriotism, and thus unapologetically contest the fascists, on our class basis, for the banner of national sovereignty. We must also dialectically link the commitment to national independence with the strategic struggle for socialism.

As we know, Dimitrov insisted in his 1935 conclusions on the urgent need for communist parties to champion the independence of their respective homelands because, as we know, the Third Reich wanted to forge a Greater Germanic Europe on the ruins of free nations by joining forces with the vassal oligarchies of many European countries that ‘preferred Hitler to the Soviets’.

Faced with the danger of globalised imperialist wars, which in our time have a hegemonic, even exterminatory dimension, the Seventh Congress taught us, in principle, not to denounce “imperialism” in abstract terms, but to identify the main enemy of the peoples in each era. Yesterday, the Seventh Congress called on communists not to dismiss Nazi Germany and its Western rivals, even if they were imperialist (France, England, the USA, etc.), but to target primarily Hitlerism allied with Mussolini and the Japanese militarists, whom the Comintern rightly described as the ‘shock troops of world reaction’. Moreover, Hitler’s final defeat in 1945 led to the unprecedented expansion of the world socialist camp, demonstrating the futility of the Trotskyists’ criticism of the Seventh Congress for burying the struggle for socialism in the name of anti-fascism. Today, it would be simplistic and erroneous to dismiss, as some communist parties do, like the Trotskyists, on the one hand, the very

diverse countries that make up the BRICS—even if some of them are bourgeois and counter-revolutionary, such as Russia, or heavily reactionary, such as N. Modi’s India—and, on the other hand, Euro-Atlantic hegemony, the number one enemy of the peoples, including the peoples of Western Europe and North America. Modi. Indeed, since 1945, US imperialism, flanked by its Anglo-Saxon, European, South Korean and Japanese vassals, has been tempted, in order to maintain the threatened global domination of the dollar and above all to avoid being supplanted by China led by the CCP, to go all out in a potentially exterminatory Third World War, with the help of nuclear weapons. And this global hegemony is all the more dangerous because it is in decline and is playing with the very survival of humanity, relying on the most reactionary forces on the planet, from the neo-Nazis in Kiev to the ultra-Zionists, including the jihadists of the Islamic State (Syria), the obscurantist Chinese sect Falun Gong and the most delusional North American messianists.

How can we fail to see that in the five states that make up the initial core of the BRICS—Brazil, Russia, India, China, and South Africa—proletarian and communist traditions and legacies are strong or just waiting to be revived? So much so that a global victory for multipolarity led by the BRICS would inevitably reignite the global confrontation between Capital and Labour and Capitalism/Socialism on a global scale, while the struggle for multipolarity encourages all the dominated or marginalised countries of the world to reaffirm their national sovereignty against hegemony (as we see from the ALBA countries to the Sahel countries), which is very positive. In reality, since Euro-Atlantic hegemony is currently the spear-

head of the most unbridled capitalist globalisation, its defeat would open a huge breach in the flank of capitalism itself, just as the defeat of Hitlerism in 1945 opened a huge breach that made it possible to create the European socialist camp and pave the way for the socialist and/or anti-imperialist revolutions in China, Vietnam, Cuba and Africa. This is all the more true given that the global proletariat, and especially the working class, has been awakening almost everywhere since the early 2020s in the form of a powerful strike movement that stretches from India to Great Britain, from Bangladesh to South Korea, from Mexico to the USA via Quebec, not to mention, in the most recent period, the strike movements in Greece, Belgium, Italy, and of course in France at the moment.

Unfortunately, many progressives confuse ‘fascism’ with ‘fascisation’. Fascism, defined by Dimitrov as the political mechanism that allows the most reactionary layers of imperialism to crush the working class, and in doing so to liquidate freedoms, but also to quietly prepare for imperialist war, is only the end result of the process of fascisation. This is why we must not cry fascism at every measure taken by the police to tighten bourgeois democracy, as this would only trivialise fascism itself and weaken the vigilance of workers. But symmetrically, under the pretext that the forms of fascistisation are never the same in different countries and periods and that, for example, the countries of the EU are not currently fully fascist, we must not deny the increasingly clear process of fascistisation of bourgeois democracies which, faced with a breakdown in political consent on the part of the working classes, notably a latent rejection of European “integration”, support for NATO, acceptance of capitalism, and acquiescence to the Palestinian genocide, etc., are becoming increasingly hardened, cultivating state anti-communism, flirting with the racist far right, allying themselves with Bandera, neo-Nazi or neo-Mussolini movements, and designating certain sections of the population

(notably ‘Muslims’ today) as scapegoats for the social crisis. In short, as Dimitrov observed, increasingly creating the conditions for fascism in the strict sense of the term, i.e. the liquidation of bourgeois democracy and unbridled violence against workers.

This is why, even if the forms of fascism have changed between the 1930s and today, in order to combat the march towards fascism, it is still necessary to combine this struggle with the defence of popular interests, the rejection of imperialist wars, and the defence of national sovereignty, without ceasing to confront the far right itself directly.

Anti-fascism does not mean supporting the bourgeois bloc responsible for fascism by default, but calling on workers not only to fight the far right, but also to strike at the Euro-Atlanticist policy that constantly creates the socio-cultural breeding ground for fascism. Today’s anti-fascism must therefore not consist in dreaming of an impossible ‘progressive reorientation of the EU’, as the PCF does, as if the EU were an alternative to fascism, but in explaining that European ‘integration’, insofar as it aims to establish a fascist and warlike empire, to destroy the popular gains of each country, to carve up free nations, criminalise communism, etc., is in essence and in fact, with the general crisis of capitalism of which it is a symptom, one of the root causes of fascism, which must be fought no less than the far right. This is all the more true given that, in our era, the old ‘populist’ far right and the new ultra-warmongering reaction that claims allegiance to the EU-NATO and the anti-Russian crusade have already begun to merge, as shown by the support given by Ursula von der Leyen and Co. to the Ukrainian regime, which is riddled with avowed neo-Nazis.

Conclusion: the line of principle drawn by the Seventh Congress encourages us more than ever to reject both the ‘funeral march of the working class’ and the empty union behind this or that bourgeois, petty-bourgeois or nationalist force. By defending this rigorous and unifying orientation, Dimitrov did not

betray the essence of Leninism, he fully deployed it; for Lenin, the Party must unite behind it all the forces of social change, given that only the working class is capable of gathering around it, in a vast 'front of fronts', all the struggles for emancipation. Today, when capitalism has become exterminationist, leading humanity to death or barbarism, communists have the highest of responsibilities: that of consistently carrying on the anti-exterminationist struggle for life, that is, until the final victory of communism.

This is what Fidel understood when, denouncing Gorbachev and his policy of abandoning socialism under the pretext of universal peace, the Cuban leader ended his historic speech in Camaguey with the revolutionary and universally unifying slogan: Patria(s) o muerte, socialismo o morir, venceremos!

Neofascism in Latin America, chapter El Salvador

Ramón Valencia (El Salvador)

In the last decade of the 20th century, the United States consolidated the imposition of neoliberal globalism in Latin America, exerting strong pressure on countries in the region to adopt a system of rules and institutions designed to guarantee its control over governments and peoples globally. This strategy was implemented through international institutions such as the World Trade Organization (WTO), the World Bank (WB), and the International Monetary Fund (IMF), which functioned as instruments to condition and guide economic and social policies.

In addition to resorting to these global bodies, the United States promoted the creation of specific regional entities to reinforce its influence and economic dominance on the continent. Among these was the Free Trade Area of the Americas (FTAA), a project that sought to deepen economic integration under neoliberal criteria and guarantee unrestricted access to Latin American markets for U.S. capital and products.

The central objective of this initiative was to establish an institutional framework that would ensure the economic dominance of the United States over the peoples of Latin America, limiting the autonomy of their governments and restricting the possibilities for sovereign development in the region.

To legitimize its platform of domination and exploitation, the old military dictatorships, which had enjoyed support in previous periods, were replaced by governments that had emerged through electoral processes. This transformation sought to project the image of democratic, progressive, and civilian administrations, as well as that of a regional project focused on cooperation and development. However, behind this appearance, the free exploitation of the continent's extensive natural resources was ensured for the benefit of external interests.

This context created new possibilities for popular

and left-wing parties and organizations, which until then had been persecuted or directly confronted by their own governments. These groups were invited to participate in electoral processes, but on the condition that they abide by the rules established by the system. In contrast, those countries, parties, or organizations that decided to confront and denounce the imperialist strategy, defending their sovereignty and national interests, were subjected to isolation and aggression. Within this scenario, the example of dignity and resistance demonstrated by both the people and the government of Cuba stands out.

In this context of domination and subjugation driven by imperialism, the figure of Commander Hugo Rafael Chávez emerged. In 1998, at the head of the Bolivarian movement in Venezuela, he achieved a historic electoral victory that marked a turning point in the region. This triumph, by defeating the right wing, showed the Latin American peoples that it is possible to conquer political power even under the rules imposed by the dominant system and, from there, to begin the transformation of societies toward more just and sovereign models.

Commander Chávez's victory triggered a series of victories for left-wing and progressive parties and movements in various Latin American countries. These political projects were distinguished by their commitment to the sovereign interests of their nations and by incorporating a significant component of popular participation in decision-making and political construction processes.

The impact of this new balance of power had consequences at the regional level, notably the defeat of the neoliberal Free Trade Area of the Americas (FTAA) project. In its place, alternative integration initiatives based on solidarity and complementarity among Latin American nations emerged. Examples of this are the formation of the Bolivarian Alliance

for the Peoples of Our America (ALBA) and the creation of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States (CELAC), among other projects aimed at strengthening cooperation and sovereign development in the region.

The 2008 financial crisis represented the exhaustion of the neoliberal project and forced imperialism to patch up its strategy worldwide. Meanwhile, in the region, the United States opted to launch a counteroffensive aimed at reestablishing and strengthening its economic, political, and military control over Latin American countries. To achieve this goal, imperialism resorted to the application of intervention methods already used in the past, known for their effectiveness in interfering in the internal affairs of countries. However, unlike previous stages, this new cycle incorporated more sophisticated and updated techniques, which significantly increased the scope and danger of interventionist actions.

This combination of traditional and modern tactics not only included mechanisms of economic pressure and political manipulation but also encompassed the use of media and digital tools, the judicialization of politics, disinformation campaigns, and the exploitation of internal conflicts. This deepened the capacity for destabilization and reinforced the strategy to subjugate and control the governments and peoples of the region, making the offensive even more lethal and difficult to counter.

As early as 2001, the United States government organized a coup d'état that overthrew President Hugo Chávez, which was defeated and reversed by the heroic action of the Bolivarian people. A year later, it promoted an oil strike that sought to economically strangle the Bolivarian Revolution. These actions were directed especially against the Republic and the Bolivarian Revolution of Venezuela. These interventionist actions were studied and became the basis for the regional strategy. By 2009, the counteroffensive had spread throughout the region.

The initial element was a strong disinformation campaign by the media monopolies, all owned by oligarchic groups. The main message was to accuse the

national government of the consequences of maintaining a national and sovereign policy against the interests of the United States, holding it responsible for the effects caused by the campaign of isolation and destabilization that this entailed.

The disinformation campaign was accompanied by the organization of two social structures, built from U.S. embassies with resources monitored through USAID. One consisted of a series of non-profit organizations and citizen associations that carried out street actions in each country, gradually moving from social protest to political protest, which could escalate into criminal violence, whose main element was a feeling of dissatisfaction that escalated into frustration. The other structure was that of digital platforms, which were used to shape public opinion by manipulating perception and post-truths.

Finally, there were special operations ranging from social and economic destabilization to coups d'état or contract killings. To this end, problems of violence were exploited and maximized, using special groups that appeared to be social organizations and that might be associated in one way or another with transnational crime structures, which were always controlled by agencies such as the DEA.

In 2009, a coup d'état was carried out against President Mel Zelaya of the sister Republic of Honduras, the first democratically elected progressive government to be overthrown by the imperialist counteroffensive. From that moment on, the policy of destabilization and defeat of different governments deepened. Whether defeated at the polls or through a coup d'état, the goal was to change the political map, consolidating a cycle of democratic setbacks and loss of popular gains.

In this first stage of the counteroffensive, once the leftist or progressive government had been defeated or overthrown, the coup sectors, guided by imperialism, sought, among other objectives, to ensure control of the electoral bodies or institutions of the respective country, with the aim of giving the appearance of maintaining the constitutional framework and pretending to return to “democratic normality,”

but ensuring control of the right-wing succession by fraudulent means.

