

Platform

February 2026 No.33

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 red flag aloft with her right arm. The background is a solid red color. The entire illustration is framed by a thin white border.





Contents

Work	Disruption of Unity Under Cover of Outcries for Unity 2 V.I. Lenin
Article	The Question of Human Dignity in the Works of K. Marx and its Paradoxes 14 Victor Alexeyevich Vaziulin
	Left Anticommunism: The Unkindest Cut 17 Michael Parenti
	Solidarity with the Islamic Republic of Iran! 26 Communist Organization (KO, Germany)
	The Era of “Do Whatever You Want” in the Global Capitalist Crisis: Part 1 · 34 Mücadele Birliđi (Struggle Unity, Türkiye)
	Understanding the heroism of Yemen 40 Harpreet Pannu Communist Party of Great Britain (Marxist-Leninist)
	What does the sacrifice of the 32 Cubans signify, and what is the dirty role of the renegades acting on orders in WWII? · · · · 55 Dimitrios Patelis Founding member of the Revolutionary Theory Group (Greece)
	Collective Hero, “Nicolás—From Yare to Miraflores” 65 Stephen Cho Coordinator of the Korean International Forum
	Héroe colectivo, “Nicolás—De Yare a Miraflores” 67 Stephen Cho Coordinador del Foro Internacional Coreano
	The Accelerated Strategic Defeat of US Imperialism 69 Stephen Cho Coordinator of the Korean International Forum
	La derrota estratégica acelerada del imperialismo estadounidense 77 Stephen Cho Coordinador del Foro Internacional Coreano

Disruption of Unity Under Cover of Outcries for Unity

V.I. Lenin

May 1914

The questions of the present-day working-class movement are in many respects vexed questions, particularly for representatives of that movement's recent past (i. e., of the stage which historically has just drawn to a close). This applies primarily to the questions of so-called factionalism, splits, and so forth. One often hears intellectuals in the working-class movement making nervous, feverish and almost hysterical appeals not to raise these vexed questions. Those who have experienced the long years of struggle between the various trends among Marxists since 1900—01, for example, may naturally think it superfluous to repeat many of the arguments on the subject of these vexed questions.

But there are not many people left today who took part in the fourteen-year-old conflict among Marxists (not to speak of the eighteen- or nineteen-year-old conflict, counting from the moment the first symptoms of Economism appeared). The vast majority of the workers who now make up the ranks of the Marxists either do not remember the old conflict, or have never heard of it. To the overwhelming majority (as, incidentally, was shown by the opinion poll held by our journal^[5]), these vexed questions are a matter of exception ally great interest. We therefore intend to deal with these questions, which have been raised as it were anew (and for the younger generation of the workers they are really new) by Trotsky's "non-factional workers' journal", *Borba*.

I. "FACTIONALISM"

Trotsky calls his new journal "non-factional". He puts this word in the top line in his advertisements; this word is stressed by him in every key, in the editorial articles of *Borba* itself, as well as in the liquidationist *Severnaya Rabochaya Gazeta*, which

carried an article on *Borba* by Trotsky before the latter began publication.

What is this "non-factionalism"?

Trotsky's "workers' journal" is Trotsky's journal for workers, as there is not a trace in it of either workers' initiative, or any connection with working-class organisations. Desiring to write in a popular style, Trotsky, in his journal for workers, explains for the benefit of his readers the meaning of such foreign words as "territory", "factor", and so forth.

Very good. But why not also explain to the workers the meaning of the word "non-factionalism"? Is that word more intelligible than the words "territory" and "factor"?

No, that is not the reason. The reason is that the label "non-factionalism" is used by the worst representatives of the worst remnants of factionalism to mislead the younger generation of workers. It is worth while devoting a little time to explaining this.

Group-division was the main distinguishing feature of the Social-Democratic Party during a definite historical period. Which period? From 1903 to 1911.

To explain the nature of this group-division more clearly we must recall the concrete conditions that existed in, say, 1906—07. At that time the Party was united, there was no split, but group-division existed, i. e., in the united Party there were virtually two groups, two virtually separate organisations. The local workers' organisations were united, but on every important issue the two groups devised two sets of tactics. The advocates of the respective tactics disputed among themselves in the united workers' organisations (as was the case, for example, during the discussion of the slogan: a Duma, or Cadet, Ministry, in 1906, or during the elections of delegates to the London Congress in 1907), and questions were

decided by a majority vote. One group was defeated at the Stockholm Unity Congress (1906), the other was defeated at the London Unity Congress (1907).

These are commonly known facts in the history of organised Marxism in Russia.

It is sufficient to recall these commonly known facts to realise what glaring falsehoods Trotsky is spreading.

For over two years, since 1912, there has been no factionalism among the organised Marxists in Russia, no disputes over tactics in united organisations, at united conferences and congresses. There is a complete break between the Party, which in January 1912 formally announced that the liquidators do not belong to it, and the liquidators. Trotsky often calls this state of affairs a “split”, and we shall deal with this appellation separately later on. But it remains an undoubted fact that the term “factionalism” deviates from the truth.

As we have said, this term is a repetition, an uncritical, unreasonable, senseless repetition of what was true yesterday, i. e., in the period that has already passed. When Trotsky talks to us about the “chaos of factional strife” (see No. 1, pp. 5, 6, and many others) we realise at once which period of the past his words echo.

Consider the present state of affairs from the viewpoint of the young Russian workers who now constitute nine-tenths of the organised Marxists in Russia. They see three mass expressions of the different views, or trends in the working-class movement: the Pravdists, gathered around a newspaper with a circulation of 40,000; the liquidators (15,000 circulation) and the Left Narodniks (10,000 circulation). The circulation figures tell the reader about the mass character of a given tenet.

The question arises; what has “chaos” got to do with it? Everybody knows that Trotsky is fond of high-sounding and empty phrases. But the catchword “chaos” is not only phrase-mongering; it signifies also the transplanting, or rather, a vain attempt to

transplant, to Russian soil, in the present period, the relations that existed abroad in a bygone period. That is the whole point.

There is no “chaos” whatever in the struggle between the Marxists and the Narodniks. That, we hope, not even Trotsky will dare to deny. The struggle between the Marxists and the Narodniks has been going on for over thirty years, ever since Marxism came into being. The cause of this struggle is the radical divergence of interests and viewpoints of two different classes, the proletariat and the peasantry. If there is any “chaos” anywhere, it is only in the heads of cranks who fail to understand this.

What, then, remains? “Chaos” in the struggle between the Marxists and the liquidators? That, too, is wrong, for a struggle against a trend, which the entire Party recognised as a trend and condemned as far back as 1908, cannot be called chaos. And everybody who has the least concern for the history of Marxism in Russia knows that liquidationism is most closely and inseparably connected, even as regards its leaders and supporters, with Menshevism (1903—08) and Economism (1894—1903). Consequently, here, too, we have a history extending over nearly twenty years. To regard the history of one’s own Party as “chaos” reveals an unpardonable empty-headedness.

Now let us examine the present situation from the point of view of Paris or Vienna. At once the whole picture changes. Besides the Pravdists and liquidators, we see no less than five Russian groups claiming membership of one and the same Social-Democratic Party: Trotsky’s group, two Vperyod groups, the “pro-Party Bolsheviks” and the “pro-Party Mensheviks”.^[6] All Marxists in Paris and in Vienna (for the purpose of illustration I take two of the largest centres) are perfectly well aware of this.

Here Trotsky is right in a certain sense; this is indeed group-division, chaos indeed!

Groups within the Party, i. e., nominal unity (all claim to belong to one Party) and actual disunity (for, in fact, all the groups are independent of one

another and enter into negotiations and agreements with each other as sovereign powers).

“Chaos”, i. e., the absence of (1) objective and verifiable proof that these groups are linked with the working-class movement in Russia and (2) absence of any data to enable us to judge the actual ideological and political physiognomy of these groups. Take a period of two full years—1912 and 1913. As everybody knows, this was a period of the revival and upswing of the working-class movement, when every trend or tendency of a more or less mass character (and in politics this mass character alone counts) could not but exercise some influence on the Fourth Duma elections, the strike movement, the legal newspapers, the trade unions, the insurance election campaign, and so on. Throughout those two years, not one of these five groups abroad asserted itself in the slightest degree in any of the activities of the mass working-class movement in Russia just enumerated!

That is a fact that anybody can easily verify.

And that fact proves that we were right in calling Trotsky a representative of the “worst remnants of factionalism”.

Although he claims to be non-factional, Trotsky is known to everybody who is in the least familiar with the working-class movement in Russia as the representative of “Trotsky’s faction”. Here we have group-division, for we see two essential symptoms of it: (1) nominal recognition of unity and (2) group segregation in fact. Here there are remnants of group-division, for there is no evidence whatever of any real connection with the mass working-class movement in Russia.

And lastly, it is the worst form of group-division, for there is no ideological and political definiteness. It cannot be denied that this definiteness is characteristic of both the Pravdists (even our determined opponent L. Martov admits that we stand “solid and disciplined” around universally known formal decisions on all questions) and the liquidators (they, or

at all events the most prominent of them, have very definite features, namely, liberal, not Marxist).

It cannot be denied that some of the groups which, like Trotsky’s, really exist exclusively from the Vienna-Paris, but by no means from the Russian, point of view, possess a degree of definiteness. For example, the Machist theories of the Machist Vperyod group are definite; the emphatic repudiation of these theories and defence of Marxism, in addition to the theoretical condemnation of liquidationism, by the “pro-Party Mensheviks”, are definite.

Trotsky, however, possesses no ideological and political definiteness, for his patent for “non-factionalism”, as we shall soon see in greater detail, is merely a patent to flit freely to and fro, from one group to another.

To sum up:

1) Trotsky does not explain, nor does he understand, the historical significance of the ideological disagreements among the various Marxist trends and groups, although these disagreements run through the twenty years’ history of Social Democracy and concern the fundamental questions of the present day (as we shall show later on);

2) Trotsky fails to understand that the main specific features of group-division are nominal recognition of unity and actual disunity;

3) Under cover of “non-factionalism” Trotsky is championing the interests of a group abroad which particularly lacks definite principles, and has no basis in the working-class movement in Russia.

All that glitters is not gold. There is much glitter and sound in Trotsky’s phrases, but they are meaningless.

II. THE SPLIT

“Although there is no group-division, i. e., nominal recognition of unity, but actual disunity, among you, Pravdists, there is something worse, namely, splitting tactics,” we are told. This is exactly what Trotsky says. Unable to think out his ideas or to get his arguments to hang together, he rants against group-division at

one moment, and at the next shouts: “Splitting tactics are winning one suicidal victory after another” (No. 1, p. 6.)

This statement can have only one mending: “The Pravdists are winning one victory after another” (this is an objective, verifiable fact, established by a study of the mass working-class movement in Russia during, say, 1912 and 1913), but I, Trotsky, denounce the Pravdists (1) as splitters, and (2) as suicidal politicians.

Let us examine this.

First of all we must express our thanks to Trotsky. Not long ago (from August 1912 to February 1914) he was at one with F. Dan, who, as is well known, threatened to “kill” anti-liquidationism, and called upon others to do so. At present Trotsky does not threaten to “kill” our trend (and our Party—don’t be angry, Citizen Trotsky, this is true!), he only prophesies that it will kill itself!

This is much milder, isn’t it? It is almost “non-factional”, isn’t it?

But joking apart (although joking is the only way of retorting mildly to Trotsky’s insufferable phrase-mongering).

“Suicide” is a mere empty phrase, mere “Trotskyism”.

Splitting tactics are a grave political accusation. This accusation is repeated against us in a thousand different keys by the liquidators and by all the groups enumerated above, who, from the point of view of Paris and Vienna, actually exist.

And all of them repeat this grave political accusation in an amazingly frivolous way. Look at Trotsky. He admitted that “splitting tactics are winning [read: the Pravdists are winning] one suicidal victory after another”. To this he adds:

“Numerous advanced workers, in a state of utter political bewilderment, themselves often become active agents of a split.” (No. 1, p. 6.)

Are not these words a glaring example of irresponsibility on this question?

You accuse us of being splitters when all that we see in front of us in the arena of the working-class movement in Russia is liquidationism. So you think that our attitude towards liquidationism is wrong? Indeed, all the groups abroad that we enumerated above, no matter how much they may differ from each other, are agreed that our attitude towards liquidationism is wrong, that it is the attitude of “splitters”. This, too, reveals the similarity (and fairly close political kinship) between all these groups and the liquidators.

If our attitude towards liquidationism is wrong in theory, in principle, then Trotsky should say so straightforwardly, and state definitely, without equivocation, why he thinks it is wrong. But Trotsky has been evading this extremely important point for years.

If our attitude towards liquidationism has been proved wrong in practice, by the experience of the movement, then this experience should be analysed; but Trotsky fails to do this either. “Numerous advanced workers,” he admits, “become active agents of a split” (read: active agents of the Pravdist line, tactics, system and organisation).

What is the cause of the deplorable fact, which, as Trotsky admits, is confirmed by experience, that the advanced workers, the numerous advanced workers at that, stand for Pravda?

It is the “utter political bewilderment” of these advanced workers, answers Trotsky.

Needless to say, this explanation is highly flattering to Trotsky, to all five groups abroad, and to the liquidators. Trotsky is very fond of using, with the learned air of the expert, pompous and high-sounding phrases to explain historical phenomena in a way that is flattering to Trotsky. Since “numerous advanced workers” become “active agents” of a political and Party line which does not conform to Trotsky’s line, Trotsky settles the question unhesitatingly, out of hand: these advanced workers are “in a state of utter political bewilderment”, whereas he,

Trotsky, is evidently “in a state” of political firmness and clarity, and keeps to the right line!... And this very same Trotsky, beating his breast, fulminates against factionalism, parochialism, and the efforts of intellectuals to impose their will on the workers!

Reading things like these, one cannot help asking oneself: is it from a lunatic asylum that such voices come?