The unexpected response for the imperialists and the right wing was that the resistance of the people returned to occupy the streets and squares. Despite coup maneuvers, repression, media deception, and electoral intervention, the people confronted these maneuvers and often regained political spaces and governments by using the same institutional mechanisms that the system itself provided. This situation showed that imperialist control, based on democratic appearances and institutional mechanisms, was unsustainable in the face of social mobilization and organized resistance. Faced with this impossibility of stabilizing its dominance, imperialism was forced to modify its strategy once again, resorting to the destruction of the very framework of bourgeois law that it had promoted decades earlier. The main objective was to reduce the spaces for democratic participation and definitively repress left-wing or progressive movements and parties. In this way, it sought to eliminate any possibility of popular organization that could challenge the established control.

In this new scenario, space opened up for increasingly extremist and authoritarian political positions. Regardless of whether they came to power through coups or elections, they immediately adopted measures aimed at destroying any form of popular organization and the spaces conquered by the people. More authoritarian and repressive forms of government were consolidated, laying the foundation for the imposition of fascist models that limit democratic participation and guarantee absolute control for the dominant sectors.

Chapter: El Salvador

December 31, 1991, marked a historic turning point for El Salvador, when the Peace Accords were signed, ending two decades of armed conflict, including a civil war that had begun in January 1981. This negotiation process resulted in a transition from armed confrontation to the political-electoral arena, allowing the opposing projects that had sustained the

conflict to continue their disputes through political participation and electoral competition.

For the Farabundo Martí National Liberation Front (FMLN), the transition from a guerrilla movement to a political and electoral actor represented an enormous challenge. Nevertheless, it gradually managed to build a solid electoral base and growing acceptance among the Salvadoran population. This allowed it to advance and ultimately achieve presidential victory in 2009.

The FMLN's conquest of the government coincided with an extremely adverse international context. At that time, the global financial crisis that began in 2008 was severely impacting the region, generating uncertainty and economic difficulties. In addition, the imperialist offensive was unfolding with force in Latin America, as evidenced by the coup d'état against President Mel Zelaya in Honduras, also in 2009.

During the two terms in which the Farabundo Martí National Liberation Front (FMLN) was in power—a total of ten years—the country was the scene of an intense campaign of political destabilization. In the first term, despite not having a parliamentary majority, the FMLN was able to take advantage of internal divisions within the right wing and, by building strategic alliances, managed to secure a simple majority that allowed it to govern. This context forced the opposition, led by the U.S. embassy, to modify its strategy and shift the focus of its offensive to other institutional fronts.

The opposition's new tactic was to use the judiciary, the Attorney General's Office, and the media as the first line of attack against the FMLN government. Despite these maneuvers, the FMLN managed to secure, albeit by a narrow margin, its continuity in a second presidential term. However, this result provoked an immediate reaction from abroad: the U.S. State Department decided to intensify its campaign of attrition.

As part of this intensification, Ms. Jane Manes was appointed as the U.S. ambassador to the country. Her agenda and work plan added new elements to

the destabilization process, including strengthening organizational work in communities and forming non-profit associations financed through the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID). At the same time, the embassy became directly involved in a campaign to discredit the national political system.

The end result of this campaign of attrition was the electoral defeat of the FMLN. However, the repercussions were not limited to the left: the destabilization strategy also led to the breakdown of the country's entire traditional political system, even affecting the right-wing party that aspired to regain power. In this scenario of crisis and the breakdown of traditional political structures, an unexpected winner emerged for the United States, significantly transforming the Salvadoran political landscape.

The process of attrition promoted by the U.S. embassy was key to creating an atmosphere of widespread rejection of the traditional Salvadoran political system. This strategy, sustained for years, not only weakened the FMLN government but also the legitimacy of the historical parties, paving the way for the emergence of an alternative that presented itself as "anti-system."

In this context, Bukele emerged as a figure who represented a different option from the traditional parties. His strategy consisted of presenting himself as a staunch opponent of the "political class," which allowed him to attract both disenchanted left-wing and right-wing sectors. His discourse was distinguished by its aggressive, banal, and insulting tone, which capitalized on deep social resentment toward the political class. As a result, Bukele's campaign achieved a resounding victory at the polls.

After taking office, to reinforce his discourse, Bukele launched two lines of action on social media: a campaign of harassment, persecution, and, in some cases, physical capture of opposition political leaders, whether from the left or the right, with a clear objective—to neutralize any voice that could represent an obstacle or threat to the new government. Simultaneously, he organized public spectacles

through the same digital media, announcing the closure of programs and institutions emblematic of previous FMLN governments. During these actions, employees identified as left-wing sympathizers were dismissed, sometimes in an insulting manner and without any consideration for their labor rights. The arbitrariness was such that anyone could be accused of being a relative or sympathizer and dismissed immediately. Those who tried to resist these measures faced harassment and were accused under any pretext, further intensifying the atmosphere of persecution.

These two campaigns, carried out simultaneously and with media coverage, succeeded in instilling fear as a central element in public life. The underlying goal was to consolidate a climate of insecurity and vulnerability for all those who dared to question or confront the regime's actions.

From his first day in power, Nayib Bukele established a clear stance on the international stage, aimed at affirming his imperialist position. One of his first actions was to break diplomatic relations with the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela. This was not only done publicly and in the media but also without due process, which showed his intention to position himself before the international community and send signals about the new orientation of the Salvadoran government.

At the same time, Bukele undertook a significant rapprochement with the administration of Donald Trump in the United States. This bond was such that he came to be recognized as a personal friend of the then-U.S. president, thus consolidating a relationship of political and strategic proximity. This rapprochement marked a difference from other countries in the region and showed El Salvador's alignment with the policies promoted by Washington.

During the second year of Bukele's administration, the arrival and spread of the COVID-19 pandemic became the perfect justification for implementing a level of social control never before seen in the country. Under the guise of preventing the spread of the disease, the government decreed a total lockdown

of the national territory, restricting the mobility and daily activities of the population. This measure was accompanied by an intense media campaign of panic, urging citizens to report anyone who had recently entered the country.

As part of these actions, confinement areas were established for those entering the country—areas that lacked the minimum conditions to adequately handle quarantine—quickly becoming hotbeds of contamination and spread of the virus. Far from containing the spread of the disease, these measures proved counterproductive and contributed to the spread of the pandemic throughout the country.

Throughout that year, the population lived in a state of constant anxiety, facing a series of abuses and controversial measures that deepened the climate of fear. The message was clear: citizens had to cooperate with the authorities, or at least appear to do so, in order to protect themselves, making people feel vulnerable and unprotected in the face of the government's arbitrary actions.

During 2021, elections were held for the Legislative Assembly in El Salvador. With the aim of securing a parliamentary majority, President Bukele began, months in advance, to construct a public narrative in which he blamed opposition deputies for the lack of financial support needed to combat the epidemic and for other resources essential for government management.

For their part, legislators responded by exposing cases of corruption in the administration of these resources and denouncing violations of the law in several of the measures taken by the government. However, Bukele, supported by the media, managed to manipulate public perception, presenting these allegations as attempts to obstruct his administration and harm the interests of the people.

Every time the debate was opened, the president intensified the level of confrontation and insults, preventing the situation from being properly understood. This strategy reached its peak on February 9, 2021, when Bukele, using the army, the police, and various civilian shock groups, took over the parlia-

ment building by force.

The action was accompanied by a publicity campaign that presented this parliamentary coup as a “liberating action” against an alleged clique of deputies and former officials who were blamed for the country's serious problems.

At the end of the occupation, in a gesture intended to be messianic, Bukele addressed the assembly from the podium of the legislative presidency, declaring, “Now we know who is in control,” but adding that “God had spoken to him, telling him that he should not yet take the legislative palace.” This episode, together with the enormous media campaign that supported it, proved favorable for Bukele: a month later, the coalition of parties that formed his alliance managed to obtain a qualified parliamentary majority.

The new balance of power was immediately manifested through the dismissal of the entire Supreme Court of Justice, an act that violated the constitutional procedures established for the gradual removal of magistrates. Likewise, the Attorney General of the Republic was removed and replaced by a figure aligned with the government's interests.

Shortly thereafter, most of the country's judges were dismissed and replaced, thus bringing the judiciary completely in line with the executive branch. This reconfiguration allowed the government to exercise absolute control over the judicial system, eliminating any possibility of institutional checks and balances.

To justify more far-reaching changes, a commission of experts was formed, chaired by the Vice President of the Republic, under the pretext of proposing a constitutional reform. However, this initiative never produced results, making it clear that the real objective was to legitimize presidential reelection, even though the Constitution prohibits it.

Faced with the impossibility of presenting a legitimate constitutional reform, the Constitutional Chamber took on the task of interpreting the article referring to the exercise of the presidency, decreeing that said article did not prevent reelection. At the same time, Bukele's parliamentary group drafted and

approved a reform to the same article, ensuring the president's continued reelection, which had to be ratified by the next Legislative Assembly.

The growing discontent of the population, exacerbated by constant abuses of power and deteriorating living conditions, led to the organization and mobilization of a renewed social movement. Faced with this new wave of protests, President Bukele's immediate reaction was to order the arrest of former public officials and some social leaders, many of whom were deprived of their liberty without having undergone a proper judicial process. However, despite these attempts at intimidation, social mobilization persisted and continued to manifest itself in the country.

At that point, he launched a policy of violence control under the pretext of combating gangs. Thanks to an agreement with Bukele, the gangs had maintained relative calm in terms of lethal violence, although not in their extortion of the population. This agreement was broken after a series of violent acts and murders attributed to these criminal groups. Immediately after the campaign began, a state of emergency was declared, and the rights of association, mobility, and protest were suspended, muzzling the social movement and neutralizing protests and denunciations of human and constitutional rights violations. According to unofficial data, there have been at least 7,000 arbitrary arrests of people who do not belong to gangs, representing 10% of the total number of arrests, and 153 cases of death in custody have been documented, as well as reports of torture and ill-treatment.

The 2024 electoral process in El Salvador took place in an environment marked by political tension and control exercised by the Bukele government. Although these elections saw a decline in popular support, reflected in a decrease in votes for the presidential candidate, there was also a significant increase in reports of possible irregularities. Among the main concerns were alterations to the electoral roll and a lack of transparency in the audit of the computer system, which raised suspicions about the legitimacy of the results.

Despite these allegations, the ruling coalition managed to maintain a qualified majority in the Legislative Assembly. This result was key, as it allowed for the ratification of the article of law that enables Bukele's reelection, thus ensuring the president's permanence in power and consolidating the executive branch's control over the Salvadoran political system.

International Position

On the international stage, although relations with Joe Biden's administration deteriorated, they were never in danger of breaking down. With Donald Trump's return to the U.S. presidency, bilateral ties have been strengthened, positioning El Salvador as a key country for Trump's strategy in the region.

The strengthening of relations with the Trump administration has turned El Salvador into an example of the policy of domination and control that the U.S. president seeks to impose on Latin America. The country has become a key player in the strategy of aggression against the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, playing an active role in actions aimed at destabilizing the Venezuelan government.

In this context, El Salvador has granted refuge and made high-profile advisors of numerous Venezuelans who have been convicted for their participation in coups and terrorist acts. These individuals continue to conspire and operate permanently against Venezuela, which has prompted complaints from the Venezuelan government. During the presidential elections on July 28, 2024, the Bolivarian government publicly accused one of the main members of this group of leading a hacking attack against the computer system of the electoral process.

As part of these actions against the Venezuelan government and people, Bukele made prison facilities, known as CECOT, available to the United States government for the deportation and kidnapping of Venezuelan migrant citizens, accusing them of belonging to criminal gangs without due process, thereby creating a serious precedent of human rights violations.

This action was carried out with extreme violence and widespread media coverage, hoping to elicit sympathy from the Venezuelan people for the brutal way in which the alleged criminals were punished. The result was quite the opposite: the Venezuelan people showed solidarity and mobilized for the freedom of their fellow citizens, forcing Trump to order their transfer to their homeland—all without taking Bukele’s opinion into account.

Finally, as part of this strategy of aggression, a permanent media campaign is being waged against the Venezuelan people, showing them the living conditions of Venezuelan refugees in El Salvador and presenting Bukele as a charismatic leader, with the intention of creating a favorable opinion of what they call the “Bukele model.”

In short, in just six years, Nayib Bukele’s government has managed to reverse the fundamental contents of the Peace Accords, minimizing and even denying their historical importance and the causes that motivated them. This process has been accompanied by the systematic demolition of the constitutional framework, establishing a regime that operates de facto and acts arbitrarily, even affecting the legislative and judicial branches of government.

The control exercised by the government extends to the field of communication, where it maintains constant activity on social media. Through these platforms, the executive branch distracts the public, eliminates public debate, and projects a favorable international image, while persecuting and repressing any expression of opposition within the country.

The repression instituted by the Bukele government does not distinguish between levels of opposition: it affects political parties, social movements, and individual citizens who dare to question or denounce recurring abuses, including people in his inner circle who have dared to point out crimes or misdemeanors committed by the government itself and its officials. Physical acts of persecution, repression, and murder have created an atmosphere of widespread fear, in which most people live under the constant threat of reprisals, with no collective capacity to confront this

situation.

While on the international stage it has established a pro-imperialist position and remains hostile to progressive governments and movements—with particular aggression against the Bolivarian government—one of its main contributions to the imperial counteroffensive in the region is its advertising campaign aimed at the popular sectors, which seeks to encourage them to emulate the Bukele model.

Final Considerations

The current imperialist strategy responds directly to the crisis of capitalism and the progressive decline of the United States as a hegemonic power. This strategy is aimed at establishing neo-fascist regimes, whose main objective is to ensure the recovery and maintenance of U.S. dominance. To achieve this, they not only seek to eliminate political and social opposition but are also willing to break bourgeois constitutional frameworks when these are considered obstacles to their interests.

Although Bukele’s initial rise to power may have seemed fortuitous, it is, in fact, fully aligned with this imperialist strategy. However, it is important to consider that an eventual change of government in the United States could mean the return of its traditional representatives and, consequently, the fall of Bukele.

Even so, this would not imply an abandonment of the imperialist intention to maintain control over Salvadoran society. The advance of neo-fascism—including that imposed by the Trump administration in the United States—poses a serious threat not only to the region but to all of humanity. However, this threat also opens up the opportunity to confront and defeat what the empire of barbarism represents, promoting the advance of socialism.

Thus, a historic duty arises: defeating the offensive of imperialism and neo-fascism requires raising the level of organization and struggle of the peoples. The widespread dissemination of the principles of socialism is the only guarantee of achieving definitive victory over darkness and ensuring a future of justice and dignity.

The Parenthesis Between Capital and Life (Reflections from an Organic Militancy)

Aminta Beleño Gómez | Colombian Communist Party

Introduction

The call for an International Anti-Imperialist Conference in Venezuela is a propitious space for articulation among parties, organisations, and social leaders who are fully aware of the importance of the historical moment we are living through. It goes beyond the militancy of the global left—it concerns humanity itself, which has had to live in the parenthesis between capital and life, when there is very little time left to stop planetary destruction.

Inspired by the tenacious resilience that Palestine, an indigenous people, has shown in defence of its territory, culture, history, language, art, olive trees, and humanity as a whole, I dared to write this article from the perspective shaped by my organic communist militancy in Colombia—between the landscape of my experience in Venezuela during the Bolivarian Revolution and the ancestral legacy one receives through nightmares and dreams.

In this text, I intend to recall the essential origins of imperialism, because we no longer have much human time left to make mistakes. In defining a struggle against imperialism, we must target capitalism, for it is there that imperialist logic is engendered. The struggle against Nazism, fascism, and Zionism has the same character, as these are the most developed expressions of systemic violence.

Likewise, it is crucial to understand that the capitalist system was born from the oppressive legacies of other tyrannical systems that preceded and shaped it: patriarchy, slavery, and feudalism—all of which survive well into the 21st century and inhabit the most sophisticated forms of capital.

This is why the systemic logic and actions of impe-

rialism often confound our own logic. Just when we believed that international conventions on human rights, national sovereignty, and the self-determination of peoples had consigned to history the horrors of European colonisation, holy wars, the First and Second World Wars, and the atomic bombings of Nagasaki and Hiroshima, one day we awoke to eco-genocide in Gaza, Nazis in Ukraine, and missiles targeting our fishermen in the Caribbean Sea—without a single criminal action being taken against their perpetrators.

Nevertheless, there is always a light that remains lit to show us the way through the darkness: humanity itself—humanity fighting for humanity—counted in the multitudes who have risen up from all corners of the world, even from the very bowels of the monster, to fight hand to hand against the eco-genocide in Gaza.

From within our organic militancy, let us find the invisible threads that connect us to our remote origins—to that humanity itself—and let us break the parenthesis that will allow us to leave capital behind and transcend toward life.

The Complexity of the Decline That Intercepts Us

The historical moment we have been given to live in is quite convoluted. It is marked by what has come to be characterised as systemic decline, originating in the deepest crisis of transnationalised capitalism, consistent with that specific historical phase of capital development that Lenin identified and defined as imperialism.^[1]

The transnational capitalism of our time is pos-

sessed by a destructive logic that increasingly and ruthlessly revalidates and reconfigures its aggressive, exploitative, patriarchal, and unnatural nature. From this logic, it plans the destabilisation of nations, the mass elimination of living beings—both human and non-human—and proudly displays its potential for planetary self-destruction.

In this regard, it is worth quoting excerpts from the speech delivered by the President of Colombia, Gustavo Petro Urrego, before the General Assembly of the United Nations (UN) on 23 September of this year. As he himself stated, “it was not just another speech”; it was an urgent call in the face of the certainty that “humanity is facing its greatest crossroads,” and that only the unity of our peoples can save us.

Let us read:

“...The Dantesque situation in Palestine did not lead me to think that the same, or almost the same, could happen in the Colombian Caribbean, when missiles are fired at unarmed young people at sea. And so now we are facing a different, perhaps more global, situation. Today, barbarism is planetary; today it falls upon the whole of humanity. This chamber is a silent witness and accomplice to genocide in today’s world, when we thought it was only the preserve of Hitler. Europe and the United States continue to applaud their new fashionable Hitlers... today they are doing the same thing as Hitler. The UN must change now—a different, humane UN. First and foremost, it must stop the genocide in Gaza. Humanity cannot allow another day of genocide, neither by Netanyahu’s genocidal regime nor by its allies in the United States and Europe.”^[2]

Warmongering, drug trafficking, human trafficking, the sexual exploitation of women and children, and the exploitation of labour under new conditions of slavery and servitude have become the preferred mechanisms for the accumulation of wealth.

These are the reasons for the resurgence of the extreme right around the world, the rise of religious fanaticism, the resurrection of Nazi-fascism, and the

strengthening of its highest form: Zionism.

In this sense, the stark speech by our Colombian president before the UN continues:

“They need violence to dominate Colombia and Latin America. They need to destroy dialogue and to impose and launch killer missiles on poor young people in the Caribbean. The anti-drug policy is not meant to stop cocaine from reaching the United States—it is meant to dominate the peoples of the South. The anti-drug policy is not about the public health of society, but about the politics of power. They do not want light to be shed on Latin America, nor for the time of the peoples to come. The young people killed by missiles in the Caribbean were not from the Tren de Aragua^[3]; they were Caribbean—they were simply poor young people from Latin America. The drug traffickers live elsewhere—in New York and in Miami. They make deals with the DEA, which allows them to traffic in Africa, Europe, Russia, or China, but not in the United States—a country that supposedly stops cocaine consumption without actually reducing it. This happens simply because its sick drug addicts—and they are sick—have moved on to consuming the deadly drug of humanity’s counterculture in times of extinction caused by the climate crisis: fentanyl. This fentanyl is produced within the industrial apparatus of the United States—a self-destructive American consumption that represents the worst understanding of drugs in the history of humanity: addiction to fentanyl and to petrol—total poisons to life on Earth. Cocaine used to kill, through the poisons mixed with it, about 3,000 people a year in this country. Today, fentanyl kills 100.03 times more—it is a death sentence for humanity.”

New, Effective and Addictive Forms of Domination

This “greater crossroads” referred to by President Petro is not only related to the most atrocious form of physical subjugation that reveals the specific his-

torical phase of capitalism—imperialism. It also confronts us with the scientific and technological advances produced by working humanity, but co-opted to generate instruments and devices that enable the control and manipulation of collective thought, and even to create globalised psyches that respond to patterns of systemic hegemony.

We are witnessing new, effective, and addictive forms of domination that violate everything from childlike innocence—hypnotised and manipulated in the world of virtual games—to the memory of those who have died, exploiting the virtual records they left on social media. Images, videos, voice notes, texts, surveys, preferences, and entertainment have generated an archive that is stored in the false cloud, feeding the *griefbots*.^[4]

Social phenomena such as the so-called hikikomori in Japan—young people who live trapped in their own homes, totally isolated from real society yet hyperconnected to intangible dimensions, spaces, and beings—should sound alarm bells. Although this modern hermit-like existence originated in Japan and was associated with cultural factors, working conditions, and individual emotional problems, it has now spread in significant numbers to South Korea, the United States, Spain, France, and Italy, among other territories.

Officially, Japan recognised this social anomaly as a feature of “new capitalism,” which addresses “social issues” to drive “economic growth.” Thus, this workforce of thousands of people categorised as hikikomori is being exploited through telework, which ultimately undermines the historical social essence of employment and production, in order to generate greater surpluses and accumulate wealth among the ruling elites.^[5]

New, effective, and addictive forms of domination have even taken hold of the terms of commercial exchange, resorting to virtuality so that money becomes intangible and escapes any physical, national, legal, and—above all—social control.

*In this regard, Peruvian scholar Jorge Millones, in his work *Artificial Intelligence and Natural Stupidity*, explains that:*

“Tokens, the final frontier of economic digitalisation, have emerged as digital units of value that redefine the relationships of production and consumption in contemporary capitalism.

A token is a digital asset that represents rights to a good or service, and its existence is materialised in the blockchain—a distributed database that ensures the integrity of transactions.

These tokens not only facilitate transactions and smart contracts but also encapsulate digital fetishism, where value is abstracted from the tangible and focused on the virtual.

Essentially, tokens are an extension of capitalism into cyberspace, commodifying ever more aspects of digital life.

They function as vehicles for financial speculation, creating markets where value is not based on production or human labour, but on artificial scarcity and market perception.

This market logic not only amplifies existing inequalities but also obscures social relations of exploitation by shifting value towards an abstract digital consensus.

In this new paradigm, human labour is subsumed under the efficiency of code and algorithms, reinforcing a power structure that prioritises financial capital over productive capital.”^[6]

These new, effective, and addictive forms of imperialist domination, embedded in the deep crisis of capital, correspond to Gramsci’s definition of “crisis”: “The crisis consists precisely in the fact that the old is dying and the new cannot be born; in this interregnum, the most morbid phenomena appear.”^[7]

It is the crisis of capitalism in its phase of systemic decline that has generated these “most morbid phenomena”—never before imagined—such as the eco-genocide in Palestine^[8], carried out daily, live and direct, under complete and blatant impunity.

This impunity allows the greatest criminal in history, Benjamin Netanyahu, to appear before the UN with pride and arrogance, reaffirming the slaughter of that indigenous civilian population with missiles, bombs, and starvation.

The crime against Palestine has included many other perversions, such as torture and sexual violence against imprisoned leaders, broadcast on television as a display of power—morbid phenomena carried out by Zionism that recall the horrors of Hitler during the Second World War.^[9] Yes, what Petro desperately shouted is true: “...humanity faces its greatest crossroads...”

This variety of “morbid phenomena” is also reflected in the rise of gender-based violence (GBV), which now operates as part of the commodification of everything that exists—a system that creates, recreates, reproduces, and trades in every form of aggression against women and feminised beings.

The rate of femicide in Latin America and the Caribbean is already alarming: on average, eleven women a day were murdered for gender-related reasons in 2023, according to the latest bulletin from the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC), published in 2024.^[10]

Paedophilia and online rape—whether individual or group, live or recorded—are not isolated psychological perversions or products of sick cinematography. They are part of a reality that has been corporately promoted in the name of free enterprise, positioning these forms of gender-based violence as lucrative audiovisual content in high demand. This is also linked to the promotion of narcotics, labelled as symbols of youth, rebellion, freedom, and pleasure.

In this regard, Rocío López Millón, an activist with the Feminist Policy Forum of Málaga (Spain), warned in her article “A Critical Stance on the Prostitution System”:

“Another major threat lies in the link between pornography and prostitution.

Pornography is educating future consumers, and its

dissemination on social media helps normalise this type of violence against women, in a context in which savage capitalism sends the message that our bodies are our best asset and we must exploit them through pornography, prostitution, and surrogacy.”^[11]

Human trafficking targets women as the main victims of modern slavery under the logic of the ‘morbid phenomena’ of transnational capitalism, which includes the terrible sex market. Impoverished women and children across the world are caught in migration processes induced by war, the destruction of local economies, the spread of drug trafficking, extractive industries, genetically modified food, pharmacology, and cosmetics—as well as by the imposition of blockades and sanctions against peoples who resist this decadent, neo-colonial logic of imperialism.

Organic Militancy and the Instinctive Consciousness of the Masses

The complexity of this historical moment urges us to take responsibility, in the present, for the immediate future—to awaken concern for an inevitable resolution that will not necessarily lead to the defeat of capitalism, but may instead result in the disintegration of our social nature and the destruction of all forms of life on the planet.