The Party put the question of liquidationism, and of condemning it, before the “advanced workers” as far back as 1908, while the question of “splitting” away from a very definite group of liquidators (namely, the *Nasha Zarya* group), i. e., that the only way to build up the Party was without this group and in opposition to it—this question was raised in January 1912, over two years ago. The overwhelming majority of the advanced workers declared in favour of supporting the “January (1912) line”. Trotsky himself admits this fact when he talks about “victories” and about “numerous advanced workers”. But Trotsky wriggles out of this simply by hurling abuse at these advanced workers and calling them “splitters” and “politically bewildered”!

From these facts sane people will draw a different conclusion. Where the majority of the class-conscious workers have rallied around precise and definite decisions, there we shall find unity of opinion and action, there we shall find the Party spirit, and the Party.

Where we see liquidators who have been “removed from office” by the workers, or half a dozen groups outside Russia, who for two years have produced no proof that they are connected with the mass working-class movement in Russia, there, indeed, we shall find bewilderment and splits. In now trying to persuade the workers not to carry out the decisions of that “united whole”, which the Marxist Pravdists recognise, Trotsky is trying to disrupt the movement and cause a split.

These efforts are futile, but we must expose the arrogantly conceited leaders of intellectualist groups,

who, while causing splits themselves, are shouting about others causing splits; who, after sustaining utter defeat at the hands of the “advanced workers” for the past two years or more, are with incredible insolence flouting the decisions and the will of these advanced workers and saying that they are “politically bewildered”. These are entirely the methods of Nozdrev,^[7] or of “Judas” Golovlyov.^[8]

In reply to these repeated outcries about a split and in fulfilment of my duty as a publicist, I will not tire of repeating precise, unrefuted and irrefutable figures. In the Second Duma, 47 per cent of the deputies elected by the worker curia were Bolsheviks, in the Third Duma 50 per cent were Bolsheviks, and in the Fourth Duma 67 per cent.

There you have the majority of the “advanced workers”, there you have the Party; there you have unity of opinion and action of the majority of the class-conscious workers.

To this the liquidators say (see Bulkin, L. M., in *Nasha Zarya* No. 3) that we base our arguments on the Stolypin curias. This is a foolish and unscrupulous argument. The Germans measure their successes by the results of elections conducted under the Bismarckian electoral law, which excludes women. Only people bereft of their senses would reproach the German Marxists for measuring their successes under the existing electoral law, without in the least justifying its reactionary restrictions.

And we, too, without justifying curias, or the curia system, measured our successes under the existing electoral law. There were curias in all three (Second, Third and Fourth) Duma elections; and within the worker curia, within the ranks of Social-Democracy, there was a complete swing against the liquidators. Those who do not wish to deceive themselves and others must admit this objective fact, namely, the victory of working-class unity over the liquidators.

The other argument is just as “clever”: “Mensheviks and liquidators voted for (or took part in the election of) such-and-such a Bolshevik.” Splendid! But does

not the same thing apply to the 53 per cent non-Bolshevik deputies returned to the Second Duma, and to the 50 per cent returned to the Third Duma, and to the 33 per cent returned to the Fourth Duma?

If, instead of the figures on the deputies elected, we could obtain the figures on the electors, or workers' delegates, etc., we would gladly quote them. But these more detailed figures are not available, and consequently the "disputants" are simply throwing dust in people's eyes.

But what about the figures of the workers' groups that assisted the newspapers of the different trends? During two years (1912 and 1913), 2,801 groups assisted Pravda, and 750 assisted Luch.^[1] These figures are verifiable and nobody has attempted to disprove them.

Where is the unity of action and will of the majority of the "advanced workers", and where is the flouting of the will of the majority?

Trotsky's "non-factionalism" is, actually, splitting tactics, in that it shamelessly flouts the will of the majority of the workers.

III. THE BREAK-UP OF THE AUGUST BLOC

But there is still another method, and a very important one, of verifying the correctness and truthfulness of Trotsky's accusations about splitting tactics.

You consider that it is the "Leninists" who are splitters? Very well, let us assume that you are right.

But if you are, why have not all the other sections and groups proved that unity is possible with the liquidators without the "Leninists", and against the "splitters"?... If we are splitters, why have not you, uniters, united among yourselves, and with the liquidators? Had you done that you would have proved to the workers by deeds that unity is possible and beneficial!...

Let us go over the chronology of events.

In January 1912, the "Leninist" "splitters" declared that they were a Party without and against the liquidators.

In March 1912, all the groups and "factions": liquidators, Trotskyists, Vperyodists, "pro-Party Bolsheviks" and "pro-Party Mensheviks", in their Russian news sheets and in the columns of the German Social-Democratic newspaper Vorwärts, united against these "splitters". All of them unanimously, in chorus, in unison and in one voice vilified us and called us "usurpers", "mystifiers", and other no less affectionate and tender names.

Very well, gentlemen! But what could have been easier for you than to unite against the "usurpers" and to set the "advanced workers" an example of unity? Do you mean to say that if the advanced workers had seen, on the one hand, the unity of all against the usurpers, the unity of liquidators and non-liquidators, and on the other, isolated "usurpers", "splitters", and so forth; they would not have supported the former?

If disagreements are only invented, or exaggerated, and so forth, by the "Leninists", and if unity between the liquidators, Plekhanovites, Vperyodists, Trotskyists, and so forth, is really possible, why have you not proved this during the past two years by your own example?

In August 1912, a conference of "uniters" was convened. Disunity started at once: the Plekhanovites refused to attend at all; the Vperyodists attended, but walked out after protesting and exposing the fictitious character of the whole business.

The liquidators, the Letts, the Trotskyists (Trotsky and Semkovsky), the Caucasians, and the Seven "united". But did they? We stated at the time that they did not, that this was merely a screen to cover up liquidationism. Have the events disproved our statement?

Exactly eighteen months later, in February 1914, we found:

1. that the Seven was breaking up. Buryanov had left them.
2. that in the remaining new "Six", Chkheidze and Tulyakov, or somebody else, could not see eye to eye

on the reply to be made to Plekhanov. They stated in the press that they would reply to him, but they could not.

3. that Trotsky, who for many months had practically vanished from the columns of Luch, had broken away, and had started “his own” journal, Borba. By calling this journal “non-factional”, Trotsky clearly (clearly to those who are at all familiar with the subject) intimates that in his, Trotsky’s, opinion, Nasha Zarya and Luch had proved to be “factional”, i. e., poor uniters.

If you are a uniter, my dear Trotsky, if you say that it is possible to unite with the liquidators, if you and they stand by the “fundamental ideas formulated in August 1912” (Borba No. 1, p. 43, Editorial Note), why did not you yourself unite with the liquidators in Nasha Zarya and Luch?

When, before Trotsky’s journal appeared, Severnaya Rabochaya Gazeta published some scathing comment stating that the physiognomy of this journal was “unclear” and that there had been “quite a good deal of talk in Marxist circles” about this journal, Put Pravdy (No. 37)^[2] was naturally obliged to expose this falsehood. It said: “There has been talk in Marxist circles” about a secret memorandum written by Trotsky against the Luch group; Trotsky’s physiognomy and his breakaway from the August bloc were perfectly “clear”.

4. An, the well-known leader of the Caucasian liquidators, who had attacked L. Sedov (for which he was given a public wiggling by F. Dan and Co.), now appeared in Borba. It remains “unclear” whether the Caucasians now desire to go with Trotsky or with Dan.

5. The Lettish Marxists, who were the only real organisation in the “August bloc”, had formally withdrawn from it, stating (in 1914) in the resolution of their last Congress that:

“the attempt on the part of the conciliators to unite at all costs with the liquidators (the August Conference of 1912) proved fruitless, and the unit-

ers themselves became ideologically and politically dependent upon the liquidators.”

This statement was made, after eighteen months’ experience, by an organisation which had itself been neutral and had not desired to establish connection with either of the two centres. This decision of neutrals should carry all the more weight with Trotsky!

Enough, is it not?

Those who accused us of being splitters, of being unwilling or unable to get on with the liquidators, were themselves unable to get on with them. The August bloc proved to be a fiction and broke up.

By concealing this break-up from his readers, Trotsky is deceiving them.

The experience of our opponents has proved that we are right, has proved that the liquidators cannot be co-operated with.

IV. A CONCILIATOR’S ADVICE TO THE “SEVEN”

The editorial article in issue No. 1 of Borba entitled “The Split in the Duma Group” contains advice from a conciliator to the seven pro-liquidator (or inclining towards liquidationism) members of the Duma. The gist of this advice is contained in the following words:

“first of all consult the Six whenever it is necessary to reach an agreement with other groups...” (P. 29.)

This is the wise counsel which, among other things, is evidently the cause of Trotsky’s disagreement with the liquidators of Luch. This is the opinion the Pravdists have held ever since the outbreak of the conflict between the two groups in the Duma, ever since the resolution of the Summer (1913) Conference was adopted. The Russian Social-Democratic Labour group in the Duma has reiterated in the press, even after the split, that it continues to adhere to this position, in spite of the repeated refusals of the Seven.

From the very outset, since the time the resolution of the Summer Conference was adopted, we have been, and still are, of the opinion that agreements on questions concerning activities in the Duma are

desirable and possible; if such agreements have been repeatedly arrived at with the petty-bourgeois peasant democrats (Trudoviks), they are all the more possible and necessary with the petty-bourgeois, liberal-labour politicians.

We must not exaggerate disagreements, but we must face the facts: the Seven are men, leaning towards liquidationism, who yesterday entirely followed the lead of Dan, and whose eyes today are travelling longingly from Dan to Trotsky and back again. The liquidators are a group of legalists who have broken away from the Party and are pursuing a liberal-labour policy. Since they repudiate the “underground”, there can be no question of unity with them in matters concerning Party organisation and the working-class movement. Who ever thinks differently is badly mistaken and fails to take into account the profound nature of the changes that have taken place since 1908.

But agreements on certain questions with this group, which stands outside or on the fringe of the Party, are, of course, permissible: we must always compel this group, too, like the Trudoviks, to choose between the workers’ (Pravdist) policy and the liberal policy. For example, on the question of fighting for freedom of the press the liquidators clearly revealed, vacillation between the liberal formulation of the question, which repudiated, or overlooked, the illegal press, and the opposite policy, that of the workers.

Within the scope of a Duma policy in which the most important extra-Duma issues are not directly raised, agreements with the seven liberal-labour deputies are possible and desirable. On this point Trotsky has shifted his ground from that of the liquidators to that of the Party Summer (1913) Conference.

It should not be forgotten, however, that to a group standing outside the Party, agreement means something entirely different from what Party people usually understand by the term. By “agreement” in the Duma, non-Party people mean “drawing up a tactical resolution, or line”. To Party people agreement is an attempt to enlist others in the work of carrying

out the Party line.

For example, the Trudoviks have no party. By agreement they understand the “voluntary”, so to speak, “drawing up” of a line, today with the Cadets, tomorrow with the Social-Democrats. We, however, understand something entirely different by agreement with the Trudoviks. We have Party decisions on all the important questions of tactics, and we shall never depart from these decisions; by agreement with the Trudoviks we mean winning them over to our side, convincing them that we are right, and not rejecting joint action against the Black Hundreds and against the liberals.

How far Trotsky has forgotten (not for nothing has he associated with the liquidators) this elementary difference between the Party and non-Party point of view on agreements, is shown by the following argument of his:

“The representatives of the International must bring together the two sections of our divided parliamentary group and jointly with them ascertain the points of agreement and points of disagreement... A detailed tactical resolution formulating the principles of parliamentary tactics may be drawn up...” (No. 1, pp. 29—30.)

Here you have a characteristic and typical example of the liquidationist presentation of the question! Trotsky’s journal forgets about the Party; such a trifle is hardly worth remembering!

When different parties in Europe (Trotsky is fond of inappropriately talking about Europeanism) come to an agreement or unite, what they do is this: their respective representatives meet and first of all ascertain the points of disagreement (precisely what the International proposed in relation to Russia, without including in the resolution Kautsky’s ill-considered statement that “the old Party no longer exists”^[9]). Having ascertained the points of disagreement, the representatives decide what decisions (resolutions, conditions, etc.) on questions of tactics, organisation, etc., should be submitted to the congresses of the two

parties. If they succeed in drafting unanimous decisions, the congresses decide whether to adopt them or not. If differing proposals are made, they too are submitted for final decision to the congresses of the two parties.

What appeals to the liquidators and Trotsky is only the European models of opportunism, but certainly not the models of European partisanship.

“A detailed tactical resolution” will be drawn up by the members of the Duma! This example should serve the Russian “advanced workers”, with whom Trotsky has good reason to be so displeased, as a striking illustration of the lengths to which the groups in Vienna and Paris—who persuaded even Kautsky that there was “no Party” in Russia—go in their ludicrous project-mongering. But if it is some times possible to fool foreigners on this score, the Russian “advanced workers” (at the risk of provoking the terrible Trotsky to another outburst of displeasure) will laugh in the faces of these project-mongers.

“Detailed tactical resolutions,” they will tell them, “are drawn up among us (we do not know how it is done among you lion-Party people) by Party congresses and conferences, for example, those of 1907, 1908, 1910, 1912 and 1913. We shall gladly acquaint uninformed foreigners, as well as forgetful Russians, with our Party decisions, and still more gladly ask the representatives of the Seven, or the August bloc members, or Left-wingers or anybody else, to acquaint us with the resolutions of their congresses, or conferences, and to bring up at their next congress the definite question of the attitude they should adopt towards our resolutions, or towards the resolution of the neutral Lettish Congress of 1914, etc.”

This is what the “advanced workers” of Russia will say to the various project-mongers, and this has already been said in the Marxist press, for example, by the organised Marxists of St. Petersburg. Trotsky chooses to ignore these published terms for the liquidators? So much the worse for Trotsky. It is our duty to warn our readers how ridiculous that “unity” (the

August type of “unity”?) project-mongering is which refuses to reckon with the will of the majority of the class-conscious workers of Russia.