Currently, as a result of capitalist voracity, and according to the Red List of the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN):

“...more than 47,000 species are threatened with extinction...”^[12]

It is climate change that is advancing toward the destruction of life on the planet, and, as Petro stated in his most recent speech to the UN:

“...we have 10 years to reach a point of no return... And once we pass that point, nothing can be done. We will only observe the catastrophes, and we will even feel them in our own families... because the extinction of life, including human life, will be irreversible... No technology, no political or social force,

no human mind will be able to do anything to stop the collapse... it will be irreversible..."

It is necessary to break with this culture of capitalist production that not only profits from surplus value but has extended its exploitative claws into the bowels of the Earth and seeks to appropriate every form of life, disrupting the delicate balance that sustains the planet.

This culture of capitalist production has served only to enrich elites, impoverish peoples, and destroy the equilibrium of forces that coexist in perfect harmony to sustain planetary existence. The world system has imposed its unnatural culture of production upon us, making us believe in the myth that humanity is a superior creature with the right to take everything and give nothing back. Yet those who take everything are only a white, patriarchal, racist, murderous, and perverted elite.

Our humanity—that of the vast majority—must recover its ancestral memory, the one that records us as merely another creature of the planet: echoic and interdependent, with no divine origin or heaven to inhabit, destined always to return to the Earth.

In this sense, from our organic militancy, we must value, re-evaluate, and commit to the resistance and resilience of the multitudes who, in many countries across the world, are shaping an instinctive growth of anti-systemic and anti-imperialist consciousness. This consciousness manifests itself in the recognition of multiple oppressions, violences, and injustices exacerbated by the development of capital, as well as in the appropriation of mechanisms to make social realities visible and to dismantle the virtual reality that the system seeks to impose.

This consciousness gives rise, almost spontaneously, to potentially powerful initiatives, rhythms, and actions, as they manage to break with the pragmatic foresight of the system—taking by storm both the imperialist logic and that of those of us who are organically militant against the establishment.

This awakening of consciousness can be seen in the

mass protests and strikes against the ecocide in Gaza, taking place in major cities around the world—even in the streets of the ecocidal state of Israel itself.

A recent example: the demonstrations held on 23 September in 65 cities across Italy, including Rome, Milan, Turin, Naples, and Genoa. In the latter, the port was blocked to prevent the shipment of weapons to Israel. Ninety percent of public transport workers joined the strike, schools closed, and the enraged population bravely confronted police repression.

The event was described by Stacciolo Francesco, one of the protesters, as "...a powerful popular message against the logic of war..."^[13]—humanity itself: humanity fighting for humanity.

The Urgency of What to Do

For those of us committed to building another possible world—that communist utopia—analysis without a concrete programme, and theory without practice, are meaningless. That is why we always remember old Lenin and his unavoidable question: "What is to be done?"^[14]

Although this historical moment is different, because the dimensions of the world-system can now be measured in light years compared to the time of our classics, we continue to live in a world plagued by bourgeois tyranny, which has exacerbated all the injustices, oppressions, and violence inherited from the systems that preceded it.

We have achieved much, we are moving forward, and the proletarian class remains standing. However, the antagonisms between transnationalised capitalism and life itself have already transcended the limits of endurance: "...we have 10 years to reach a point of no return... And once we pass that point, nothing can be done..." said our president Petro at the UN, based on scientific findings that continue to exist against the tide of imperialism.

In that direction—in that urgency for necessary action—it is important to take Petro at his word, drawn from the many voices he has made his own:

Plan, global plan... if it is not for capital, it will be for humanity and for life. The owner of capital is a powerful human being, not a thing, not a fetish. This human being, driven by greed, is the one who will seek to have more and more oil approved here... regardless of the poisoning of the atmosphere with CO₂, which is the poisoning of all life on the planet... ...So—capital or life... barbarism or local and global democracy, or freedom or death, as Bolívar said... What is needed to overcome the climate crisis positively and prevent it from turning into a global collapse is a worldwide revolution of the peoples. It is a revolution of the united peoples, of civilisations that must dialogue more than states...

...And it can no longer be done because capital itself has become global and not state-owned... We must raise the red and black flag of freedom or death that Bolívar raised, without forgetting the white colour he lifted alongside them—the colour of peace—as a hope for life on Earth and in the heart of humanity. It is time for freedom or death. Death by missiles is real, but so is freedom in the human heart and its capacity for unity, rebellion, and existence...

Our meetings must advance this global plan, champion true rebellion and freedom, confront the imperialist eco-genocidal war, and decide—as the multitudes have decided—to organise the Army of Humanity that Petro called for in the streets of New York^[15] to stop the eco-genocide in Gaza, which stands as the greatest human pain and shame in all our history.

How long will this atrocity be allowed to continue? We have powers capable of halting the Zionist horror, just as the heroic Red Army halted the Hitlerian horror. If The Freedom Flotilla^[16] emerged and set sail with civilian heroes and heroines, how can we not form a Global Fleet for the salvation of the Palestinian people?

We have already suffered missiles in our Caribbean Sea. We already have civilian victims of Zionist war-mongering on our continent. What more must we

endure?

The Bolivarian peoples have a legacy of unity, cooperation, and mutual defence against external aggression: the Amphictyonic Congress of Panama, which remains essentially valid. Next year marks the 200th anniversary of its establishment. Let us celebrate this bicentennial by sealing a supra-continental unity—a unity of humanity itself—that will draw up and execute a tactical plan and a strategic programme to help us emerge from the systemic crisis, crossing that interregnum between the death of the old and the birth of the new.

Notes

[1] In 1917, Vladimir Ulyanov Lenin wrote an essay on the state of capitalism at the time, whose title has been translated into our language as *Imperialism: The Highest Stage of Capitalism*. In the work, Lenin described and identified the essential elements of imperialism: the concentration of production and capital, leading to the creation of monopolies; the fusion of banking and industrial capital, forming finance capital; the export of capital as distinct from the export of goods; the formation of international monopoly capitalist associations; and the territorial division of the world among the capitalist powers.

[2] Available at: <https://youtu.be/n0avn2Ge-d0?si=3tNofAR7EVmBH1K>

[3] El Tren de Aragua is the name given to a criminal gang that began operating in Venezuela around 2005, near the construction sites of the Aragua State railway. Following induced migration, many of its members left the country to commit crimes abroad. Despite the successful security operations implemented by the Venezuelan government against this and other criminal groups, the United States government has used it as a pretext to attack Venezuelan migrants on its territory and, more recently, to threaten Venezuelan sovereignty by launching missiles at fishermen navigating national waters.

[4] Griefbots are artificial intelligence programs that use the digital data of deceased individuals to create chat interfaces through which their relatives can communicate with them—simulating a form of life after death.

[5] See: “2% of Japan’s Workforce Could Be ‘Modern Recluses,’” Asia Pacific Foundation of Canada, 18 April 2023. Available at: <https://www.asiapacific.ca/publication/2-percent-japanese-labour-force-modern-day-recluses>.

Also: “Review of Hikikomori: A Global Health Problem, Identification and Treatment,” *Asian Journal of Psychiatry*, Vol. 84, June 2023. Available at: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S187620182300151X>.

And: “What Are ‘Hikikomori’? The Hundreds of Thousands of Young

People Who Live Without Leaving Their Rooms,” BBC News, 3 March 2019. Available at: <https://www.bbc.com/mundo/vert-fut-47212332>.

[6] Millones, Jorge (2025). Artificial Intelligence and Natural Stupidity: Reflections on Technological Capitalism. Editorial Trinchera and Editorial Nuestro Sur.

[7] Gramsci, Antonio (1981). Prison Notebooks, Vol. IV. Ediciones ERA.

[8] The term ecocide is used here because, in Palestine, all forms of life inhabiting the Gaza Strip are being annihilated. It is important to note that when a bomb explodes, it generates temperatures above 1,000 °C; combined with the blast wave, this not only kills human beings but also destroys infrastructure, flora, fauna, and soil composition—which will take hundreds or even thousands of years to regenerate. This is the scenario of all contemporary wars in which weapons of mass destruction are used: they are ecocidal.

[9] It should be remembered that Zionism originated in Europe at the end of the 19th century, led by Theodor Herzl. The movement also maintained a covert connection with the Nazis, and its leaders were complicit in crimes against European Jews to compel their adherence to the colonialist project in Palestine, among other reasons.

[10] Available at: <https://oig.cepal.org/es/indicadores/femicidio>

[11] López Millón, Rocío (2021). XXXI Feminist Policy Forum Workshop: Weaving Feminist Internationalism in the Face of the Patriarchal and Neoliberal Offensive. Feminist Policy Forum.

[12] Data from the IUCN, collected within the framework of the 16th Conference of the Parties (CoP) to the United Nations Convention on Biodiversity, held in Cali (Colombia) in October 2024. Available at: <https://www.iucnredlist.org/>

[13] Available at DW Español: https://www.instagram.com/reel/D089Bp2Ad_8/

[14] Lenin, Vladimir (1981). What Is To Be Done? Burning Issues of Our Movement. Vol. VI, Complete Works. Editorial Progreso.

[15] Petro led marches in New York following his address to the UN, where he proposed the creation of an army for global democracy against eco-genocide in Palestine. Available at: <https://www.instagram.com/reel/DPE8slPjnsu/?igsh=ZjFkYzMzMDQzZg==>

[16] The Freedom Flotilla is a humanitarian aid vessel organised by the NGO Freedom Flotilla Coalition, composed of participants from various parts of the world. Its aim is to break the siege on Gaza and deliver food, medicine, and essential supplies. On 1 October, it was illegally detained by Israeli forces in international waters. Among those detained were Luna Feu and Manuela Bedoya, both Colombian nationals.

“Struggle against imperialism and fascism stands today at the forefront.”

Pedro Rosas | Popular Revolutionary Anti-Imperialist Unity (UPRA, Venezuela)

In the struggle waged by peoples against various forms of exploitation and oppression, the struggle against imperialism and fascism stands today at the forefront. External military aggression and the fascist threat currently represent the **MAIN DANGER** for Venezuela—especially for workers, peasants, and community members—as the enemies of the people, in their desperation over the crisis and great debacle they are experiencing, resort to the manipulation of information, open violence, terrorism, and genocide, regardless of norms or values, ushering in a new era of obscurantism for all humanity.

Just as we face this main danger at our country’s doorstep—with threatening ships in the Caribbean Sea and bases in neighboring territories, and with fascist enemies acting with terrorist and paramilitary plans within our borders—we also have a people who resist and fight against imperialist aggression, who are preparing in all areas for the defense of national sovereignty.

But this situation does not exist only in Venezuela; on a global level, imperialism is a threat to all peoples, which is why we can describe it as the **COMMON ENEMY** of the proletariat and of all humanity, of the workers of both imperialist and dependent countries. Therefore, preparing ourselves to face and defeat such a cruel enemy is a task of the utmost importance, particularly in Venezuela, a country under siege by the imperialist bloc of the United States and the European Union. That is why we, the people and our institutions, are working to consolidate militant internationalism in all fields of struggle and to coordinate various initiatives to promote **GLOBAL ANTI-FASCIST AND ANTI-IMPERIALIST COORDINATION**, beyond ideological differences. This is

why we are present—solidary and committed—to this event and to every other where we can contribute to the idea of international popular unity.

Anti-Imperialism and Anti-Fascism

Anti-imperialism and anti-fascism are two concepts that express the response of peoples—especially studied and applied by revolutionaries—to two phenomena characteristic of capitalism in its highest phase. They directly confront imperialism and fascism, not only denouncing these negative expressions of bourgeois oppression but also representing an analysis of their origin, development, and organizational forms, while promoting a class policy specifically aimed at defeating these phenomena of the 20th and 21st centuries.

To delve into the fundamental elements of anti-imperialism and anti-fascism, we must make as objective an assessment as possible of what imperialism and fascism are—the former as a development of capitalism in its highest phase, controlled by large monopolies, and the latter as a product of imperialism, which, in times of serious crisis, resorts to direct violence to maintain itself, while during times of prosperity, imperialism resorts to social-democratic demagogy. Therefore, we must conclude that fascism is a product of imperialism in crisis; it is the most reactionary and violent dictatorship of capital.

It is important to understand that capitalism, like other modes of production known throughout human history, has undergone and continues to undergo changes throughout its existence. These changes are determined by intrinsic material relations that evolve from their emergence to their consolidation and decline, reaching a process of decomposition

that heralds their replacement by another mode of production. And although the ruling classes strive to prevent their disappearance, their crises and the revolutionary actions of the oppressed classes accelerate their demise and the birth of new social relations at both national and international levels. This does not occur in hours or days; it is a historical process that we have been experiencing for decades—though we may not always realize it—and which will surely continue for decades to come, marking structural changes in the dominant mode of production, which is taking on water, and through many of its cracks, new forms of labor organization and distribution of products are penetrating, generating major confrontations at the global level.