V. TROTSKY’S LIQUIDATIONIST VIEWS

As to the substance of his own views, Trotsky contrived to say as little as possible in his new journal. Put Pravdy (No. 37) has already commented on the fact that Trotsky has not said a word either on the question of the “underground” or on the slogan of working for a legal party, etc.^[3] That, among other things, is why we say that when attempts are made to form a separate organisation which is to have no ideological and political physiognomy, it is the worst form of factionalism.

Although Trotsky has refrained from openly expounding his views, quite a number of passages in his journal show what kind of ideas he has been trying to smuggle in.

In the very first editorial article in the first issue of his journal, we read the following:

“The pre-revolutionary Social-Democratic Party in our country was a workers’ party only in ideas and aims. Actually, it was an organisation of the Marxist intelligentsia, which led the awakening working class.” (5.)

This is the old liberal and liquidationist tune, which is really the prelude to the repudiation of the Party. It is based on a distortion of the historical facts. The strikes of 1895—96 had already given rise to a mass working-class movement, which both in ideas and organisation was linked with the Social-Democratic movement. And in these strikes, in this economic and non-economic agitation, the “intelligentsia led the working class”!?

Or take the following exact statistics of political offences in the period 1901—03 compared with the preceding period.

Occupations of participants in the emancipation movement prosecuted for political offences (per cent)

Period	Agriculture	Industry and commerce	Liberal professions and students	No definite occupation, and no occupation
1884—90	7.1	15.1	53.3	19.9
1901—03	9.0	46.1	28.7	8.0

We see that in the eighties, when there was as yet no Social-Democratic Party in Russia, and when the movement was “Narodnik”, the intelligentsia predominated, accounting for over half the participants.

But the picture underwent a complete change in 1901—03, when a Social-Democratic Party already existed, and when the old Iskra was conducting its work. The intelligentsia were now a minority among the participants of the movement; the workers (“industry and commerce”) were far more numerous than the intelligentsia, and the workers and peasants together constituted more than half the total.

It was precisely in the conflict of trends within the Marxist movement that the petty-bourgeois intellectualist wing of the Social-Democracy made itself felt, beginning with Economism (1895—1903) and continuing with Menshevism (1903—1908) and liquidationism (1908—1914). Trotsky repeats the liquidationist slander against the Party and is afraid to mention the history of the twenty years’ conflict of trends within the Party.

Here is another example.

“In its attitude towards parliamentarism, Russian Social-Democracy passed through the same three stages ... [as in other countries] ... first ‘boycottism’ ... then the acceptance in principle of parliamentary tactics, but ... [that magnificent “but”, the “but” which Shchedrin translated as: The ears never grow higher than the forehead, never!^[4]]... for purely agitational purposes ... and lastly, the presentation from the Duma rostrum ... of current demands....” (No. 1, p. 34.)

This, too, is a liquidationist distortion of history. The distinction between the second and third stages was invented in order to smuggle in a defence of reformism and opportunism. Boycottism as a stage

in “the attitude of Social-Democracy towards parliamentarism” never existed either in Europe (where anarchism has existed and continues to exist) or in Russia, where the boycott of the Bulygin Duma, for example, applied only to a definite institution, was never linked with “parliamentarism”, and was engendered by the peculiar nature of the struggle between liberalism and Marxism for the continuation of the onslaught. Trotsky does not breathe a word, about the way this struggle affected the conflict between the two trends in Marxism!

When dealing with history, one must explain concrete questions and the class roots of the different trends; anybody who wants to make a Marxist study of the struggle of classes and trends over the question of participation in the Bulygin Duma, will see therein the roots of the liberal-labour policy. But Trotsky “deals with” history only in order to evade concrete questions and to invent a justification, or a semblance of justification, for the present-day opportunists!

“Actually, all trends,” he writes, “employ the same methods of struggle and organisation.” “The outcries about the liberal danger in our working-class movement are simply a crude and sectarian travesty of reality.” (No. 1, pp. 5 and 35.)

This is a very clear and very vehement, defence of the liquidators. But we will take the liberty of quoting at least one small fact, one of the very latest. Trotsky merely slings words about; we should like the workers themselves to ponder over the facts.

It is a fact that Severnaya Rabochaya Gazeta for March 13 wrote the following:

“Instead of emphasising the definite and concrete task that confronts the working class, viz., to compel the Duma to throw out the bill [on the press], a vague formula is proposed of fighting for the ‘uncurtailed slogans’, and at the same time the illegal press is widely advertised, which can only lead to the relaxation of the workers’ struggle for their legal press.”

This is a clear, precise and documentary defence

of the liquidationist policy and a criticism of the Pravda policy. Well, will any literate person say that both trends employ “the same methods of struggle and organisation” on this question? Will any literate person say that the liquidators are not pursuing a liberal-labour policy on this question, that the liberal menace to the working-class movement is purely imaginary?

The reason why Trotsky avoids facts and concrete references is because they relentlessly refute all his angry outcries and pompous phrases. It is very easy, of course, to strike an attitude and say: “a crude and sectarian travesty”. Or to add a still more stinging and pompous catch-phrase, such as “emancipation from conservative factionalism”.

But is this not very cheap? Is not this weapon borrowed from the arsenal of the period when Trotsky posed in all his splendour before audiences of high-school boys?

Nevertheless, the “advanced workers”, with whom Trotsky is so angry, would like to be told plainly and clearly: Do you or do you not approve of the “method of struggle and organisation” that is definitely expressed in the above-quoted appraisal of a definite political campaign? If you do, then you are pursuing a liberal-labour policy, betraying Marxism and the Party; to talk of “peace” or of “unity” with such a policy, with groups which pursue such a policy, means deceiving yourself and others.

If not, then say so plainly. Phrases will not astonish, satisfy or intimidate the present-day workers.

Incidentally, the policy advocated by the liquidators in the above-quoted passage is a foolish one even from the liberal point of view, for the passage of a bill in the Duma depends on “Zemstvo-Octoberists” of the type of Bennigsen, who has already shown his hand in the committee.

* *
*

The old participants in the Marxist movement in

Russia know Trotsky very well, and there is no need to discuss him for their benefit. But the younger generation of workers do not know him, and it is therefore necessary to discuss him, for he is typical of all the five groups abroad, which, in fact, are also vacillating between the liquidators and the Party.

In the days of the old Iskra (1901—03), these waverers, who flitted from the Economists to the Iskrist and back again, were dubbed “Tushino turncoats” (the name given in the Troublous Times in Rus to fighting men who went over from one camp to another^[10]).

When we speak of liquidationism we speak of a definite ideological trend, which grew up in the course of many years, stems from Menshevism and Economism in the twenty years’ history of Marxism, and is connected with the policy and ideology of a definite class—the liberal bourgeoisie.

The only ground the “Tushino turncoats” have for claiming that they stand above groups is that they “borrow” their ideas from one group one day and from another the next day. Trotsky was an ardent Iskrist in 1901—03, and Ryazanov described his role at the Congress of 1903 as “Lenin’s cudgel”. At the end of 1903, Trotsky was an ardent Menshevik, i. e., he deserted from the Iskrist to the Economists. He said that “between the old Iskra and the new lies a gulf”. In 1904—05, he deserted the Mensheviks and occupied a vacillating position, now co-operating with Martynov (the Economist), now proclaiming his absurdly Left “permanent revolution” theory. In 1906—07, he approached the Bolsheviks, and in the spring of 1907 he declared that he was in agreement with Rosa Luxemburg.

In the period of disintegration, after long “non-factional” vacillation, he again went to the right, and in August 1912, he entered into a bloc with the liquidators. He has now deserted them again, although in substance he reiterates their shoddy ideas.

Such types are characteristic of the flotsam of past historical formations, of the time when the mass,

working-class movement in Russia was still dormant, and when every group had “ample room” in which to pose as a trend, group or faction, in short, as a “power”, negotiating amalgamation with others.

The younger generation of workers should know exactly whom they are dealing with, when individuals come before them with incredibly pretentious claims, unwilling absolutely to reckon with either the Party decisions, which since 1908 have defined and established our attitude towards liquidationism, or with the experience of the present-day working-class movement in Russia, which has actually brought about the unity of the majority on the basis of full recognition of the aforesaid decisions.

Notes

[1] A preliminary calculation made up to April 1, 1914, showed 4,000 groups for Pravda (commencing with January 1, 1912) and 1,000 for the liquidators and all their allies taken together.—Lenin

[2] See pp. 158—81 of this volume.—Ed.

[3] See pp. 158—61 of this volume.—Ed.

[4] Meaning the impossible.—Ed.

[5] This refers to Prosveshcheniye.

[6] Pro-Party Bolsheviks—conciliators with leanings towards the liquidators. (For further details see Lenin’s article “Adventurism”, pp. 350—59 of this volume.)

Pro-Party Mensheviks—headed by Plekhanov, came out against the liquidators during the period of reaction. While taking a Menshevik stand, the Plekhanovites at the same time stood for the preservation and strengthening of the illegal Party organisation and therefore stood for a bloc with the Bolsheviks. Plekhanov broke the bloc with the Bolsheviks at the end of 1911. Under the guise of fighting “factionalism” and the split in the R.S.D.L.P. he attempted to reconcile the Bolsheviks with the opportunists. In 1912 the Plekhanovites, together with the Trotskyists, Bundists and liquidators, came out against the decisions of the Prague Conference of the R.S.D.L.P.

[7] Nozdrev—a character in Gogol’s *Dead Souls* typifying a self-assured, impudent, and mendacious person.

[8] “Judas” Golovlyov—a character in Saltykov-Shchedrin’s book *The Golovlyov Family* typifying the spiritual and physical disintegration of the historically doomed class of feudal landlords, social parasites, treacherous hypocrites.

[9] At the December meeting of the International Socialist Bureau (held in London on December 13—14, 1913) a resolution was adopted instructing the Executive of the International Socialist Bureau to call a meeting of representatives of “all factions of the labour

movement in Russia, including Russian Poland, who recognise the Party Programme or whose programme corresponds with that of the Social-Democrats, for a mutual exchange of opinions (*Aussprache*) on points of disagreement”. In seconding this resolution, Kautsky, in his speech of December 14, stated that the old Social-Democratic Party in Russia was dead. It had to be re-established on the basis of the Russian workers’ urge for unity. In his article “A Good Resolution and a Bad Speech”, Lenin examined this resolution and called Kautsky’s speech monstrous. (See present edition, Vol. 19, pp. 528—30.)

[10] The Troublous Times—a term used in pre-revolutionary Russian historiography to denote the period of the peasant war and the struggle of the Russian people against the Polish and Swedish intervention in the early seventeenth century.

In 1608 the Polish troops under Pseudo-Dmitry II, a henchman of the Polish landed gentry who posed as the younger son of the Russian tsar Ivan the Terrible, invaded Russia, and reached the outskirts of Moscow, where they encamped in Tushino. A government headed by Pseudo-Dmitry was formed in Tushino in opposition to the government of Moscow. Some of the Russian nobles and boyar aristocracy deserted one camp for another in an effort to keep in with the winning side. These deserters were called “Tushino turncoats”.

The Question of Human Dignity in the Works of K. Marx and its Paradoxes

Victor Alexeyevich Vaziulin

Proceedings of the International Conference 'Ethics of Human Rights', Lomonosov Moscow State University—Tula, 1994

1. The current approach to the understanding of human dignity in the 'International Bill of Human Rights'^[1] clearly shows a low level of methodological literacy: the concept of 'human dignity' is understood as a foundational notion but is neither clarified nor further developed in any way. As a result, a limiting empiricism characterises any further formulation.

This methodological inadequacy is also blatantly evident in a Council of Europe document on human rights, for example in the book 'Medicine and Human Rights' (Moscow, 1992), which presents the results of many years of research on the subject, conducted under the auspices of the Council of Europe. The main content of the book is reduced to a simple presentation of cases and, in fact, proclaims a principled refusal to generalise.

2. In the commonly used meaning (Dictionary of the Russian Language. M., 1957. Vol. 1), human dignity is understood as respect for oneself, conscience of one's rights, one's value. Consequently, the common understanding of the dignity of a person is, firstly, the conscience of their rights and, secondly, the conscience of the value of their personality.

3. The question of human rights and morality in the works of K. Marx.

Human rights constitute determinations and enactments that pertain to the realm of law and politics. This is how K. Marx interprets them. According to

K. Marx, human rights are the rights that emerged with the emergence of bourgeois society and represent human rights within bourgeois society.

With the emergence and development of bourgeois society, with the abolition of feudal privileges, K. Marx shows that there is a separation, or rather an alienation of the political sphere, where all are equal before the law, from a society of individuals, where community is a community of private owners, where community is a means for the realisation of private property. And the political sphere serves as a means for the realisation of private property.

On the example of the most radical and consistent, the boldest bourgeois constitution—the constitution of the Great French Bourgeois Revolution—K. Marx proves that the fundamental human rights—liberty, equality, property (i.e. private property)—are the rights of separated egoistic individuals, the rights of self-interest. He proves that these rights reflect the position of separated individuals who treat other individuals, society and community as a means to satisfy their ends and needs, and thus, as alienated from themselves.

In fact, freedom is defined in the Declaration of Human Rights of 1791 as the right to do and engage in anything that does not harm another person, i.e. the limits of each person's activities without causing harm to others. Consequently, '...the right of man to liberty is based not on the association of man with man, but on the separation of man from man [...] It is the right of this separation, the right of the restricted individual, withdrawn into himself. The practical application of man's right to liberty is man's right to private property. [...] the right to enjoy one's property

and to dispose of it at one's discretion (à son gré), without regard to other men, independently of society, the right of self-interest.'^[2]

Equality. Equality is the equality of the liberty described above: 'Equality consists in the fact that the law is the same for all, whether it protects or punishes'^[3] 'None of the so-called rights of man, therefore, go beyond egoistic man, beyond man as a member of civil society—that is, an individual withdrawn into himself, into the confines of his private interests and private caprice, and separated from the community. In the rights of man, he is far from being conceived as a species-being; on the contrary, species-life itself, society, appears as a framework external to the individuals, as a restriction of their original independence.'^[4] The only link that unites these individuals is natural necessity, private interest, the preservation of their property and their egoistic personality.

What about morality and human dignity?

Firstly, morality is subordinated to the sphere of law and politics, a fact also evident in the contemporary established meaning of the word 'human dignity' (as the realisation of human rights). Hegel insightfully captured the position of 'conscious morality' or 'individual morality' (Moralität) and 'habitual morality' or 'social morality' (Sittlichkeit) in bourgeois society, by integrating the analysis of these concepts into the philosophy of law.

Secondly, the more society is a society of private owners, of isolated individuals, the more their relations are regulated by law, by politics, and not by morality, the less importance morality has in society.

Thirdly, liberty and equality are first and foremost the liberty and equality of private owners. Consequently, the basis of liberty and equality in bourgeois society is private property, and therefore human dignity is actually determined by private property (and therefore by property differences), but not at all by the value of the individual, although formally all are equal before the law and therefore all, having for-

mally equal rights, have formally equal dignity.

4. Value of personality. The characterisation of a personality specifically from the perspective of its value constitutes a particular case of considering, from this perspective, nature, man and the world created by man. The concept of 'value' gains significance with the establishment of the domination of commodity and money relations. Under the domination of commodity and money relations, everything, including a person, the individual, is drawn into its orbit and is assigned a price. Everything can be sold and bought, everything can be evaluated and valued. A person, his qualities, his characteristics, become a commodity and thus a thing. The famous psychotherapist Fritz Perls rightly believes that 'our (modern—V. V.) man is dead, he is a puppet, and his behaviour is really very similar to that of a corpse, which allows others to do whatever they want with him, although he himself, by his mere presence, influences them in a certain way'. But long before F. Perls, K. Marx, like no other scientist, no other thinker in the world, deeply understood and explained that in bourgeois society, in a world dominated by private property, by commodity and money relations, in market society, the human being is degraded and reduced to the status of a commodity, he is relegated into an object.

Therefore, to the extent that a person is reduced to the status of an object, their human dignity is also disregarded.

5. From the position of K. Marx and actual Marxism (as opposed to various pseudo-Marxist approaches), man constitutes the highest value for man and the main strategic task is to create a society in which people would freely unite to form society, treating everyone not as a means but as an end.

Such a society is in a certain sense the opposite of the bourgeois, market society of isolated, egoistic individuals, each of whom treats himself as an end and others as means.

K. Marx made a tremendous effort to identify the actual ways, methods, means, etc. to achieve a truly human society, truly human relations.

6. K. Marx showed that human rights, the value of personality, the concepts of human rights and the value of personality are based on the dominance of money relations, the dominance of the market.

During the exchange of the products of labour of isolated producers, each of them exchanges, alienates the product of labour which satisfies the needs of someone else, in order to receive for it an equivalent product of others, which is capable of satisfying his own needs.

In the exchange of equivalents, there is liberty (everyone exchanges in order to satisfy his needs and in exactly the same way that the needs of others are satisfied), equality (in a law-governed way, exchange is an exchange of equivalents), private property (separate owners engage in exchange).

However, 'freedom' and 'equality' only reign in the process of exchange, of the circulation of commodities and money, i.e. in the sphere of the surface. Marx does not limit himself to the study of exchange, to the study of the market, as vulgar economists do, the way that the vast majority of economists approach modern bourgeois society.

K. Marx does not simply document the circulation of commodities and money, he also exposes its contradictions, which lead into the depths of market society, into the sphere of commodity production. He discovers that at the heart of the visible paradise of natural human rights (of equality, freedom, and private property) lies the hidden hell of capitalist production, where inequality and unfreedom reign, where private property is revealed as having been primarily created not by those who own it, but by those who are robbed of it. The distribution of market shares among the wage-earners, like a fig-leaf covering the nakedness of the 'market society', only conceals their position as wage-earners, but does not

eliminate it.

Yet it is not only in the hell of bourgeois production, but also in the supposed paradise of the circulation of commodities and money, in the supposed paradise of the market, that the glow of hellfire can be seen, if one looks impartially, unselfishly and deeply. Egoism, the relegation of the human being to the position of objects, to the position of 'living corpses', to people who are spiritually dead, to puppets, to manipulators and manipulated, the denial, in essence, of human dignity—this is the reflection of the flames of hell in the paradise of 'free market society'. A fire that cannot be extinguished without overcoming this 'paradise' that is the system of 'free enterprise'. K. Marx, the great thinker and brilliant scientist, devoted his whole life to this end.

Notes

[1] The International Bill of Human Rights consists of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), adopted by the UN General Assembly in 1948, and the International Covenants, the International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR), and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), which were adopted in 1966.

[2] K. Marx "On the Jewish Question", 1844

[3] Constitution du 5 Fructidor An III, 1795

[4] K. Marx "On the Jewish Question", 1844

Left Anticommunism: The Unkindest Cut

Michael Parenti

This essay first ran in the 1990s, and was first republished on May 23, 2015 on The Greanville Post.

In January 2026, the American Marxist Michael Parenti passed away at the age of 92. In remembrance of his lifelong dedication, we present here one of his most representative and influential works.

Editor’s Note: Part opportunism, part careerism, part willful denial (or ignorance) of true capitalist and imperial dynamics, and part attachment to the comforts of being within the respectable fold of “permissible” criticism, Left Anticommunism continues to take a huge toll on the American left. In this comprehensive and incisive essay, Michael Parenti explores the reasons why the Left anti-communist stance must be seen for what it is: a de facto collaboration with the forces defending the corporate status quo. [This selection is from Parenti’s book *Blackshirts and Reds: Rational Fascism and the Overthrow of Communism* (City Lights, 1997). It is reproduced here by courtesy of the author.]—Patrice Greanville

In the United States, for over a hundred years, the ruling interests tirelessly propagated anticommunism among the populace, until it became more like a religious orthodoxy than a political analysis. During the Cold War, the anticommunist ideological framework could transform any data about existing communist societies into hostile evidence. If the Soviets refused to negotiate a point, they were intransigent and belligerent; if they appeared willing to make concessions, this was but a skillful ploy to put us off our guard. By opposing arms limitations, they would have demonstrated their aggressive intent; but

when in fact they supported most armament treaties, it was because they were mendacious and manipulative. If the churches in the USSR were empty, this demonstrated that religion was suppressed; but if the churches were full, this meant the people were rejecting the regime’s atheistic ideology. If the workers went on strike (as happened on infrequent occasions), this was evidence of their alienation from the collectivist system; if they didn’t go on strike, this was because they were intimidated and lacked freedom. A scarcity of consumer goods demonstrated the failure of the economic system; an improvement in consumer supplies meant only that the leaders were attempting to placate a restive population and so maintain a firmer hold over them. If communists in the United States played an important role struggling for the rights of workers, the poor, African-Americans, women, and others, this was only their guileful way of gathering support among disfranchised groups and gaining power for themselves. How one gained power by fighting for the rights of powerless groups was never explained. What we are dealing with is a nonfalsifiable orthodoxy, so assiduously marketed by the ruling interests that it affected people across the entire political spectrum.

Genuflection to Orthodoxy

Many on the U.S. Left have exhibited a Soviet bashing and Red baiting that matches anything on the Right in its enmity and crudity. Listen to Noam Chomsky holding forth about “left intellectuals” who try to “rise to power on the backs of mass popular movements” and “then beat the people into submission. . . . You start off as basically a Leninist who is

going to be part of the Red bureaucracy. You see later that power doesn't lie that way, and you very quickly become an ideologist of the right. . . . We're seeing it right now in the [former] Soviet Union. The same guys who were communist thugs two years back, are now running banks and [are] enthusiastic free marketeers and praising Americans" (Z Magazine, 10/95).

Chomsky's imagery is heavily indebted to the same U.S. corporate political culture he so frequently criticizes on other issues. In his mind, the revolution was betrayed by a coterie of "communist thugs" who merely hunger for power rather than wanting the power to end hunger. In fact, the communists did not "very quickly" switch to the Right but struggled in the face of a momentous onslaught to keep Soviet socialism alive for more than seventy years. To be sure, in the Soviet Union's waning days some, like Boris Yeltsin, crossed over to capitalist ranks, but others continued to resist free-market incursions at great cost to themselves, many meeting their deaths during Yeltsin's violent repression of the Russian parliament in 1993.

Some leftists and others fall back on the old stereotype of power-hungry Reds who pursue power for power's sake without regard for actual social goals. If true, one wonders why, in country after country, these Reds side with the poor and powerless often at great risk and sacrifice to themselves, rather than reaping the rewards that come with serving the well-placed.

For decades, many left-leaning writers and speakers in the United States have felt obliged to establish their credibility by indulging in anticommunist and anti-Soviet genuflection, seemingly unable to give a talk or write an article or book review on whatever political subject without injecting some anti-Red sideswipe. The intent was, and still is, to distance themselves from the Marxist-Leninist Left.

Adam Hochschild: Keeping his distance from the "Stalinist Left" and recommending same posture to

fellow progressives.

Adam Hochschild, a liberal writer and publisher, warned those on the Left who might be lackadaisical about condemning existing communist societies that they "weaken their credibility" (Guardian, 5/23/84). In other words, to be credible opponents of the cold war, we first had to join in the Cold-War condemnations of communist societies. Ronald Radosh urged that the peace movement purge itself of communists so that it not be accused of being communist (Guardian, 3/16/83). If I understand Radosh: To save ourselves from anticommunist witch hunts, we should ourselves become witch hunters. Purging the Left of communists became a longstanding practice, having injurious effects on various progressive causes. For instance, in 1949 some twelve unions were ousted from the CIO because they had Reds in their leadership. The purge reduced CIO membership by some 1.7 million and seriously weakened its recruitment drives and political clout. In the late 1940s, to avoid being "smeared" as Reds, Americans for Democratic Action (ADA), a supposedly progressive group, became one of the most vocally anticommunist organizations.

The strategy did not work. ADA and others on the Left were still attacked for being communist or soft on communism by those on the Right. Then and now, many on the Left have failed to realize that those who fight for social change on behalf of the less privileged elements of society will be Red-baited by conservative elites whether they are communists or not. For ruling interests, it makes little difference whether their wealth and power is challenged by "communist subversives" or "loyal American liberals." All are lumped together as more or less equally abhorrent.

Even when attacking the Right, the left critics cannot pass up an opportunity to flash their anti-communist credentials. So Mark Green writes in a criticism of President Ronald Reagan that "when presented with a situation that challenges his conservative catechism, like an unyielding Marx-

ist-Leninist, [Reagan] will change not his mind but the facts.” While professing a dedication to fighting dogmatism “both of the Right and Left,” individuals who perform such de rigueur genuflections reinforce the anticommunist dogma. Red-baiting leftists contributed their share to the climate of hostility that has given U.S. leaders such a free hand in waging hot and cold wars against communist countries and which even today makes a progressive or even liberal agenda difficult to promote.

A prototypic Red-basher who pretended to be on the Left was George Orwell. In the middle of World War II, as the Soviet Union was fighting for its life against the Nazi invaders at Stalingrad, Orwell announced that a “willingness to criticize Russia and Stalin is the test of intellectual honesty. It is the only thing that from a literary intellectual’s point of view is really dangerous” (Monthly Review, 5/83). Safely ensconced within a virulently anticommunist society, Orwell (with Orwellian doublethink) characterized the condemnation of communism as a lonely courageous act of defiance. Today, his ideological progeny are still at it, offering themselves as intrepid left critics of the Left, waging a valiant struggle against imaginary Marxist-Leninist-Stalinist hordes.

Sorely lacking within the U.S. Left is any rational evaluation of the Soviet Union, a nation that endured a protracted civil war and a multinational foreign invasion in the very first years of its existence, and that two decades later threw back and destroyed the Nazi beast at enormous cost to itself. In the three decades after the Bolshevik revolution, the Soviets made industrial advances equal to what capitalism took a century to accomplish—while feeding and schooling their children rather than working them fourteen hours a day as capitalist industrialists did and still do in many parts of the world. And the Soviet Union, along with Bulgaria, the German Democratic Republic, and Cuba provided vital assistance to national liberation movements in countries around the world, including Nelson Mandela’s Afri-

can National Congress in South Africa.

Left anticommunists remained studiously unimpressed by the dramatic gains won by masses of previously impoverished people under communism. Some were even scornful of such accomplishments. I recall how in Burlington Vermont, in 1971, the noted anticommunist anarchist, Murray Bookchin, derisively referred to my concern for “the poor little children who got fed under communism” (his words).

Slinging Labels

Those of us who refused to join in the Soviet bashing were branded by left anticommunists as “Soviet apologists” and “Stalinists,” even if we disliked Stalin and his autocratic system of rule and believed there were things seriously wrong with existing Soviet society. Our real sin was that unlike many on the Left we refused to uncritically swallow U.S. media propaganda about communist societies. Instead, we maintained that, aside from the well-publicized deficiencies and injustices, there were positive features about existing communist systems that were worth preserving, that improved the lives of hundreds of millions of people in meaningful and humanizing ways. This claim had a decidedly unsettling effect on left anticommunists who themselves could not utter a positive word about any communist society (except possibly Cuba) and could not lend a tolerant or even courteous ear to anyone who did.

Saturated by anticommunist orthodoxy, most U.S. leftists have practiced a left McCarthyism against people who did have something positive to say about existing communism, excluding them from participation in conferences, advisory boards, political endorsements, and left publications. Like conservatives, left anticommunists tolerated nothing less than a blanket condemnation of the Soviet Union as a Stalinist monstrosity and a Leninist moral aberration.