The Development of Capitalism and Its Contradictions

To address these changes in contemporary capitalism, we can summarize them as the transition from pre-monopoly or free-competition capitalism to monopoly capitalism or imperialism, which was already clearly evident at the beginning of the 20th century. Lenin, with his extraordinary ability to apply the dialectical materialist method, recognized this phenomenon, studied it, analyzed it, and reviewed the work of other economists, who saw only the form but not the content of what was happening. He identified the central elements of the new phase of capitalism and characterized it as IMPERIALISM. As both a practical revolutionary leader and a theorist, he defined the appropriate strategy and tactics to confront and destroy capitalism—wresting a large territory from it after the October Revolution of 1917—which began its weakening and indicated a path for building socialism, thus initiating the first stage of the general crisis of capitalism.

From that time onward, the understanding of capitalism's development and decomposition became clearer, aided and disseminated by various works, especially Lenin's *Imperialism: The Highest Stage*

of Capitalism, which clearly explains the fundamental features and control mechanisms of this form of capitalism.

IMPERIALISM, understood from the scientific perspective of Marxism-Leninism, is a category of analysis superior to that of EMPIRE, as it is located at a specific stage in the development of the capitalist mode of production and addresses elements such as the emergence of the financial oligarchy, the fusion of banking and industrial capital, the rise of monopolies, the struggle between powers for world division, and global imperialist competition for markets. Under these premises, it is possible to define two groups of countries—imperialist and dependent—as well as the fundamental contradictions existing in the imperialist phase of capitalism.

Imperialist countries acquire this status as a result of the development of their productive forces, the maintenance of proletarian exploitation by their bourgeoisie, the expansion of subjugation over dependent countries to a nearly global level, and confrontation with other imperialist powers. This leads to three fundamental contradictions characteristic of the higher phase of capitalism: the inter-imperialist contradiction, the contradiction between imperialist and dependent countries, and the capital-labor contradiction.

The development of these contradictions leads to periods of crisis, depression, recovery, and boom in capitalism, which in its current phase have become global phenomena, not merely national ones. These affect the capitalist-imperialist system everywhere, although, due to uneven development, the effects differ between countries and production areas—some are able to strengthen themselves by exploiting the crisis, while others are weakened.

During periods of economic boom, better living conditions allow workers and the general population to enjoy relative stability and well-being, reducing social conflict and generating a democratic illusion that attempts to hide the mechanisms of exploitation.

Social democracy exploits this illusion to subdue revolutionary forces through deception, handouts, and selective, low-intensity repression.

When the economic crisis returns and spreads globally, peaceful methods lose effectiveness, the bourgeois democratic illusion crumbles, and the bourgeoisie resorts to the elimination of rights. The proletariat feels deceived and dispossessed, suffering hardships that lead to mobilization, generating confrontations that gradually escalate in ideological, organizational, and practical terms. This causes the leadership of large monopolies to resort to violating their own laws, to repression, and to FASCISM—the extreme dictatorship of finance capital—in an attempt to curb the struggles. Before reaching the full expression of fascism, which manifests as new laws and regulations implementing direct repression and blatant dispossession, the bourgeoisie progressively creates the conditions to legitimize the violent dictatorship of financial capital, trying to justify it by labeling opposing forces as terrorists. This is the process of FASCISTIZATION that the world is experiencing today—visible everywhere, but initially and most blatantly in Palestine, by the fascist-Zionist state of Israel, and in the United States itself, with its violation of its own democracy to impose the dictatorship of the fascist right under Trump’s leadership.

The process of fascistization is a conjunctural moment that capitalism is acquiring and expanding worldwide, to which anti-imperialism and anti-fascism are the urgent and necessary responses to stop and defeat such a macabre bourgeois monstrosity.

Venezuela and the Call for Global Coordination

The people of Venezuela, who are resisting and fighting against imperialist aggression, have been affected by these phenomena for years and are involved as a territory in dispute in the struggle for a new division of the world among powers. They also face the struggle for national and social liberation, as

well as the contradictions between capital and labor.

The imperialist bloc led by the United States is becoming more aggressive as it perceives the decomposition of its model of exploitation and tries to halt it—resorting to unilateral actions in the economic, political, social, and military spheres, both within and beyond its borders. The response of its opponents is also escalating, reaching regional wars that may surely grow into a third world war, as the only alternative for the imperialists to try to resolve their contradictions.

Faced with this reality of confrontation and imperialist wars, the popular movement has before it the possibility of revolutions. Crises are times of wars and revolutions that we must take advantage of to truly transform society, control the power of monopolies, and confront the violent capabilities of states. The most consistent fighters—the advanced classes, leaders and intellectuals, revolutionary activists—have before them a great opportunity to capitalize on the weariness caused by oppression and the desire for change among the exploited and oppressed majorities, to expose bourgeois demagogy by presenting a genuine program of transformation toward popular democracy as an immediate step toward overcoming bourgeois democracy.

In countries under attack and threat, Popular Revolutionary Unity represents the alternative for the accumulation of forces toward structural change and true national and social liberation. While bourgeois sectors limit themselves to national defense and unity under native bourgeois leadership—without transforming relations of production or property forms—the revolutionary sectors propose popular unity that addresses both national liberation (from imperialist subjugation) and social liberation (from the oppression of the parasitic bourgeoisie). This proposal assumes the defense of the nation against external aggressors, advancing true sovereignty under the leadership of a united and armed people, controlling the means of production and distribution

to satisfy the needs of the majority—not the exploiters—both in war and in peace.

From the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, at a time when imperialist aggression is advancing violently throughout the world—expressed in military scenarios as well as in the diplomacy of arrogance displayed by the United States and Israel at the 80th UN Assembly—we call upon various international revolutionary, anti-fascist, and anti-imperialist initiatives to promote mechanisms for global coordination to create a single front of struggle, enabling us to face the complex challenges of the current moment through the strength of united international action. We have a clearly defined common enemy and a clearly defined main danger. We have important initiatives for organization and struggle emerging from different regions of the world. We have experience and the capacity for mobilization—but this important potential for action remains scattered, draining our energy. Let us build bridges for joint work and move forward together toward victory, closing ranks against imperialism and defeating fascism, as happened in the 20th century. To do this, we must understand our differences and prioritize the requirements for success against the enemies of humanity.

By joining forces, we can take on the role of an organized vanguard which, from different regions and initiatives, through global actions—starting with GLOBAL ANTI-FASCIST AND ANTI-IMPERIALIST COORDINATION—can carry out joint actions, such as a large-scale mobilization of all forces on the International Day of Solidarity with Palestine, 29 November, stepping forward and presenting an option for the most consistent combatants in the struggle to defeat the fascist monster. With initiatives on every continent and presence on agreed dates, with common symbols and coordinated slogans, we will be able to demonstrate the immense strength of the organized proletariat.

The Popular Revolutionary Anti-Imperialist Unity

(UPRA) from Venezuela is at your service to collaborate in all initiatives in the spirit of global anti-fascist and anti-imperialist coordination, calling on all democratic and revolutionary forces to establish this coordination and to take the first joint global action on 29 November 2025.

With reason and strength, we will prevail!

“Anti-Imperialist and Anti-Fascist Front”

Irina Santesteban | Liberation Party (Argentina)

I come from Argentina, a country with a rich history dating back to the struggles for its first independence from Spanish colonialism, led by our liberator José de San Martín. The Argentine people have been protagonists in heroic popular struggles, giving birth to a strong and organized labor movement that won social and democratic rights. We have also fought against military dictatorships that represented the oligarchic and business classes, with the support of U.S. imperialism, which, since the Monroe Doctrine, has considered Latin America its “backyard.”

Today, Argentina is going through a disastrous period under the fascist government of Javier Milei, who came to power almost two years ago by popular vote. It is not the first time that we have had a “constitutional” government that imposes austerity measures, curtails popular and democratic rights, represses dissent, and hands over state-owned companies and our sovereignty. Carlos Menem, in the 1990s, boasted of his “carnal relations” with the U.S.

However, Milei has reached limits never before seen in Argentina: he is a strategic partner of U.S. imperialism and an unconditional ally of the Zionist state of Israel—both responsible for the genocide against the Palestinian people.

Anti-Imperialist and Anti-Fascist Front

For years, the Liberation Party has advocated the need for an Anti-Imperialist Front—not only within our country, to break the chains of dependence, but also at the international level—to confront U.S. imperialism, its European allies, NATO, and Israel.

For two years, we have been promoting, though often in isolation, the importance of building an Anti-Imperialist and Anti-Fascist Front in our country and also globally. Fascism and the far-right forces

operate in coordination with economic, political, and military power groups to subjugate peoples and eliminate the emergence and struggle of resistance organizations. They do so by committing genocide, as Israel has done in the Palestinian territory of Gaza, and also by other methods that are less “criminal” but equally harmful to the people.

Many progressive and even left-wing organizations in Argentina refuse to characterize Milei’s government as fascist. According to the definition of the Third Communist International in 1935, fascism in power is the open and terrorist dictatorship of the most reactionary, most chauvinistic, and most imperialist elements of finance capital. It uses nationalist variants, the support of discontented middle classes, and declassed sectors of the popular classes. Fascism envisions a totalitarian and anti-democratic form of government and promotes racism, anti-communism, and fear and hatred toward those who are different or who oppose it.

Twenty-first-century fascism has found new forms of organization, propaganda, and brainwashing through social media, which, in a globalized world, have a far greater impact.

The Liberation Party has a clear stance against fascism, opposing those who underestimate the danger of governments such as Milei’s. We describe him as fascist because he surrenders our sovereignty, resources, and territory to the voracity of corporations and imperialism; governs authoritatively through decrees without respecting the separation of powers; vetoes laws that benefit the people; and brutally represses protests by pensioners, workers, students, scientists, indigenous peoples, women, and diverse groups—in short, all those who oppose his plan of destruction, hunger, repression, and depen-

dency.

Milei has called for our country to join NATO (it has been a special non-NATO partner since the Menem era), has expressed his intention to allow the installation of a U.S. Southern Command military base in Ushuaia, in the south of our country—a strategic location facing Antarctica and the bi-oceanic canal—and intends to sign a Free Trade Agreement with the U.S.

In terms of human rights, he denies the crimes against humanity committed by the military-civilian dictatorship, closes memorial sites, endorses Israel's genocide against the Palestinian people, denigrates "leftists" and feminism, and promotes hate speech against the LGBT community.

Foreign Debt

Argentina's subjugation to imperialism is clearly demonstrated by the drama of its foreign debt, described as "odious" in modern doctrine because it was incurred behind the backs of the people and constitutes a mechanism of economic and financial domination with political conditions. The Argentine foreign debt contracted with the IMF by Presidents Mauricio Macri (2018) and Javier Milei today is also illegitimate because it did not follow constitutional procedures, which require approval by the National Congress. Neither Macri nor Milei did so.

Argentina's total gross debt now stands at \$454.234 billion, and during this government's term it has increased by 22.5 percent in less than two years. The commitments made by former President Mauricio Macri in 2018, legitimized during the government of Alberto Fernández, Cristina Kirchner, and Sergio Massa, and the recent ones made by Milei, are unpayable despite the cuts and adjustments implemented by this government. The usurious interest rates are impossible to meet, even for a country as wealthy as Argentina, and they increase the debt until it becomes a spiral from which the only way out is to repudiate the illegitimate debt.

For this reason, the Liberation Party is part of the Self-Convended Movement for the Suspension of Foreign Debt Payments, together with other organizations and Nobel Peace Prize winner Adolfo Pérez Esquivel.

The interest rates imposed by the IMF and other international organizations, accepted by successive governments and by Milei, are usurious: up to 10 percent per annum in dollars (above the 3–5 percent paid by developed countries) and more than 50 percent per annum for debt in pesos.

The consequences of these adjustment policies for our people are catastrophic: 223,537 layoffs in the formal sector and an even greater number of precarious (informal) jobs lost. A total of 15,564 companies have closed, exceeding the number that shut down during the Covid-19 pandemic. In the state sector, which has been particularly hard hit by Milei's "chainsaw," there have been 78,000 redundancies.

Falkland Islands

Argentina has suffered imperialist occupation by the United Kingdom in the Falkland Islands since 1833, with a brief interregnum in 1982, when the islands were temporarily recovered, ending with Argentina's defeat at the hands of England, the U.S., and NATO. Our fishing resources and oil are being plundered there.