That many U.S. leftists have scant familiarity with Lenin’s writings and political work does not pre-

vent them from slinging the “Leninist” label. Noam Chomsky, who is an inexhaustible fount of anti-communist caricatures, offers this comment about Leninism: “Western and also Third World intellectuals were attracted to the Bolshevik counterrevolution [sic] because Leninism is, after all, a doctrine that says that the radical intelligentsia have a right to take state power and to run their countries by force, and that is an idea which is rather appealing to intellectuals.” Here Chomsky fashions an image of power-hungry intellectuals to go along with his cartoon image of power-hungry Leninists, villains seeking not the revolutionary means to fight injustice but power for power’s sake. When it comes to Red-bashing, some of the best and brightest on the Left sound not much better than the worst on the Right.

At the time of the 1996 terror bombing in Oklahoma City, I heard a radio commentator announce: “Lenin said that the purpose of terror is to terrorize.” U.S. media commentators have repeatedly quoted Lenin in that misleading manner. In fact, his statement was disapproving of terrorism. He polemicized against isolated terrorist acts which do nothing but create terror among the populace, invite repression, and isolate the revolutionary movement from the masses. Far from being the totalitarian, tight-circled conspirator, Lenin urged the building of broad coalitions and mass organizations, encompassing people who were at different levels of political development. He advocated whatever diverse means were needed to advance the class struggle, including participation in parliamentary elections and existing trade unions. To be sure, the working class, like any mass group, needed organization and leadership to wage a successful revolutionary struggle, which was the role of a vanguard party, but that did not mean the proletarian revolution could be fought and won by putschists or terrorists.

Lenin constantly dealt with the problem of avoiding the two extremes of liberal bourgeois opportunism and ultra-left adventurism. Yet he himself is

repeatedly identified as an ultra-left putschist by mainstream journalists and some on the Left. [Notably Chris Hedges, accused him often of “hijacking the revolution”, whatever that means.) Whether Lenin’s approach to revolution is desirable or even relevant today is a question that warrants critical examination. But a useful evaluation is not likely to come from people who misrepresent his theory and practice.

Left anticommunists find any association with communist organizations to be morally unacceptable because of the “crimes of communism.” Yet many of them are themselves associated with the Democratic Party in this country, either as voters or members, seemingly unconcerned about the morally unacceptable political crimes committed by leaders of that organization. Under one or another Democratic administration, 120,000 Japanese Americans were torn from their homes and livelihoods and thrown into detention camps; atomic bombs were dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki with an enormous loss of innocent life; the FBI was given authority to infiltrate political groups; the Smith Act was used to imprison leaders of the Trotskyist Socialist Workers Party and later on leaders of the Communist Party for their political beliefs; detention camps were established to round up political dissidents in the event of a “national emergency”; during the late 1940s and 1950s, eight thousand federal workers were purged from government because of their political associations and views, with thousands more in all walks of life witch hunted out of their careers; the Neutrality Act was used to impose an embargo on the Spanish Republic that worked in favor of Franco’s fascist legions; homicidal counterinsurgency programs were initiated in various Third World countries; and the Vietnam War was pursued and escalated. And for the better part of a century, the Congressional leadership of the Democratic Party protected racial segregation and stymied all anti-lynching and fair employment bills. Yet all these crimes, bringing ruination and

death to many, have not moved the liberals, the social democrats, and the “democratic socialist” anticommunists to insist repeatedly that we issue blanket condemnations of either the Democratic Party or the political system that produced it, certainly not with the intolerant fervor that has been directed against existing communism.

Pure Socialism vs. Siege Socialism

The upheavals in Eastern Europe did not constitute a defeat for socialism because socialism never existed in those countries, according to some U.S. leftists. They say that the communist states offered nothing more than bureaucratic, one-party “state capitalism” or some such thing. Whether we call the former communist countries “socialist” is a matter of definition. Suffice it to say, they constituted something different from what existed in the profit-driven capitalist world—as the capitalists themselves were not slow to recognize.

First, in communist countries there was less economic inequality than under capitalism. The perks enjoyed by party and government elites were modest by corporate CEO standards in the West [even more so when compared with today’s grotesque compensation packages to the executive and financial elites.—Eds], as were their personal incomes and lifestyles. Soviet leaders like Yuri Andropov and Leonid Brezhnev lived not in lavishly appointed mansions like the White House, but in relatively large apartments in a housing project near the Kremlin set aside for government leaders. They had limousines at their disposal (like most other heads of state) and access to large dachas where they entertained visiting dignitaries. But they had none of the immense personal wealth that most U.S. leaders possess. {Nor could they transfer such “wealth” by inheritance or gift to friends and kin, as is often the case with Western magnates and enriched political leaders. Just vide Tony Blair.—Eds]

The “lavish life” enjoyed by East Germany’s party

leaders, as widely publicized in the U.S. press, included a \$725 yearly allowance in hard currency, and housing in an exclusive settlement on the outskirts of Berlin that sported a sauna, an indoor pool, and a fitness center shared by all the residents. They also could shop in stores that carried Western goods such as bananas, jeans, and Japanese electronics. The U.S. press never pointed out that ordinary East Germans had access to public pools and gyms and could buy jeans and electronics (though usually not of the imported variety). Nor was the “lavish” consumption enjoyed by East German leaders contrasted to the truly opulent life style enjoyed by the Western plutocracy.

Second, in communist countries, productive forces were not organized for capital gain and private enrichment; public ownership of the means of production supplanted private ownership. Individuals could not hire other people and accumulate great personal wealth from their labor. Again, compared to Western standards, differences in earnings and savings among the populace were generally modest. The income spread between highest and lowest earners in the Soviet Union was about five to one. In the United States, the spread in yearly income between the top multibillionaires and the working poor is more like 10,000 to 1.

Third, priority was placed on human services. Though life under communism left a lot to be desired and the services themselves were rarely the best, communist countries did guarantee their citizens some minimal standard of economic survival and security, including guaranteed education, employment, housing, and medical assistance.

Fourth, communist countries did not pursue the capital penetration of other countries. Lacking a profit motive as their motor force and therefore having no need to constantly find new investment opportunities, they did not expropriate the lands, labor, markets, and natural resources of weaker nations, that is, they did not practice economic impe-

rialism. The Soviet Union conducted trade and aid relations on terms that generally were favorable to the Eastern European nations and Mongolia, Cuba, and India.

All of the above were organizing principles for every communist system to one degree or another. None of the above apply to free market countries like Honduras, Guatemala, Thailand, South Korea, Chile, Indonesia, Zaire, Germany, or the United States.

But a real socialism, it is argued, would be controlled by the workers themselves through direct participation instead of being run by Leninists, Stalinists, Castroites, or other ill-willed, power-hungry, bureaucratic, cabals of evil men who betray revolutions. Unfortunately, this “pure socialism” view is ahistorical and nonfalsifiable; it cannot be tested against the actualities of history. It compares an ideal against an imperfect reality, and the reality comes off a poor second. It imagines what socialism would be like in a world far better than this one, where no strong state structure or security force is required, where none of the value produced by workers needs to be expropriated to rebuild society and defend it from invasion and internal sabotage.

The pure socialists’ ideological anticipations remain untainted by existing practice. They do not explain how the manifold functions of a revolutionary society would be organized, how external attack and internal sabotage would be thwarted, how bureaucracy would be avoided, scarce resources allocated, policy differences settled, priorities set, and production and distribution conducted. Instead, they offer vague statements about how the workers themselves will directly own and control the means of production and will arrive at their own solutions through creative struggle. No surprise then that the pure socialists support every revolution except the ones that succeed.

The pure socialists had a vision of a new society that would create and be created by new people, a society so transformed in its fundamentals as to leave little

room for wrongful acts, corruption, and criminal abuses of state power. There would be no bureaucracy or self-interested coteries, no ruthless conflicts or hurtful decisions. When the reality proves different and more difficult, some on the Left proceed to condemn the real thing and announce that they “feel betrayed” by this or that revolution.

The pure socialists see socialism as an ideal that was tarnished by communist venality, duplicity, and power cravings. The pure socialists oppose the Soviet model but offer little evidence to demonstrate that other paths could have been taken, that other models of socialism—not created from one’s imagination but developed through actual historical experience—could have taken hold and worked better. Was an open, pluralistic, democratic socialism actually possible at this historic juncture? The historical evidence would suggest it was not. As the political philosopher Carl Shames argued:

“How do [the left critics] know that the fundamental problem was the “nature” of the ruling [revolutionary] parties rather than, say, the global concentration of capital that is destroying all independent economies and putting an end to national sovereignty everywhere? And to the extent that it was, where did this “nature” come from? Was this “nature” disembodied, disconnected from the fabric of the society itself, from the social relations impacting on it? ... Thousands of examples could be found in which the centralization of power was a necessary choice in securing and protecting socialist relations. In my observation [of existing communist societies], the positive of “socialism” and the negative of “bureaucracy, authoritarianism and tyranny” interpenetrated in virtually every sphere of life.” (Carl Shames, correspondence to me, 1/15/92.)

The pure socialists regularly blame the Left itself for every defeat it suffers. Their second-guessing is endless. So we hear that revolutionary struggles fail because their leaders wait too long or act too soon, are too timid or too impulsive, too stubborn or too

easily swayed. We hear that revolutionary leaders are compromising or adventuristic, bureaucratic or opportunistic, rigidly organized or insufficiently organized, undemocratic or failing to provide strong leadership. But always the leaders fail because they do not put their trust in the “direct actions” of the workers, who apparently would withstand and overcome every adversity if only given the kind of leadership available from the left critic’s own group. Unfortunately, the critics seem unable to apply their own leadership genius to producing a successful revolutionary movement in their own country.

Tony Febbo questioned this blame-the-leadership syndrome of the pure socialists:

“It occurs to me that when people as smart, different, dedicated and heroic as Lenin, Mao, Fidel Castro, Daniel Ortega, Ho Chi Minh and Robert Mugabe—and the millions of heroic people who followed and fought with them—all end up more or less in the same place, then something bigger is at work than who made what decision at what meeting. Or even what size houses they went home to after the meeting. . . .

These leaders weren’t in a vacuum. They were in a whirlwind. And the suction, the force, the power that was twirling them around has spun and left this globe mangled for more than 900 years. And to blame this or that theory or this or that leader is a simple-minded substitute for the kind of analysis that Marxists [should make].” (Guardian, 11/13/91)

To be sure, the pure socialists are not entirely without specific agendas for building the revolution. After the Sandinistas overthrew the Somoza dictatorship in Nicaragua, an ultra-left group in that country called for direct worker ownership of the factories. The armed workers would take control of production without benefit of managers, state planners, bureaucrats, or a formal military. While undeniably appealing, this worker syndicalism denies the necessities of state power. Under such an arrangement,

the Nicaraguan revolution would not have lasted two months against the U.S.-sponsored counterrevolution that savaged the country. It would have been unable to mobilize enough resources to field an army, take security measures, or build and coordinate economic programs and human services on a national scale.

Decentralization vs. Survival

For a people’s revolution to survive, it must seize state power and use it to (a) break the stranglehold exercised by the owning class over the society’s institutions and resources, and (b) withstand the reactionary counterattack that is sure to come. The internal and external dangers a revolution faces necessitate a centralized state power that is not particularly to anyone’s liking, not in Soviet Russia in 1917, nor in Sandinista Nicaragua in 1980.

Engels offers an apposite account of an uprising in Spain in 1872–73 in which anarchists seized power in municipalities across the country. At first, the situation looked promising. The king had abdicated and the bourgeois government could muster but a few thousand ill-trained troops. Yet this ragtag force prevailed because it faced a thoroughly parochialized rebellion. “Each town proclaimed itself as a sovereign canton and set up a revolutionary committee (junta),” Engels writes. “[E]ach town acted on its own, declaring that the important thing was not cooperation with other towns but separation from them, thus precluding any possibility of a combined attack [against bourgeois forces].” It was “the fragmentation and isolation of the revolutionary forces which enabled the government troops to smash one revolt after the other.”

Decentralized parochial autonomy is the graveyard of insurgency—which may be one reason why there has never been a successful anarcho-syndicalist revolution. Ideally, it would be a fine thing to have only local, self-directed, worker participation, with minimal bureaucracy, police, and military. This prob-

ably would be the development of socialism, were socialism ever allowed to develop unhindered by counterrevolutionary subversion and attack. One might recall how, in 1918–20, fourteen capitalist nations, including the United States, invaded Soviet Russia in a bloody but unsuccessful attempt to overthrow the revolutionary Bolshevik government. The years of foreign invasion and civil war did much to intensify the Bolsheviks' siege psychology with its commitment to lockstep party unity and a repressive security apparatus. Thus, in May 1921, the same Lenin who had encouraged the practice of internal party democracy and struggled against Trotsky in order to give the trade unions a greater measure of autonomy, now called for an end to the Workers' Opposition and other factional groups within the party. "The time has come," he told an enthusiastically concurring Tenth Party Congress, "to put an end to opposition, to put a lid on it: we have had enough opposition." Open disputes and conflicting tendencies within and without the party, the communists concluded, created an appearance of division and weakness that invited attack by formidable foes.

Only a month earlier, in April 1921, Lenin had called for more worker representation on the party's Central Committee. In short, he had become not anti-worker but anti-opposition. Here was a social revolution—like every other—that was not allowed to develop its political and material life in an unhindered way.

By the late 1920s, the Soviets faced the choice of (a) moving in a still more centralized direction with a command economy and forced agrarian collectivization and full-speed industrialization under a commandist, autocratic party leadership, the road taken by Stalin, or (b) moving in a liberalized direction, allowing more political diversity, more autonomy for labor unions and other organizations, more open debate and criticism, greater autonomy among the various Soviet republics, a sector of privately owned small businesses, independent

agricultural development by the peasantry, greater emphasis on consumer goods, and less effort given to the kind of capital accumulation needed to build a strong military-industrial base.

The latter course, I believe, would have produced a more comfortable, more humane and serviceable society. Siege socialism would have given way to worker-consumer socialism. The only problem is that the country would have risked being incapable of withstanding the Nazi onslaught. Instead, the Soviet Union embarked upon a rigorous, forced industrialization. This policy has often been mentioned as one of the wrongs perpetrated by Stalin upon his people. It consisted mostly of building, within a decade, an entirely new, huge industrial base east of the Urals in the middle of the barren steppes, the biggest steel complex in Europe, in anticipation of an invasion from the West. "Money was spent like water, men froze, hungered and suffered but the construction went on with a disregard for individuals and a mass heroism seldom paralleled in history."

Stalin's prophecy that the Soviet Union had only ten years to do what the British had done in a century proved correct. When the Nazis invaded in 1941, that same industrial base, safely ensconced thousands of miles from the front, produced the weapons of war that eventually turned the tide. The cost of this survival included 22 million Soviets who perished in the war and immeasurable devastation and suffering, the effects of which would distort Soviet society for decades afterward.

All this is not to say that everything Stalin did was of historical necessity. The exigencies of revolutionary survival did not "make inevitable" the heartless execution of hundreds of Old Bolshevik leaders, the personality cult of a supreme leader who claimed every revolutionary gain as his own achievement, the suppression of party political life through terror, the eventual silencing of debate regarding the pace of industrialization and collectivization, the ideological regulation of all intellectual and cultural life, and the

mass deportations of “suspect” nationalities.

The transforming effects of counterrevolutionary attack have been felt in other countries. A Sandinista military officer I met in Vienna in 1986 noted that Nicaraguans were “not a warrior people” but they had to learn to fight because they faced a destructive, U.S.-sponsored mercenary war. She bemoaned the fact that war and embargo forced her country to postpone much of its socio-economic agenda. As with Nicaragua, so with Mozambique, Angola and numerous other countries in which U.S.-financed mercenary forces destroyed farmlands, villages, health centers, and power stations, while killing or starving hundreds of thousands—the revolutionary baby was strangled in its crib or mercilessly bled beyond recognition. This reality ought to earn at least as much recognition as the suppression of dissidents in this or that revolutionary society.

The overthrow of Eastern European and Soviet communist governments was cheered by many left intellectuals. Now democracy would have its day. The people would be free from the yoke of communism and the U.S. Left would be free from the albatross of existing communism, or as left theorist Richard Lichtman put it, “liberated from the incubus of the Soviet Union and the succubus of Communist China.”

In fact, the capitalist restoration in Eastern Europe seriously weakened the numerous Third World liberation struggles that had received aid from the Soviet Union and brought a whole new crop of right-wing governments into existence, ones that now worked hand-in-glove with U.S. global counterrevolutionaries around the globe.

In addition, the overthrow of communism gave the green light to the unbridled exploitative impulses of Western corporate interests. No longer needing to convince workers that they live better than their counterparts in Russia, no longer restrained by a competing system, the corporate class is rolling back the many gains that working people have won over

the years. Now that the free market, in its meanest form, is emerging triumphant in the East, so will it prevail in the West. “Capitalism with a human face” is being replaced by “capitalism in your face.” As Richard Levins put it, “So in the new exuberant aggressiveness of world capitalism we see what communists and their allies had held at bay” (Monthly Review, 9/96).

Having never understood the role that existing communist powers played in tempering the worst impulses of Western capitalism, and having perceived communism as nothing but an unmitigated evil, the left anticommunists did not anticipate the losses that were to come. Some of them still don’t get it.”

Solidarity with the Islamic Republic of Iran!

Communist Organization (KO, Germany)

The last few weeks in Iran have been marked by protests and civil war-like conditions. However, the regime change hoped for by imperialist foreign powers and large sections of the Western left has not materialized. This was largely due to the mass mobilization of the Iranian people, who took to the streets in their millions to oppose the violence of a the armed section of the protests (largely foreign) and to express their fundamental support for the Islamic Republic of Iran (IRI). The military strike announced by the US and Israel has not yet materialized. However, this is no guarantee that it will remain that way, as reports of weapons systems being moved into the region are mounting.

Most left-wing and communist forces in Germany, but also in other imperialist countries, have indiscriminately backed the protests and cheered on their progression toward civil war. In doing so, they have often uncritically reproduced the narratives and supposed facts put forward by imperialism, while simply ignoring counter-movements (such as the large-scale popular mobilizations in defense of the IRI). In this , we take the positions of left-wing and communist actors as a starting point in order to contrast them with a background, the course of the protests, the character of the IRI, and the consequences of a successful regime change. We show how the positioning of the left-wing and communist movement in the imperialist center—whether intentional or unintentional—helps to legitimize the war course against Iran and thus effectively works against the interests of the Iranian people.

For if it is indeed a matter of supporting the Iranian people in their struggle for greater self-determination, our struggle must be directed against the ongoing economic war waged by means of sanctions

and against the open military preparations for war against Iran.

Reason for and composition of the protests

Protests began in Iran on December 28, 2025, triggered by high inflation rates and, above all, the sudden collapse of the rial, which was likely due to deliberate currency manipulation (either by the “reformers”^[1] in Iran itself or by imperialist foreign powers, something that remains to be clarified). These protests were initiated by the strike of the “Bazaaris” in Tehran, a class of merchants whose businesses, dependent on the exchange rate, were significantly hampered by the currency’s decline and who wanted to put pressure on the government. Although those who did not want to close their businesses were threatened with violence^[2], the protests themselves were initially rather peaceful, spread to other cities, and eventually took the form of a wave of protests. This had a clear economic starting point. Gradually, however, rioters and terrorist cells became more active in the protests, and by January 8 at the latest, the situation had turned into an uprising with scenes resembling civil war, before subsiding significantly in the following days, thanks in part to an internet blackout. The government repeatedly assured the public that it was taking the economic concerns seriously and distinguished between demonstrators and terrorist elements.^[3] Hundreds of thousands of Iranians initially took to the streets, and by January 12 at the latest, millions had done so, to take a clear stand against the subversive violence and to show their fundamental support for the Islamic Republic.^[4] By this point at the latest, the overthrow of the system longed for by Western leftists had failed.

A decisive factor in the hopelessness and difficult

economic situation—and thus the protests—are the Western and UN sanctions against the country. As early as 1979, Washington imposed sanctions on Tehran, which became increasingly aggressive and far-reaching over time. Between 2012 and 2023 alone, Iran is estimated to have suffered damages amounting to \$1.2 trillion.^[5] According to the World Bank, per capita GDP fell from approximately \$8,000 in 2012 to approximately \$5,000 in 2024.^[6] In addition, there have been massive impacts on the healthcare system, which have claimed countless lives.^[7] Life expectancy in sanctioned countries falls by an average of 1.2 to 1.4 years.^[8] Before the Russian Federation replaced Iran in 2022, it was the most sanctioned country in the world.^[9] The imposition of sanctions correlated with a slump in economic performance.^[10] Sanctions also always result in the development of a black market, which greatly encourages corruption.

A left-wing and communist movement in the imperialist center should actually start here and focus on the fight against sanctions, which make life in Iran unbearable and are also intended to undermine the country and ultimately eliminate the system of government. This would be particularly important in Germany, because it plays a central role in the current impoverishment with the completely unjustified reinstatement of sanctions through the snapback mechanism under the Iran nuclear agreement. Even though the sanctions are mentioned by many, at least in passing, the issue is given virtually no attention in actual activity—after all, the same goal is pursued with regard to Iran as by the imperialists who are implementing the sanctions: to overthrow the state.

On violence by the state and terrorists

The statements and articles of the communist movement in the broader sense are unanimous when it comes to the allegedly excessive violence by the state security forces in Iran. Almost word for word, they refer to brutal and bloody repression (the group “Kommunistische Partei”^[11]), a “brutal

massacre” (Kommunistischer Aufbau^[12]), “brutal oppression” (Sozialismus von Unten (SvU) and International Socialist Tendency (IST)^[13]), “bloody crackdown” (Nick Brauns, junge Welt^[14]), “murderous crackdown” (German Foreign Policy^[15]), “bloody repression” (Perspektive Online^[16]). “Thousands of demonstrators” were shot down (IST^[17]) or “killed in cold blood” (Rebell^[18]), possibly even more than 10,000 people “massacred” (Fabian Lehr^[19]). One article writes of a “bloodbath” (“Revolutionäre Kommunistische Partei”^[20]), another is even titled “Towards the bullets” (Lower Class Magazine^[21])—there was no shortage of eloquent language, but there was a shortage of facts that contradicted this narrative.

According to consistent reports, the death toll runs into the thousands. According to statements by the Iranian Ministry of the Interior and the Foundation for Martyrs and Veterans Affairs, a total of 3,117 people were killed, including 2,427 civilians and members of the security forces—the remaining 690 are presumably implied to be the Iranian figures for dead terrorists.^[22] According to its own figures, Iran had several hundred dead security forces to mourn,^[23] while Supreme Leader Khamenei spoke of several thousand killed by terrorists.^[24] Reuters claims to quote an Iranian official who puts the death toll at around 5,000, including about 500 security forces.^[25] Even if this ratio is correct, it does not necessarily indicate excessive violence on the part of the government—especially since many of the deaths are likely to be attributable to the terrorist cells themselves. State-affiliated Iranian media reports that most people were deliberately killed by terrorist cells when Trump threatened further deaths with a military strike.^[26] The early figures were circulated by US-funded “NGOs”^[27]; for instance, the five-digit death tolls used by the influencer Fabian Lehr is a number claimed by the pro-imperialist press^[28].

The well-documented violence of the terrorists during the uprisings, on the other hand, is not

mentioned at all in any of the left-wing and communist articles and statements. However, even the Western bourgeois press documented burning mosques^[29], media houses^[30], and government buildings^[31]. According to Iranian sources, for example, 250 schools and 300 mosques^[32] were destroyed or damaged, fire stations were attacked^[33], and 180 ambulances were set on fire^[34]. According to a report by Asr Iran, on January 8, the residence of the Palestinian Authority (PA) ambassador to Iran was also attacked and vandalized by 200 people with Molotov cocktails.^[35] This should come as no surprise, given that the opposition to the Islamic Republic, both at home and abroad, has been complaining for years about the ongoing support for Palestine.

In addition to at least one infant killed by the terrorists^[36], there are numerous videos that clearly document the deliberate destruction of mosques^[37], organized use of firearms^[38], mob-like attacks^[39], and even lynchings^[40]. In addition, there are reports of a hospital being set on fire^[41], beheadings^[42], and at least one police officer^[43] and one security guard^[44] allegedly being set on fire. The organized violence evident in the videos alone^[45] shows that these are definitely not just demonstrators.

The imperialist interference is also quite open: former Israeli Defense Minister Gallant said that Israel must remain in the background and “steer the protest with an invisible hand” so that the desired regime change looks organic.^[46] The Mossad itself had publicly stated that it was involved in the uprisings on the ground.^[47] A journalist from Israel’s Channel 14 also reported that foreign forces were supplying the uprising with live ammunition and weapons, which is why hundreds of Iranian security forces are now dead.^[48] Of course, such boasts are part of the psychological warfare against Iran. However, this does not mean that they should be dismissed as mere Zionist propaganda: it is well known that Israel has repeatedly carried out attacks in Iran over the years.^[49] In addition to weapons, vast quantities of

Starlink devices were also intercepted by the Iranian secret service.^[50] As has been the case for years^[51], Kurdish militiamen were in the country and involved in armed clashes.^[52] Several Kurdish parties (including the PAK and the PKK’s sister organization, the PJAK) had recently agreed on a “united approach” in Iran.^[53] The US-trained and pro-Israeli^[54] separatist militia PAK has since admitted to taking up arms against Iranian security forces^[55]—which, given the “united approach,” strongly suggests that the other Kurdish militias were also involved in armed conflict. Similarly, the terrorist group Jaish al-Adl claimed responsibility for an attack during the uprisings.^[56] Former British diplomat and intelligence agent Alastair Crooke describes not only the extreme violence of the terrorists, but also a deliberate escalation tactic^[57] of murdering bystanders, similar to the shootings on Maidan on February 20, 2014^[58].

The large-scale elimination of the regime change tool Starlink^[59], whose base stations had already been smuggled into Iran for years^[60], was an important success that almost completely shut down the internet. This was partly because, as reported by the Israeli press, the US also waged war against Iran via the internet during the uprising.^[61] In addition, during the last attack on Iran in 2025, Israel had used a botnet to spread targeted fake news in order to incite the population to overthrow the government.^[62] On the other hand, it was also an important success because it deprived the terrorists of their means of coordination—suddenly, the uprising collapsed. This is another important indication that the demonstrators, rioters, and terrorists had not come together spontaneously, but that there was at least some support from abroad—a genuine popular uprising rooted in the masses could not be ended by blocking the internet. The claim spread in statements by the communist movement that Iran had shut down the internet only to be able to massacre the protests in peace is also being proven false: if that were the case, the networks would now be flooded with recorded

videos of the protests, at the latest since the internet was reconnected. Obviously, the communist movement has once again spread the false narratives of the ruling class.

In view of the war situation imposed on Iran from outside, as described above, the communist movement's scandalization of self-defense is all the more shameful. Not only does it support this war against Iran, it actually encourages it in the con of the uprisings and uncritically spreads imperialist narratives.