Sovereignty over our islands is a legitimate claim, recognized by the United Nations General Assembly through Resolution 2065, voted unanimously by its member countries in 1965. Since then, there have been 10 more resolutions by the General Assembly and more than 40 by the UN Decolonization Committee.

The United Kingdom not only refuses to comply with its obligation to resolve the dispute by peaceful means and to end colonialism, but also reinforces the occupation through unilateral measures, military presence, and operational areas, exploring and exploiting renewable and non-renewable natural

resources that belong to our country.

It is a colonial enclave and a NATO military base, strategically located in the South Atlantic, with access to the interoceanic canal and Antarctica, where there are also vast reserves of water, minerals, and oil.

The resources generated by the Falklands are a source of income for British and multinational companies: fishing permits for foreign fleets, port administration and control, and offshore oil exploitation in partnership with the Israeli company Navitas Petroleum, among others.

Milei, who went so far as to subscribe to the colonizer's theory legitimizing the "self-determination" of the Kelpers (the British occupying population), made a lukewarm claim to sovereignty on 24 September at the UN General Assembly.

This president has publicly expressed his admiration for Margaret Thatcher, the British prime minister who ordered the sinking of the ARA General Belgrano outside the exclusion zone in 1982, causing the deaths of 323 Argentine sailors, most of them young conscripts.

For the Liberation Party, the Malvinas cause is inalienable, and only a government that represents and defends the interests of the people and national sovereignty will be able to recover our legitimate sovereignty over those islands—with the support of the peoples of our Great Latin American Homeland, the Third World, and other countries.

That is why we are fighting for the construction of an Anti-Imperialist Front that will promote a program with strategies and forms of struggle for their recovery, beginning with the imposition of sanctions on companies operating in our country, such as the Anglo-Dutch Shell, which this government has allowed to enter the oil pipeline business in the Vaca Muerta Sur field in the province of Neuquén.

Venezuela

In the homeland of Simón Bolívar, whose people we salute, U.S. imperialism has been trying for years to

overthrow the Bolivarian government—first against Commander Hugo Chávez, including a coup d'état in April 2002, and since his death, against President Nicolás Maduro—using every possible form of destabilization.

Now, under the pretext of fighting drug trafficking, the Trump administration has mobilized naval destroyers, a nuclear submarine, aircraft, missile-equipped ships, and 4,500 marines mobilized by Admiral Holsey's Southern Command, with the clear intention of attacking Venezuela, even though its government has won elections confirming its popular support.

At the same time, they continue to threaten the Cuban Revolution with their criminal blockade, as well as Nicaragua and governments that do not follow Washington's mandates—such as Mexico, Colombia, and Honduras—whose governments, though not revolutionary, are now taking a course independent of imperial dictates.

In addition to its undeniable intention to overthrow the legitimate government of Maduro, the U.S. seeks to prevent political and commercial relations between the governments of the region and the People's Republic of China.

The peoples of Latin America and the Caribbean must not ignore these threats and aggressions. In this regard, we must reaffirm the CELAC declaration, which proclaimed Latin America a "Zone of Peace." It is necessary to confront the interventionist and militaristic policies of U.S. imperialism and its lackeys in the region—such as the Milei government—which has authorized by decree the entry of U.S. troops to carry out "Tridente" military exercises at the naval bases of Mar del Plata, Ushuaia, and Puerto Belgrano.

We congratulate President Nicolás Maduro, his government, and the Venezuelan people because, in the face of the threat of invasion, they have reacted correctly: denouncing the aggression and calling for the mass enlistment of volunteers for the Bolivarian

National Militias, which operate under the direction of the Bolivarian National Armed Forces.

Trump's accusation against Maduro of being the leader of the alleged "Cartel of the Suns" is not even believed by themselves, when Venezuela is not listed among countries that produce, distribute, or receive drugs. On the contrary, it is the United States that is the largest consumer and launderer of drug money in the world.

The illegal detention of fishing boats by the U.S. Navy in the Caribbean Sea is a ridiculous attempt to generate incidents to justify a larger-scale military invasion or aggression that seeks two objectives: to destroy the Bolivarian government and to seize its vast oil reserves—the largest in the world.

We propose that this conference declare its support for:

1. The Venezuelan government and people against the threats of invasion and aggression by U.S. imperialism.
2. The repudiation of the criminal blockade against Cuba imposed by the U.S. since 1962; and the recovery of Guantanamo from the hands of imperialism.
3. Solidarity with the struggles of the Argentine people against the austerity measures of Javier Milei, an ally of the U.S. and Israel; for the non-payment of the odious and illegitimate foreign debt.
4. Support for the presidential campaign of comrade Eduardo Artés in Chile.
5. Denounce and repudiate the genocide suffered by the Palestinian people at the hands of Israel, with the support of the U.S. Freedom for the members of the Global Sumud Flotilla. Cease the bombing of Gaza. For a free Palestine, from the river to the sea! Promote the severing of relations with Israel by all governments.
6. Congratulate the government of the People's Republic of China on the 76th anniversary of the triumph of the People's Revolution led by Mao Tse Tung; and support the Chinese government in its

rejection of the tariff war waged by Donald Trump.

7. Denounce the government of Volodymyr Zelensky in its NATO war against Russia.
8. Reject the increase in military budgets of European countries, formalized by U.S. pressure within NATO.
9. Condemn the rise of neo-Nazi and fascist parties in Europe, such as Vox in Spain, Alternative for Germany, and similar parties.
10. Call for the closure of more than 700 U.S. military bases and the withdrawal of all troops from South Korea, Japan, Germany, Spain, the Falkland Islands, Colombia, Guantanamo, and other countries where they are stationed.

The Dawn of Dignity: From Caracas to the Sahel, The Struggle is One!

Aboubakar Alassane | West Africa Peoples Organization (WAPO, Niger)

Comrades, brothers and sisters of the resistance, We are gathered here at the International Anti-Imperialist Conference, not by chance but by historical necessity. From the four corners of the globe—Europe, Africa, Asia, and Latin America—we stand united by the truth that burns on our lips: imperialism is the enemy of humanity and threatens to plunge us into a third world war at any cost—if it has not already done so. Its thirst for blood is unquenchable.

Today, our hearts beat in unison with the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, which has been martyred for decades, ever since Comrade Hugo Chávez responded to the legitimate aspirations of his people. We have listened to the clear words of President Nicolás Maduro during his interview with former President and Comrade Rafael Correa of Ecuador on RT television. We heard words that tear away the veil of imperial propaganda to reveal the horror of their cynicism.

What is the American Empire seeking at the gates of Caracas? They speak of “drug trafficking” and “democracy”—a story as thin as a Hollywood script, as Comrade Maduro so aptly put it. Lies!

What they truly seek is what the Bolivarian Revolution has taken from them: total control over Venezuela’s wealth, just as they do in Africa—in Burkina Faso, Mali, and Niger, united within the Alliance of Sahel States (AES).

They are after oil, gas, and the world’s largest reserves, which have now been re-evaluated upwards. They covet the world’s richest gold deposits, the thirty million hectares of arable land, and the gigantic aquifer that lies beneath Venezuelan soil—a source of life for the future.

But more than resources, they want to destroy the Bolivarian project—Chavismo—this democratic and liberating socialism of the 21st century, this model of independence for the entire Great Homeland! It is also this fundamental geostrategic position, this beacon of resistance in the north of South America, that they want to extinguish.

They are mobilizing warships, destroyers, and nuclear submarines, and they seek to turn Puerto Rico into a base of aggression. But we know that the people of Puerto Rico will oppose this. They will not accept their country being turned into a military base to attack their brothers in South America and the Caribbean.

This is not a fight against drug trafficking—it is an act of economic and military warfare, a cowardly act of intimidation to defend their far-right puppets, defeated at the polls and rejected by the people!

We cry out: shame on those who sully the honor of a people by slandering their president to justify their aggression! The Venezuelan people have voted, renewed their governors and mayors, and chosen peaceful coexistence and tolerance. It is this real democracy—this economy being rebuilt step by step—that they want to strangle.

Venezuela is the front line! And we are all Venezuelans! That is the price of sovereignty.

Comrades, we cannot denounce the aggression against Venezuela without also looking at the other great theater of imperial hypocrisy: Africa, and more specifically, the Sahel.

The same empire, the same predatory hand, the same methods of intimidation and chaos are being deployed on the other side of the Atlantic.

What is the parallel? In Venezuela, the pretext is the fight against drugs. In the Sahel, the pretext is the fight against terrorism.

But who sowed chaos in the Sahel? Who destabilized Libya, created a vacuum, and allowed armed groups to proliferate in order to justify an eternal military presence—intended, in reality, to plunder minerals, uranium, oil, and gold? These imperial powers have not only failed in their duty to provide security but, through their inaction and their murky arrangements, have paved the way for terrorism!

Today, Burkina Faso, Mali, and Niger—the states of the AES—have said NO! They have said “enough!” to colonial tutelage, plunder, and interference. They have asserted their will and their absolute right to total sovereignty.

And what has been the response of the Empire and its regional vassals? Sanctions!

We denounce here, before the world, these inhuman, unjust, and immoral sanctions that have struck the innocent peoples of the AES. These sanctions are not aimed at leaders; they are aimed at starving farmers, depriving children of medicine, and strangling the economy—all to break legitimate political will. It is collective punishment, violence worthy of the darkest hours of colonialism.

The spirit of resistance that animates the Venezuelan people is the same spirit stirring the peoples of the Sahel! They are not attacking Maduro for mismanagement; they are attacking him for his economic and social success and for his Bolivarianism. They are not attacking the AES for terrorism; they are attacking it for its sovereignty!

Comrades, the Empire is playing a dangerous game with the fate of the world. Whether in Palestine, the proxy war against Russia in Ukraine, the crisis in the Democratic Republic of Congo, or the war in Sudan—it seeks only to destroy. It seeks to divide, isolate, and create climates of war and far-right domination.

But in the face of this global threat, our response must be one: unity.

Let the governor of Puerto Rico know that he will find no accomplices in the Caribbean or Latin America to attack his brothers. Let the powers suffocating Burkina Faso, Mali, and Niger know that their actions are now being watched by the international tribunal of conscious peoples.

We support Venezuela against military threats and economic warfare.

We stand in solidarity with the peoples of Burkina Faso, Mali, and Niger in their struggle for total independence and sovereignty.

We are committed to building multipolarity, where mutual respect among peoples replaces the law of the strongest.

From Caracas to Ouagadougou, from Bamako to Niamey, the front line is the same!

Bolivarianism is the ideal of the Great Homeland. The Sahelian Sovereignty Revolution is the ideal of African Dignity. These struggles are ours!

Today, we are not leaving here with mere resolutions. We are leaving with an oath: the oath never to give in, never to betray, and to see the triumph of the Bolivarian Revolution and the aspiration for total sovereignty of the African peoples!

Long live free and sovereign Venezuela!

Long live the Bolivarian Revolution!

Long live the Confederation of Sahel States!

Long live the peoples in struggle throughout the world!

Down with imperialism!

Fatherland or Death! We shall overcome!

Forging the Anti-Imperialist and Anti-Fascist Front: Strategy and Tactics for a World in Crisis

Hasan Almarzooq | Unitary National Democratic Assemblage (Kingdom of Bahrain)

We are living through a period not of peace, but of a continuous, multifaceted global conflict—a Third World War waged not in trenches along a single front, but through economic sieges, proxy wars, information campaigns, and brutal sanctions that collectively target the sovereignty of nations daring to defy a unipolar world order. This new era of imperialism, often cloaked in the language of democracy and human rights, exhibits a dangerous convergence with resurgent fascist ideologies—xenophobic nationalism, the suppression of dissent, and the relentless drive for hegemony. In this crucible of conflict, the imperative for a united global anti-imperialist and anti-fascist front has never been more urgent.

The Battlefield: Imperialist Provocation and Economic Warfare

The primary instruments of modern imperialism are economic strangulation and hybrid warfare. Unilateral coercive measures—euphemistically termed “sanctions”—are not tools of diplomacy but weapons of mass societal disruption. They are designed to cripple economies, foment internal unrest, and break the political will of independent states. This economic warfare is complemented by NATO’s relentless eastward expansion, the fueling of proxy conflicts in strategic regions, and the manipulation of international institutions to serve the interests of a narrow bloc of nations.

Simultaneously, we witness the rise of neo-fascist forces in the very heart of the imperialist core and its client states. These movements, often nurtured by the capitalist system’s inherent crises, scapegoat immigrants, minorities, and leftist movements for

the problems created by capital itself. This creates a pincer movement: external pressure from imperialist states and internal decay from fascist elements, both aiming to dismantle progressive, sovereign projects.

Building the United Front: Strategy for a Fractured World

The historical lesson from the fight against 20th-century fascism is that division is death. The central strategic task for anti-imperialist and anti-fascist forces worldwide is to build a broad, flexible, and resilient united front. This is not a call for ideological uniformity, but for strategic unity around core principles:

1. **The Primacy of Sovereignty and Self-Determination:** The front must stand unequivocally against all forms of foreign intervention, military aggression, and economic coercion. Supporting a nation’s right to choose its own path—be it Cuba, Venezuela, Palestine, or Syria—is the bedrock of anti-imperialism.
2. **Anti-Fascism as a Non-Negotiable Principle:** There can be no compromise with fascism, racism, and ultra-nationalism. The front must actively oppose these ideologies wherever they emerge, understanding that imperialism often uses fascist groups as its shock troops to destabilize regions and crush popular movements.
3. **South-South Cooperation and Multipolarity:** The strategic objective is to break the unipolar model. This requires strengthening alternative economic and political alliances like BRICS, the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation (SCO), and regional trade blocs that bypass the US dollar and Western-controlled

financial systems. This creates material alternatives to imperialist dependency.

Tactics for the Modern Struggle

Strategy must be implemented through concrete tactics adapted to local conditions but aligned with global solidarity.

1. **Information and Ideological Combat:** The mainstream media is a weapon of mass deception. We must build and support independent media networks to break the monopoly on narrative. Our task is to expose the human cost of sanctions, the hypocrisy of “humanitarian interventions,” and the links between corporate power and war propaganda.

2. **Grassroots Mobilization and Direct Action:** Mass movements are the engine of change.

This includes organizing nationwide protests against involvement in proxy wars, blockading weapons shipments, and launching campaigns to divest from the war machine and corporations complicit in occupation and apartheid.

3. **Political and Diplomatic Solidarity:** Progressive governments and political parties must use their platforms in parliaments and international bodies to relentlessly challenge the legitimacy of sanctions and wars. They can facilitate diplomatic channels, offer material support to besieged nations, and recognize the legitimate governments chosen by peoples under attack.

4. **Economic Counter-Measures and Mutual Aid:** Developing alternative financial systems (e.g., local currencies for trade), promoting boycotts of complicit corporations (BDS), and creating systems of mutual aid to withstand economic pressure are crucial. Solidarity is not just rhetorical; it is about building material resilience.

5. **Internationalist Brigades and Legal Challenges:** Following historical precedents, organized solidarity in the form of medical brigades, observer missions, and legal experts can provide direct support and document crimes. Simultaneously, using interna-

tional law to prosecute war crimes and challenge the legality of sanctions in world courts is a key tactical battlefield.

The Path Forward: Unity in Action

The road ahead is fraught with difficulty. The forces we oppose are powerful and ruthless. Differences in analysis and tactics will exist within the front. However, the cost of inaction is the normalization of war, fascism, and the complete erosion of national sovereignty.

The challenge is to see the interconnectedness of all these struggles: the Palestinian resistance is an anti-imperialist struggle; the fight against neo-Nazis in Ukraine is an anti-fascist struggle; the Cuban people’s resistance to the blockade is an anti-imperialist struggle. They are all fronts in the same war.

By building a common front—respecting diversity of tactics but united in strategic purpose—the peoples of the world can halt the advance of imperialist-fascist aggression. It is a fight not for a return to a mythical past, but for the possibility of a future defined by peace, sovereignty, and justice. The third world war is ongoing. It is time to unite and win it.

Rise Against Imperialism, Resist Fascism, Defend Peace

Rafael C. Cardino | Philippine Communist Party (PKP 1930)

Dear Comrade,

Humanity now stands at the edge of its greatest danger. The threat of an imperialist global nuclear war endangers not only nations but the very survival of civilization. This is not progress. This is regression. Never before has humankind faced such a decisive moment. We must choose whether to advance toward peace and progress or fall into ruin caused by greed, domination, and decay.

Lenin defined imperialism as the highest and final stage of capitalism. It is a dying system built on monopoly, financial oligarchy, and conquest. Its nature is exploitation, its method is division, and its goal is to control the world's wealth. Yet its decay also signals the birth of a new social order based on justice and equality. The world today reflects this struggle. Imperialism is collapsing, and in its desperation, it turns to violence and deceit to delay its inevitable end.

Across the globe, the signs of decay are clear. A small group of parasites live in luxury while billions endure hunger, poverty, and disease. Recession grips the United States and Europe. The old system of exploitation in Africa, Latin America, and Asia is breaking apart. Nations are rising to reclaim their freedom and their resources from imperial domination.

A new world is beginning to rise. The BRICS alliance is growing stronger as an alternative to the collapsing imperial powers. But as imperialism weakens, it becomes more dangerous. Like a dying beast, it strikes harder. It revives its most reactionary form, which is fascism. Fascism is the open rule of capital maintained through fear, terror, and repression. It destroys democracy, silences the people, and crushes the working class. It is the enemy of progress and the

enemy of humanity.

Today, fascism is visible everywhere. It enforces sanctions and blockades against Cuba, China, North Korea, Russia, Iran, Nicaragua, Brazil, and India. It has caused wars of destruction and immeasurable sufferings in Libya, Yemen, Afghanistan, Syria, and Iraq. It starves nations and calls it freedom. In Venezuela, the United States hides behind the excuse of fighting drugs to seize oil and suppress the will of its people. In Palestine, the Zionist regime backed by the United States commits genocide. In Ukraine, fascism fuels war to weaken Russia. In Asia, it provokes China and destabilizes the region to preserve its global dominance.

The United States leads this fascist order. It aims to weaken both Europe and Asia to maintain control over the world economy. Through its proxy war in Ukraine, it has drained Europe of stability and resources. Germany, France, Italy, and Britain are now facing deep recession. The sanctions meant to destroy Russia have failed. Russia has grown stronger politically and economically. Europe, once the center of imperial power, is now collapsing under its own contradictions. The people are awakening and demanding change.

Even within the heart of the empire, in the United States itself, the crisis is undeniable. Its economy is unstable, its society divided, and its government increasingly resorts to militarization and fear. The illusion of democracy has fallen. What remains is the open rule of wealth and corporate power.

In Asia, the same pattern continues. In the Philippines, corruption and exploitation persist. The alliance between oligarchs and politicians drains the nation and deepens poverty. The economy's dependence on the United States weakens our currency

and public services. Yet our government continues to align itself with foreign powers, risking our nation's peace and sovereignty in the dispute over the West Philippine Sea. If war erupts, it is the Filipino people who will suffer. We must never allow our country to become another battleground for imperial ambition.

History shows that imperialist powers resort to war in times of deep crisis. It happened in 1914 and again in 1939. It is happening once more. The same forces that brought destruction to the world in the past are now pushing humanity toward another global conflict.

Comrades, we must resist.

The only path forward is peace and unity against imperialist war.

Let this be our collective call:

Peace, not war.

Justice, not oppression.

Freedom, not fascism.

Our struggle is both global and national. We must face our own economic, political, and social challenges. We must build a society that serves the people, not the powerful. We must fight for independence, genuine democracy, and lasting peace.

This is our duty. This is our struggle. This is our time to act.

Thank you.

NO TO IMPERIALIST FASCIST WAR
NO TO GENOCIDE IN PALESTINE
NO TO FASCIST WAR IN UKRAINE
PEACE FOR ASIA AND THE PACIFIC REGION
SUPPORT THE STRUGGLE OF THE VENEZUELAN PEOPLE AGAINST UNITED STATES IMPERIALISM

“Our Fight Against Imperialism and Fascism in the Digital Era”

Milan Dharel | Communist Party of Nepal (Unified Marxist–Leninist)

Dear Comrades,

I would like to share my sincere thanks to the World Anti-Imperialist Forum for extending an invitation to us to attend such an important conference to share our perspectives, learnings, and struggle against imperialism.

I would like to extend thanks to the government and people of Venezuela for supporting the hosting of this conference in this land of revolution that inspires the global crusaders of justice, peace, equality, and common prosperity.

Comrades,

It is a historic moment for us to observe the preparation of constitutional reforms based on the light of the Bolivarian Revolution and the great guidance of the great leader Chávez through the Golpe de Timón.

I would like to recall what Chávez shared about socialism and democracy: “Socialism is democracy, and the essence of democracy is socialism in politics, society, and economics.” This is very true, relevant, and significant in debates and discourse on democracy in various contexts at both domestic and international levels.

The very foundation of the United Nations after the end of the Second World War was to prevent wars and injustice and to promote a democratic international world order. But we have observed that multilateral institutions have been exploited, neglected, and weakened to promote war industries, perish people in developing and least-developed countries, alienate nations in the global order, and perform veto-based world hegemony. This is the real character of the capitalist order, which Chávez informed us is exclu-

sionary and an imposition of capital and capitalist elites. This is the fundamental cause of all wars and aggression, deepening poverty, political instability, and illegal occupation that we are observing these days.

Therefore, socialism at the national and domestic level through strong socialist political forces, and socialism at the international system through strong coalitions and collaboration among socialist nations, are primary demands of our time.

Comrades,

Our aspiration for just, equal, sovereign, and stable societies and nations has been challenged and obstructed by imperialism and imperialist forces throughout history. Though the era of colonization has ended, the practice of client states has become much stronger. Though the world system, international law, and multilateralism have become global norms, the practice of neo-imperialism and digital imperialism has become much more powerful these days.

Imperialism is not marching with guns and bombs, not just by commodities, but by the control over information, technologies, transport, and connectivity — imposing barriers on trade and dividing people in their homelands.

Information technologies, cyberspace, and social media platforms have emerged as new weapons and grounds to impose imperialism through political threats, mass manipulation of citizens, and the destabilization of sovereign democratic nations.

In Nepal, after seven decades of people’s struggle, we adopted a republican, socialist, and federal consti-

tution through a people's representative Constituent Assembly in 2015. The constitution, for the first time, recognized the socialist orientation of the state, adopted devolution of governance through a three-tier structure (Federal, Provincial, and Local) with a list of rights among the three layers, and endorsed principles of co-existence, coordination, and cooperation.

Nepal made progressive efforts with nationwide expansion of infrastructure development, industrialization, and economic growth, achieving over 6 percent growth even during COVID times. The imperialist conspiracy against the party and the nation ultimately caused the collapse of the communist-led government and split the largest communist party in 2021. But again, with the hard work of leaders, cadres, and the support of the people, the CPN-UML rose and became the first party by popular vote, countering all imperialist conspiracies and attacks in 2022.

Again, under the leadership of the CPN-UML, political stability and efforts for progress restarted in Nepal. The geopolitical value of Nepal in the Asian context and the rise of its political, economic, and social position worried global capitalist exploiters and imperialist aggressors. A grand conspiracy to collapse the democratic system, socialist and federal constitution, and people's elected parliament was implemented in the name of the "Generation Z Movement" on 8 September 2025, followed by nationwide vandalism, looting, and attacks on 9 September. The conspiracy was brutal that killed 75 youths, fired public offices including the central government's historic building, the President's Office, Supreme Court, and Parliament House. Leaders of the CPN-UML and its coalition partner, the Nepali Congress, were physically attacked; their properties and party offices were burnt down. Thousands of police arms and pieces of equipment were looted, and thousands of criminals escaped from jail. A puppet, unconstitutional government was founded against constitutional norms and the Supreme Court

verdict. The so-called interim government formed a biased inquiry commission and ordered police not to take any action against criminals who looted and burned public and private properties.

The whole devastation, conspiracy, and provocations were carried out through social media and gaming apps. Later, it was identified that 34% of the provoking social media accounts were fake and had posted over 100,000 provoking messages reaching 38 million users.

The imperialists have a problem with K. P. Oli, the CPN-UML leader, because his government was adopting balanced foreign relations, building close ties with China and Russia, banning unregistered social media, and taking initiatives on large projects that would lead to a prosperous life for the people of Nepal.

Nepal is just an example how the digital imperialism with the global gig companies, social media business, is promoting online fascism through creating and spreading negative narratives against progressive government, controlling and manipulating young minds, provoking vandalization and using young people as human shield on their so-called protest.

Comrades

Therefore, our fight against imperialism and fascism has gone to a new space of digital ground. We need to better prepare and better counter this threats that is widely spreading targeting progressive and socialist nations.

The five pillars of productive transformation, as suggested by Chavez, is important to consider on this fight. Without being strong nations, addressing peoples concern, disparities and poverty at our home we would not be able to counter imperialism at international level. The promotion of decentralization at our own model in each country with adequate and proper political orientation is essential for such transformation and keep the socialist leadership strong.

The construction of socialism model is unique in

each country guided by its history, demography, culture, geopolitical context and economic context. However, we all must not forget that we have a common aim to build socialism not only at our home, but to promote socialist world order that is just, multilateral, equally sovereign and truly democratize the international institution.