Timing of publications and demonstrations

What is also striking is that many of the statements were published at a time when the overthrow of the Islamic Republic had already clearly failed (e.g., IST and the “Kommunistische Partei” group on January 14, Hands Off Wedding on January 18^[63]). The demonstrations go even further: SvU took part in a demonstration in Berlin on January 18^[64], and Rote Aufbau Hamburg is even calling for another demonstration on January 24^[65]. However, the mass demonstrations in defense of the Islamic Republic in Iran, with millions of participants, and the uprisings^[66], which were almost non-existent at that point, had painted a clear picture by January 12 at the latest: the majority of Iranians do not support the terrorists backed by foreign powers and their trail of destruction and murder, but rather, when in doubt, support the Islamic Republic. However, in the days that followed, the bourgeois press and social media channels continued to keep the issue alive artificially and with the help of brazen lies, primarily to keep open the option of a military strike by the US and/or Israel, along with its media justification. While the bourgeois press had long since had to admit the failure of the uprising^[67], this does not seem to apply to the leftist scene. On January 18, for example, Rote Aufbau Hamburg published a statement^[68]—written entirely in the present tense—falsely suggesting that the uprising was still ongoing nationwide. Exaggerating the scale of protests in countries and suggesting

a state of loss of control is part of the psychological warfare waged by the West, which is willingly joined here.

In a climate where there is in fact no longer any promising uprising, but only the option of a Western attack against the country on the table, publishing a statement or even calling for a demonstration objectively has the effect of providing support for such an attack. Even if one explicitly distances oneself from it, it leads to demonizing Iran in a situation where a potential war against it is on the agenda—and thus also weakens any anti-war efforts in this country for such a case. To join the agenda of one's own bourgeois press, one's own imperialists in this way, to spread their (often false) narratives and thus objectively helping them to sell their potential attack on Iran to the public, is politically fatal. Even if one looks at Iran from an anti-government perspective, this does a disservice to any supposed solidarity with the Iranian people, as one's own behavior promotes a war against Iran.

On the character of the Islamic Republic of Iran

With very few exceptions, it seems to be completely natural for the communist and left-wing movement worldwide to follow the rhetoric of the ruling class in characterizing the Islamic Republic of Iran as a “mullah regime”^[69] and to use adjectives such as ‘reactionary’ and “fascist”^[70] to describe it. Some seem to want to outdo the bourgeois mainstream only by exaggerating.^[71] It is clear that this view is due to the bloody history of the defeat of all left-wing and communist movements after the revolution by the new state leadership under Khomeini. Few Iranian communists^[72] have managed to reflect on this history self-critically. Not to mention the terrorist opposition abroad, such as the MEK^[73], or separatist movements such as the PJAK^[74], which are now openly led by US imperialism.

At this point, it should be noted that in recent

decades, the Western left has established a largely very poor relationship with separatism. This is usually propagated uncritically, as is the case with Iran in relation to “Kurdistan” and “Baluchistan.” The fatal consequences can be observed in Syria, where the US protectorate for “Rojava,” which had existed for about a decade, deliberately robbed the central government of oil, wheat, and cotton revenues and occupied a third of the country until the Syrian Arab Republic—a long-standing central opponent of Israel and the US—was finally eliminated in December 2024 (to the cheers of many German leftists). When the predictable consequences of what left-wing and communist actors have supported become apparent—such as the current massacres in Syria or the catastrophic collapse of Libya—they say that this was not what they wanted and move on to the agenda of the day without any self-critical reflection.

This left can be harnessed to the agenda of the bourgeois press, “NGOs,” etc., which highlight virtually all supposedly or actually oppressed peoples and nations because weakening, disintegrating, or balkanizing the corresponding states is in the interest of the imperialists. It now seems to largely view it as progress in itself to have ethnically “clean” state structures and thus helps on a larger scale to attack the multi-ethnic state as such. This is one of the greatest remaining achievements of the region, which, not coincidentally, could and had to be established in struggles against colonialism, monarchy, and imperialist foreign rule. Each situation must be analyzed specifically, but given the mosaic of different religious and ethnic groups in West Asia, one must ask to what extent it is progress for the region to fall into separatism and never-ending wars over territory.

How can the Islamic Republic of Iran be characterized? First of all, by studying its history and present! The international communist movement seems far removed from this. We will not provide an analysis of Iran here either, but we will at least point out a

few realities that are relevant to our assessment. No one disputes that this republic is the result of the 1979 popular revolution, which ended the history of monarchies once and for all. But no one seems to care anymore that it is also a republic. It is claimed that power is concentrated solely in the hands of the revolutionary leader and the Revolutionary Guards subordinate to him. In fact, however, the Islamic Republic of Iran is both: it is a republic with a separation of powers and at the same time has a centralized power structure whose task is to ensure the security, control^[75], and preservation of the republic.

The relations of production are riddled with contradictions: although the capitalist mode of production prevailed in many industries after the war at the end of the 1980s, production remains large-scale and ownership of the means of production largely state-owned. The Western-oriented compradors, who have become rich through corruption and are referred to in Iran itself as an oligarchy, are the target of fierce disputes. Their harshest critics at home come from the ranks of the Revolutionary Guards. They are essentially fighting for the implementation of the constitution and the labor code. The working class in the country has grown immensely and has no significant independent organization outside the workers’ council structures, which are enshrined in the constitution and controlled by the state. However, attempts at reorganization have been observed in recent years.

Over the past 47 years, Iran has developed into a country where economic development has been driven forward despite sanctions, a very vibrant civil society culture has developed, and at the same time it remains a strong nation that stands up to imperialist aggression. As a multi-ethnic state, Iran is largely a unified nation with a national identity based on multi-ethnicity. Iran is certainly full of contradictions, foremost among them the contradiction between labor and capital. At the same time, the most loyal supporters of the revolutionary leader and the Islamic Republic are recruited from the working

class. Their class instinct seems to extend far beyond the limited horizons of many Western leftists: to repel imperialist aggression while asserting their own class interests in the country without allowing themselves to be incited against other peoples in the region or worldwide. This is still the spirit that has brought the masses onto the streets in their defense since the revolution, as was recently the case on January 12, 2026.

Quo vadis?

The communist movement in Germany almost unanimously wishes the uprisings^[76] every success in destroying the Iranian state. But before supporting this, one must ask oneself what could realistically follow the Islamic Republic. And that is the Syria scenario: civil war, Balkanization, ethnic and religious massacres. In short: catastrophe. On the one hand, because there is no unified, organized opposition capable of filling the vacuum nationwide, and on the other hand, because separatist forces have long been armed by the imperialists precisely for this purpose, to destroy Iran as a potentially dangerous power factor in the long term through Balkanization. The forces built up and armed by the US and Israel, whether monarchists or separatists, are obviously not even capable of creating a united opposition, let alone governing a multi-ethnic, multi-religious, and highly educated country like Iran. There is simply no one who could hold the state together.

The establishment of socialism, on the other hand, is unrealistic in the current situation. Some forces admit that this is unlikely, but then justify their pro-overthrow stance with phrases such as “it is extremely dynamic” (Dorna, SvU^[77]) or that one should simply have faith in the Iranian workers (Fabian Lehr^[78]). Most of the communist forces in Germany that are positive about the attempts at overthrow at least pay lip service to the necessity of a communist party anchored in the masses in order to successfully take power in a revolution. As they themselves recognize, this does not exist in Iran, but

the transition to socialism is apparently supposed to happen spontaneously anyway. Why not just discard the experiences of the labor movement in party and revolutionary theory! A successful uprising would not lead to socialism, but to the collapse of the country. The Iranian working class would have nothing to gain from it, but potentially everything to lose.

To put it bluntly: this irresponsible adventurism, which has already helped to destroy Libya and Syria and impoverish the entire region for decades, is an admission of failure and must be sharply criticized and rejected. A communist movement must analyze the situation soberly and, in some situations, defend the status quo instead of cheering on an uprising that is objectively harmful. This is not a game or a movie. The lives of millions of people depend on it.

Instead of de facto participating in the war against Iran, in the face of a potentially imminent attack by the US/Israel and the current attempts to undermine the state, we must say clearly:

No to aggression against Iran!

Away with sanctions!

Solidarity with the Islamic Republic of Iran!

Notes

[1] The term “reformers” refers to those elements of Iranian politics who seek negotiations and better relations with the West, tend to advocate neoliberal economic policies, and can be regarded as representatives of the comprador section of the Iranian bourgeoisie.

[2] See, for example, <https://thecradle.co/articles/irans-collapsing-currency-exposes-the-profiteers-behind-the-crisis>

[3] <https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2026/1/17/irans-khamenei-says-us-israel-links-behind-thousands-killed-in-protests>

[4] <https://thecradle.co/articles/millions-take-to-the-streets-of-iran-in-mass-counterprotests-against-riots-foreign-interference>

[5] <https://www.iranintl.com/en/202406244025>

[6] <https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2026/1/13/how-us-sanctions-crippled-lives-of-iranians-trump-says-he-wants-to-help>

[7] <https://www.hrw.org/de/news/2019/10/29/iran-sanktionen-gefaehrden-gesundheit>, [https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lancet/article/PIIS0140-6736\(13\)61024-7/full](https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lancet/article/PIIS0140-6736(13)61024-7/full)

[8] Ibid.

- [9] <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2022-03-07/russia-surges-past-iran-to-become-world-s-most-sanctioned-nation>
- [10] <https://www.ft.com/content/770dc40f-66be-4542-a584-3b6144117314>
- [11] <https://kommunistischepartei.de/stellungnahmen/freiheit-fuer-das-volk-im-iran-nein-zur-imperialistischen-intervention/>
- [12] <https://komaufbau.org/stellen-wir-uns-auf-die-seite-der-unterdrueckten-voelker-westasiens/>
- [13] <https://sozvu.org/iran-solidaritaet-mit-dem-aufstand-nein-zu-interventionen-von-aussen/>
- [14] <https://www.jungewelt.de/artikel/515638.vor-syrischem-szenario.html>
- [15] <https://www.german-foreign-policy.com/news/detail/10264>
- [16] <https://perspektive-online.net/2026/01/horrorbilder-aus-teheran-proteste-im-iran-gehen-weiter/>
- [17] <https://sozvu.org/iran-solidaritaet-mit-dem-aufstand-nein-zu-interventionen-von-aussen/>
- [18] <https://rebell.info/2026/01/solidaritaet-mit-allem-menschen-die-weltweit-um-befreiung-kaempfen/>
- [19] <https://www.youtube.com/shorts/OGAZZY3A9do>
- [20] <https://derfunke.at/26657-iran-revolution-gegen-die-islamische-republik-nieder-mit-der-einmischung-des-westlichen-imperialismus>
- [21] <https://lowerclassmag.com/2026/01/13/den-kugeln-entgegen/>
- [22] <https://www.tasnimnews.ir> → Article available at: <https://h7.cl/1nkCs>
- [23] On January 11, the number was already reported to be 109: <https://thecradle.co/articles/iran-says-over-100-security-police-forces-killed-by-armed-rioters>
- [24] <https://thecradle.co/articles/we-consider-trump-a-criminal-khamenei>
- [25] <https://www.reuters.com/business/media-telecom/iranian-official-says-verified-deaths-iran-protests-reaches-least-5000-2026-01-18/>
- [26] <https://t.me/thecradlemedia/49716>
- [27] <https://www.mintpressnews.com/revealed-the-cia-backed-think-tanks-fueling-the-iran-protests/290638/> or <https://youtu.be/jM8fjeLTYGM?si=P1esSb4dV7k07OV8>
- [28] The Times (UK), owned by Lachlan and Rupert Murdoch, claims 16,500 to 18,000 deaths here: <https://www.thetimes.com/world/middle-east/article/iran-young-protesters-news-nsdztp5t2>, while Saudi Arabia-funded Iran International puts the figure at at least 12,000: <https://www.iranintl.com/en/202601130145>
- [29] e.g. <https://www.nbcnews.com/video/shorts/mosque-burns-during-protest-in-tehran-255766597809> or <https://www.bbc.com/news/videos/c78e9vmn7dgo>
- [30] <https://www.ynetnews.com/article/syl1mpanwg>
- [31] <https://www.euronews.com/video/2026/01/10/footage-shows-government-buildings-on-fire-in-iran-amid-ongoing-protests>
- [32] <https://www.youtube.com/post/UgkxAP569brC2KgNqzcZ9WthdX2YI25eMxv3>
- [33] <https://x.com/TheCradleMedia/status/2010009197765693944>
- [34] https://t.me/mintpress_news/12375
- [35] <https://www.presstv.ir/Detail/2026/01/19/762528/Palestinian-Ambassador-residence-in-Tehran-attacked-amid-terror-wave>
- [36] See https://t.me/mintpress_news/12319 or <https://www.youtube.com/shorts/7Rqn7YUw2OU>, Reports of other cases, e.g. here: <https://www.presstv.ir/Detail/2026/01/15/762364/Iran-Bahareh-Trump-Israel->
- [37] <https://t.me/thecradlemedia/49563> and <https://t.me/thecradlemedia/49829>
- [38] <https://t.me/thecradlemedia/49638> and <https://t.me/thecradlemedia/49837>
- [39] <https://www.youtube.com/shorts/2YYOr5dSiaQ>, also available here: https://x.com/Megatron_\ron/status/2011888932108320921
- [40] https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=15pE6_6Ja9c and <https://t.me/thecradlemedia/49396> and <https://t.me/thecradlemedia/49670> and <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=oOdBDK-Gg34>
- [41] Mentioned, for example, here: <https://www.nachdenkseiten.de/?p=144866>
- [42] See, for example, <https://www.palestinechronicle.com/what-a-war-on-iran-would-really-look-like-beyond-the-regime-change-fantasy/> or <https://www.tasnimnews.ir> → Article available at: <https://h7.cl/1nkCs>
- [43] <https://t.me/thecradlemedia/49460>
- [44] <https://thecradle.co/articles/khamenei-slams-arrogant-trump-vows-iran-will-not-back-down-as-violent-riots-spread>
- [45] A summary can be found in this documentation, which was shared by the Iranian Foreign Minister on Twitter/X, but is no longer available there: <https://t.me/BisimchiMedia/155125>
- [46] https://t.me/mintpress_news/12373
- [47] <https://x.com/i/web/status/2005649986504237381>
- [48] <https://x.com/DropSiteNews/status/2011346215380680897>
- [49] See, for example, <https://thecradle.co/articles/israels-war-on-irans-scientific-resistance-inside-the-targeted-killings-of-nuclear-minds>
- [50] <https://thecradle.co/articles/iranian-intelligence-seizes-us-made-weapons-explosives-smuggled-by-western-backed-rioters>
- [51] <https://thecradle.co/articles/armed-kurdish-groups-dispatched-from-iraq-to-join-iran-riots-report>
- [52] <https://thecradle.co/articles/kurdish-separatist-militia-admits-targeting-iranian-security-forces-during-recent-riots>
- [53] <https://deutsch.anf-news.com/kurdistan/-49561>