Therefore, it is important that we need to stand together on our struggle to transform the world order, to liberate the international institutions from capitalist trap, imperialist exploitation and fascist aggression. This is possible only through the stronger solidarity, better exchanges, and respect to each other's domestic context and support to domestic socialist, progressive movement.

This conference is significant for this reason.

Once again, the outcome of the conference would enable us to better strengthen our effort for just world order, socialist movement at our home, solidarity among people and nations on their fight against imperialism and fascism.

At the end I would like to share our solidarity from the people and members of my party to the people and leader of Venezuela on their march to constitutional reform, progression and resilient actions against all unjust sanctions.

Long live global solidarity for socialism.

The Venezuelan People's All-People's Resistance Will Certainly Triumph Under the Banner of Anti-Imperialism and Anti-Fascism

Stephen Cho | Coordinator of the Korean International Forum

The storm of World War 3 is blowing from Eastern Europe through West Asia (the Middle East) to East Asia. When Australia and New Zealand are included, the region constitutes the Western Pacific. The boundary between the Western and Eastern Pacific is vague, with the US Indo-Pacific Command headquartered in Hawaii. In East Asia, the two main flashpoints of war are Northeast Asia and Southeast Asia. In particular, Northeast Asia is where US Forces in Japan play a central role, with operational control exercised by the Indo-Pacific Command. Should a Western Pacific war break out, it will inevitably spread across the entire Pacific. The Eastern Pacific is directly connected to North, Central, and South America. For this reason, Latin America is inevitably tied to the unfolding dynamics of World War 3.

The two most dangerous flashpoints in the world have been Ukraine in Eastern Europe and West Asia. West Asia has become a single theater of war, extending beyond Palestine. This is because Israeli Zionists, under imperialist manipulation, have become shock troops committing acts of war in pursuit of a “Greater Israel.” The main culprits of war in the West Asian region are the Israeli Zionists and the imperialists pulling the strings behind them. The trajectory of this war is gradually shifting toward East Asia, spreading through local conflicts such as Azerbaijan-Armenia, India-Pakistan, Thailand-Cambodia. The so-called “Asian Spring” operation by imperialism—continuing from Sri Lanka and Bangladesh—is now underway, with the “color revolution” in Nepal and the situation in Indonesia being added to it. It is moving toward a new flashpoint: the East Asian war.

From September to December last year, there were even direct provocations risking local war against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) and a military coup attempt in the ‘Republic of Korea (ROK, South Korea).’ If it were not for the DPRK's war deterrent and its policy of “strategic patience,” and if it were not for the heroic resistance of the ‘ROK’ people, the second Korean War—the war in the ‘ROK’—would already have broken out. As is well known, the war in the ‘ROK’ is linked to the war in Taiwan—its outbreak would immediately trigger the outbreak of war in Taiwan. If wars break out in both the ‘ROK’ and Taiwan, Japan and the Philippines would immediately join, escalating into an East Asian war. Then, with Australia and New Zealand joining, it would expand into a Western Pacific war. Military blocs such as the US-led “Squad” and “AUKUS” are all aiming at a single war—an East Asian war and Western Pacific war. The US is driving its subordinate allies, including Japan, as well as colonies like the ‘ROK,’ into an East Asian war and a world war against the DPRK, China, and Russia.

The imperialist camp has formalized a strategy it has pursued since the “Cold War” era—isolating and destabilizing Russia (formerly the Soviet Union) and China from within—into the “Indo-Pacific Strategy.” To encircle Russia, China, and the DPRK within a vast “U”-shaped containment ring, it is mobilizing all means and methods, including regional wars, local wars, military bloc formations, multi-domain warfare exercises, and “color revolutions.” The imperialist bloc's strategy for World War 3 is being pursued more persistently than at any time in history, and it

now stands on the brink of full-scale outbreak. The full outbreak of World War 3 will mark the beginning of the East Asian war and the Western Pacific war. Since the original schedule of the imperialist bloc targeted the fall of 2024, and now we are passing through 2025, it would be no surprise if war were to break out at any moment.

Both World War 1 and the early stages of World War 2 were wars between imperialist powers. World War 2 turned into an anti-fascist war when fascist Germany attacked the Soviet Union, and the socialist Soviet Union formed an anti-fascist front with the imperialist powers, the US and the UK. As a result of World War 1, the first socialist state emerged, and as a result of World War 2, the socialist camp and national liberation movements appeared on a global scale. Feeling the most severe systemic crisis after World War 2, the imperialist bloc devised the “Cold War” strategy and formed NATO. Since then, NATO’s “eastward expansion policy” threatened the Soviet Union, and even after the end of the “Cold War,” this policy has extended into the Pacific, militarily underpinning the “New Cold War” strategy.

The completion of the “Indo-Pacific Strategy” is the realization of the “Pacificization of NATO.” The preparations were politically completed at the Washington NATO Summit in July 2024, and militarily finalized through exercises such as “Freedom Edge,” “RIMPAC,” and “Ulchi Freedom Shield” between June and August 2024. There is no other reason why the imperialist camp invaded Kursk in Russia in August, launched concentrated strikes on Hezbollah in Lebanon in September, and carried out a drone attack on Pyongyang in October. It cannot be seen as a coincidence that Trump—a leading presidential candidate at the time who, while within the imperialist camp, differs in orientation from the warmongering forces—was targeted in July. Even after Trump was elected in November, restrictions on Ukraine’s use of long-range missiles against Russia

were lifted, and in December, a coup and insurrection broke out in the ‘ROK,’ while the Assad regime in Syria collapsed.

The current Trump faction faces three major dilemmas: the “Triffin’s Dilemma” in the economic sphere through the ongoing “tariff war”; a non-war-mongering stance in the military sphere, caught between warmongering and anti-war forces; and the contradictory position of being anti-deep state yet non-Zionist in the political sphere. These logical contradictions ultimately leave them with no choice but to make a binary choice. The full-scale escalation of World War 3 by the imperialist warmongering forces will not only be a decisive trigger for the decisions of the DPRK, China, Russia, and Iran—who are currently pursuing a “strategic patience” policy—but will also push the Trump faction toward a critical choice.

Trump clearly belongs to the imperialist camp, yet he has maintained a non-war-mongering stance. Since taking office, he has negotiated with Russia and Iran and mediated local conflicts between India and Pakistan, as well as Thailand and Cambodia. In Europe, so-called “New Right” forces holding positions similar to Trump’s have emerged, opposing war against Russia. However, it is a rightist deviation to argue that the communist forces should form a tactical united front with these groups, akin to the anti-fascist front during World War 2. Conversely, rejecting tactical cooperation with them—that is, tactical measures to deepen divisions within the imperialist camp—would amount to repeating the same leftist error that the Trotskyist forces made during World War 2. It is necessary to correctly understand why the DPRK, China, and Russia engage in dialogue with Trump and exert diplomatic efforts.

Meanwhile, the communist forces must, of course, strongly oppose the anti-popular and anti-democratic atrocities perpetrated by Trump and the “New Right” of the imperialist and reactionary forces. The

fundamental principle is always the standpoint of the people, including the workers. In matters of war, it is necessary to distinguish these relatively non-warmongering forces from the war-crazed warmongering forces, maintaining the principle of prioritizing strikes against the warmongers. However, in matters of exploitation and oppression, there can be no doubt that one must resolutely struggle against imperialist forces as a whole.

The political forces in the US and Europe pursuing war policies against Russia and the “Axis of Resistance” including Iran are the social democratic right and some social democratic left. This is why some social democratic leftists are criticized as “left-wing Zionists.” It is no coincidence that fake communist parties in Europe, which are communist in name only, face fierce condemnation from workers and the masses. They neither oppose imperialism nor genuinely fight fascism, merely paying lip service to these causes while actually serving as imperialism’s lackeys from a “left-wing Zionist” standpoint.

The most crucial criterion distinguishing progressives from reactionaries today is their stance on war. How can anyone who neither supports nor opposes wars instigated by imperialism and its fascist lackeys claim to be progressive? In this sense, the true progressive forces of our era hold a clear anti-imperialist, anti-fascist, and anti-war position. Those who take an anti-Russia stance by echoing imperialist propaganda branding Russia an aggressor, or who oppose Iran and the “Axis of Resistance” while effectively supporting Israeli Zionists, are nothing more than pro-imperialist forces disguised as progressives. The same applies to their stance on Venezuela.

The so-called “communist forces” that distort Venezuela’s Bolivarian Revolution and label both the past Chávez regime and the current Maduro regime as imperialist regimes are fake communist forces with no connection whatsoever to communism or Marxism-Leninism. The reason the international

communist movement cannot unite as one, and the reason it continues to face serious obstacles in conducting scientific analysis of the situation and formulating revolutionary strategy, is, as history shows, because within it lurk sectarian opportunist forces connected with imperialist spies and lackeys. This cancerous presence, these enemies within that divide the international communist movement, have also deliberately and maliciously fomented division in the Venezuelan communist movement.

Practice is the criterion of truth. US imperialism is slandering the Maduro government of Venezuela with absurd accusations. It is preparing a war of aggression to once again turn the country into an “oil colony.” The Maduro government stands at the forefront of the anti-imperialist struggle. Yet some so-called “communist forces” denounce it as an imperialist regime. In the last presidential election, these forces even joined hands with fascist groups. This was no coincidence. The fact that US imperialism is rallying fascist forces within Venezuela to provoke insurrection and to divide Venezuela’s communist forces is merely part of imperialism’s “divide and rule” doctrine, as confirmed by countless historical examples, and is by no means surprising.

US imperialism, facing a severe political and economic crisis, is massing vast military forces in the Caribbean in an attempt to seize Venezuela’s oil and turn the country into another flashpoint. If the US launches a full-scale war against Venezuela, it could become a historic spark that escalates into world war. Venezuela has forged firm alliances not only with Cuba but also with other key anti-imperialist states such as China, Russia, and the DPRK. Just as the war in Palestine immediately expanded into a regional conflict across West Asia, a war in Venezuela will inevitably spread into a regional war encompassing all of Latin America. This would be a crushing burden for US imperialism, which cannot hope to secure simultaneous victories on multiple fronts.

US imperialism, while threatening to turn Vene-

zuela into a second Syria, is deploying destroyers, submarines, stealth bombers, and Marines in nearby waters, while at the same time attempting to bribe and divide Venezuelan leaders, just as it did when toppling Saddam Hussein's regime in Iraq. But Venezuela is entirely different from Syria or Iraq. The decisive difference lies in the single-hearted unity of all the comunas, centered on the Maduro government, which holds the Bolivarian Revolution as its very lifeblood. The comuna itself is the militia; its resistance is the resistance of the entire people. A nation where the leader, the party, the army, and the people are firmly united as one and fight to the last will never collapse. US imperialism will gravely misjudge the strength of the Maduro government, the Venezuelan military, and the Venezuelan people—and suffer a crushing defeat.

Despite the outbreak of the war in Ukraine in February 2022, Solidnet—the recognized center of the international communist movement—failed in its role. Consequently, like-minded revolutionary parties gathered and established the World Anti-imperialist Platform in October 2022. Over the past three years, the World Anti-imperialist Platform has convened international anti-imperialist conferences in Paris, Belgrade, Caracas, Gwangju and Seoul, Athens, Washington D.C., Dakar, and The Hague. It has issued political declarations and statements, while also organizing anti-imperialist rallies and demonstrations.

All the events and activities carried out by the World Anti-imperialist Platform have been thoroughly consistent with the three goals set at its founding: advancing the anti-imperialist struggle, waging the ideological battle against opportunism, and strengthening the communist movement. With the slogans “Workers of the World, Unite!” and “The People United Will Never Be Defeated!,” the World Anti-imperialist Platform will, steadfastly and unflinchingly, continue the struggle until the very end to fulfill

these three tasks.

Following March 2023, we once again gather here today, in October 2025, to support the just struggle and all-people's resistance of the Venezuelan people, who have raised the banner of anti-imperialism and anti-fascism. For the victory of the Venezuelan people, we are ready to gather ten times, a hundred times, and we will do everything in our power.

The people united will never be defeated! We have not the slightest doubt in the Venezuelan people's victory. We are certain of the final triumph of the Bolivarian Revolution, the realization of Chávez's testament “Comuna o Nada,” and the socialist achievements of the Maduro government. Imperialist oppression and aggression will inevitably fail, and the Venezuelan people, having risen in people's resistance, will turn this crisis into an opportunity to accelerate their advance toward socialism.

Today, in Venezuela, the spirit of the Cuban Revolution and of Che Guevara shines brightly.

Victory to the Bolivarian Revolution!

Victory to Chávez!

Victory to Maduro!

Until the day of victory, always—Hasta la Victoria, Siempre

Platform



The World Anti-imperialist Platform