- [54] <https://www.jpost.com/middle-east/article-857931>
- [55] <https://thecradle.co/articles/kurdish-separatist-militia-admits-targeting-iranian-security-forces-during-recent-riots>
- [56] <https://thecradle.co/articles/khamenei-slams-arrogant-trump-vows-iran-will-not-back-down-as-violent-riots-spread>
- [57] <https://t.me/thecradlemedia/49823>
- [58] See, for example, here: <https://www.ardmediathek.de/video/monitor/todesschuesse-in-kiew-wer-ist-fuer-das-blutbad-vom-maidan-verantwortlich/das-erste/Y3JpZDovL3dkci5kZS9CZWl0cmFnLTc2ZGM1N2M0LTl0OTAtMTFINS1hOWE3LTUyMjFhZjBjMmJiNQ>
- [59] <https://x.com/TheCradleMedia/status/2009376711360827790>
- [60] <https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2026/1/14/is-starlink-helping-iranians-break-internet-blackout-and-how-does-it-work>
- [61] <https://t.me/thecradlemedia/49729>
- [62] <https://www.haaretz.com/israel-news/security-aviation/2025-10-03/ty-article-magazine/.premium/the-israeli-influence-operation-in-iran-pushing-to-reinstate-the-shah-monarchy/00000199-9f12-df33-a5dd-9f770d7a0000>
- [63] <https://www.unverwertbar.org/aktuell/2026/9830/>
- [64] https://www.instagram.com/sozialismus_von_unten/reel/DTp5Omligb1/
- [65] <https://www.instagram.com/p/DTp2bZdihN2/>
- [66] <https://thecradle.co/articles/millions-take-to-the-streets-of-iran-in-mass-counterprotests-against-riots-foreign-interference>
- [67] e.g. Tagesschau on January 16: <https://www.tagesschau.de/ausland/asien/iran-proteste-290.html>
- [68] <https://www.instagram.com/p/DTp2bZdihN2/>
- [69] For example, the weekend edition of *junge Welt* on January 3 this year featured the headline “Masses against mullahs”: <https://www.jungewelt.de/aktuell/pdf/index.php?day=2026-01-03>
- [70] e.g. <https://rebell.info/2026/01/solidaritaet-mit-allen-menschen-die-weltweit-um-befreiung-kaempfen/>
- [71] For example, Fabian Lehr, who speaks of the “ultra-reactionary Iranian regime” (source: <https://www.youtube.com/shorts/OGAzZY3A9do>)
- [72] Examples: <https://english.10mehr.com/> or <https://t.me/ttadarok>
- [73] Mudjahedeen-e Khalq
- [74] Partiya Jiyana Azad a Kurdistanê
- [75] Whereby “control” also includes moral and religious leadership.
- [76] Opposing views were expressed by Joachim Guilliard and Manfred Ziegler in the UZ, for example.
- [77] <https://youtu.be/U-sgfdl9NYE?si=x1BKA-F100poILnY&t=3328>
- [78] <https://www.youtube.com/shorts/OGAzZY3A9do>

The Era of “Do Whatever You Want” in the Global Capitalist Crisis: Part 1

Mücadele Birliği (Struggle Unity, Türkiye)

I

The masters of the world are writing newspaper headlines announcing the end of capitalist civilization. These new “apocalypse” debates go beyond the recurring economic collapses and the political crises that follow them. The most frequently used phrases in global financial mouthpiece publications such as Foreign Policy, New York Times, and Project Syndicate are as follows: “Disintegration,” “destruction,” “fragmented society,” “exhausted democracy,” “decline of civilization.” All of them are summarized in a striking headline: “The West is now collapsing!”

What’s happening? The bourgeoisie, which bases its entire ideological hegemony narrative on the immortality of capitalism, has realized that the new financial crisis looming on the horizon also spells its own demise. Bourgeoisie have experienced many crises throughout history, but in the language of this class, crisis also meant opportunity. Crisis experiences have shown that these take the form of “creative destruction.” New monopoly groups rise and liquidate the old structure. That is why, whenever a crisis appears on the horizon for capital, it lies in wait like a wild animal that has smelled blood, preparing moves to eliminate its rivals. But this time, the situation is different: The masters of the world are warning all capital groups with the headlines above, as if saying: Don’t undermine each other because this crisis is not an opportunity. It will bring about the end of civilization. There is no way out, no “creative destruction”...

The main theme of this call, “not competition but solidarity,” is like the frog telling the scorpion riding

on its back not to sting it, but the scorpion’s response is predictable: “What can I do? It’s in my nature.” Where does this hopelessness come from, leading to such a futile call to change the nature of the bourgeois scorpion? Or let’s put it this way: why is there no way out of the new financial collapse looming on the horizon?

Contrary to the despair among the world’s rulers, many circles claiming to be Marxist hold out hope that there is a way out. At a time when the bourgeoisie has declared the end of its own civilization, such miserable minds are competing to present evidence that the approaching crisis will result in a new form of capital accumulation and domination. According to their analysis, the period they call neoliberalism is now over. This closed period was merely a choice made by international capital to escape the crisis it entered in the 1970s. Capital, which chose neoliberalism by option, abandoned investment in industrial production and became financialized; it shifted production to dependent countries, creating a supply chain. At this stage, the imperialist centers have realized their mistake, recognized the “geopolitical” risks of deindustrialization and dependence on supply chains, and have now reversed course, closing the neoliberal era. Therefore, the new hegemonic structure that will emerge as a way out will result in imperialist centers abandoning financialization and returning to industrial production, etc.

This perspective (beyond instilling hope in the hopeless bourgeoisie) clearly contains significant errors in many respects. The most important mistake is to view the orientation of capital toward this or that structure as a simple matter of choice.

In reality, capital fundamentally follows the course of development of the productive forces and has no alternative but to conform to all the laws and conditions of advanced commodity production, which is the current framework of development. Wherever capitalist private property conflicts with this development, the penalty is imposed either on capital or on the productive forces. In this sense, while capital pursues profit, it is forced to advance the socialization of production through the crises it is dragged into. At a certain point, the contradiction sharpens and revolutions become inevitable. Today's capitalist commodity economy has reached a point where the socialization of production can only be conceived on a global scale. The penalty imposed by the social character of production on capitalist private property is global civil war.

The other mistake in this view concerns the nature of major crises; it reduces crises to accidents on preferred paths. Yet every crisis is a punishment meted out to the bourgeoisie, which fails to recognize the social character of production and lacks the ability to manage it. Let us express this in Engels' words: "It is precisely this powerful reaction of the productive forces, which are developing with great vigour, against the qualities of capital, that is the great necessity of accepting their social character, which forces the capitalist class to behave towards them, at least to the extent that is possible within capitalist relations, as social productive forces." Engels then cites the example of the alkali monopoly in England, which united 48 factories. Today, monopolies that far surpass this example dominate the world. Therefore, as the social character of production develops, the crises created by capitalist private property, which is in contradiction with it, take on a sharper, more destructive character. It is not the choice of the path that leads capital to crisis that is flawed, but its very existence, which is in contradiction with social production.

II

To concretize Engels' analysis in the long historical development of capitalism, the simplification we will now make will, of course, be incomplete in many respects, but these shortcomings can be disregarded for now in order to grasp the subject closely.

The simplification is as follows: In the history of capitalism, there has been a "leading" branch of production that symbolizes the level of socialization that production has reached and, with this feature, has led and driven all other branches of production. In the mid-19th century, this leadership was in railroad construction. By the end of the century, this leadership was shared with the electrical and petrochemical industries. By the mid-20th century, leadership had shifted to the engine industry and machine manufacturing, and by the end of the 20th century and the first quarter of the 21st century, semiconductor technologies had taken on the same role. With each changing "leading" sector, the social character of production has advanced to a new stage. Products have become more complex, and the division of labor and cooperation have become more detailed.

Globalization is not a new phenomenon. From its early stages, capitalism has spread the division of labor and cooperation required by the level of development across the world, becoming a global system. Parallel to the change in the leading sector, this global division of labor and cooperation has also changed. Of course, it has been stamped with the character of capital, from whose hands blood and pus flow.

Compared to today's development, railways correspond to a relatively simple, low-level division of labor. This simplicity is also evident in the global division of labor. In the colonialism of the 18th century, which caused the oppressed peoples to suffer greatly, the main goal was to seize the raw material resources that would feed the railways and the industries they brought with them, as well as the markets where these products could be sold.

Throughout its development, the leading sector also prepares the groundwork for the next pioneer.

Telegraph lines, necessary for the management of railways, led to the development of electricity generation; the search for more powerful locomotives led to the emergence of internal combustion engine technologies. But the engine still had a long way to go. On the other hand, electricity production has undergone change at a much faster pace. With its production, distribution, and widespread use, electricity has created a multi-layered division of labor and cooperation level with a more complex and broader ancillary industry than railways. The chemical industry, which took off thanks to electricity, triggered the search for new raw materials in imperialist colonialism. Petroleum, which is widely used in electricity production, copper, which is used in communications, elements for lighting equipment, aluminum and other main metal groups, which are inputs for the chemical industry, have intensified the struggle between monopolies.

After all, these resources are not minerals like iron ore and coal, which are abundant in every region of the world. But raw materials like oil, which are only abundant in certain regions and can be profitably exploited, and the critical logistics routes that secure their supply, necessitated a new division of the world, not freely among monopolies, but in a hegemonic manner. In the First World War, largely due to the impact of the October Revolution, this hegemony issue remained unresolved. The Second imperialist war of redistribution, waged to complete what was left unfinished, gave rise to a socialist system that spread across one-third of the world. From that point on, imperialism could no longer sustain classical colonialism, which forcibly seized raw materials.

Under these new conditions, the imperialist-capitalist world restructured its domination over the former colonies and dependent countries that had gained political independence, led by the engine manufacturing industry. The new colonialism was suited to the nature of the engine manufacturing industry. This new series of products, much more

complex than the previous ones, was based on combining hundreds of different parts. Division of labor and cooperation gave rise to new, qualitatively different stratifications. The production of highly complex engine blocks was combined with the production of relatively simple belts, gears, and plastic parts. From then on, the fate of dependent countries was shaped either by specializing in the production of certain simple parts or by working on the final assembly line where all parts were combined. The socialist system, which spread across one-third of the world, quickly exhausted the fuel of this phase of the imperialist capitalist system. In fact, this phase had come to an end in just 30 years.

The by-products of engine and machine construction were communication satellites encircling the world and optical machine tools capable of processing materials down to one-thousandth of a centimeter. Without this infrastructure, the semiconductor technologies that emerged in the 1950s would not have achieved a level of production that yielded profits for capital. However, these laser-guided optical machines were extremely expensive, and the resulting products were also extremely complex. This sector could only reach a level that guaranteed profit if a unified global market was established and if the production of each complex part was protected by patent licenses and standardized. Therefore, this sector first had to experience a high degree of monopolization and then be able to reach every corner of the world without hindrance via satellite connections. It was necessary to wait for the collapse of the Soviet Union for the leadership in semiconductor technology to be fully established.

With the semiconductor industry leading the way, a similar level of division of labor and specialization emerged in other industries, deepening the social character of production worldwide. Imperialist domination and exploitation gave shape to this new socialization. Dependent countries were rapidly drawn into a process of total economic subordina-

tion, and the markets of dependent countries became direct extensions of the production and circulation processes of imperialist metropolises.

III

During these long periods of transformation, economic crises functioned as a mechanism of “creative destruction,” preparing the next phase and clearing the obstacles in its path. The long depression of the 1870s put an end to the railway era. This crisis revealed a problem of overproduction, and the resulting deflationary cycle could only be overcome by the leadership of electricity and petrochemicals. The new leaders, monopolies born and developed in production, started to divide not only individual countries but entire continents among themselves. International trade, fueled by monopolistic competition, grew at double-digit rates every year, creating an urgent need for a universal paper currency to replace gold.

The system also needed a hegemonic power in this regard, and the First World War had not solved the problem, leaving gold on its throne. Therefore, the 1929 Crisis dragged on and on amid overproduction and the triggered deflationary cycle. The crisis was averted by the Second World War. A hegemonic power (the US) emerged, and a paper currency to be used in trade was found. The US dollar, pegged to the value of gold, attracted the new complex division of labor in the industrial phase focused on engine-machine manufacturing, first to Europe and then to all dependent countries, through many loan agreements such as the Marshall Aid.

The 1973 crisis ended the leadership of motor-machinery. The hegemonic power of the imperialist world, the US, ended the monetary system pegging the dollar to gold in order to escape the deflationary spiral that devalued capital. This was only the first step. The second was to force OPEC to increase oil prices tenfold. Thus, the whole world entered a cycle of inflation. Dependent countries, unable to pay their

debts and energy bills due to suddenly skyrocketing interest rates, were forced to accept the imposed conditions of total economic subordination. Semiconductor technologies, a by-product of this universe (the engine-machine), perfected banking transactions based on balancing all account payments. Now, all stock and commodity exchanges, banking transactions, and all trade-based money movements around the world could accumulate in the same pool and be redistributed from there. Thanks to this development, the necessary monetary capital, i.e., the first step in the production cycle in the form of capital, was firmly established in order to design the extremely complex division of labor based on semiconductor production worldwide with the flexibility to keep pace with the development speed of this technology. The rest was simply a matter of drawing all dependent countries into a banking system that removed all obstacles to debt capital, with exports heavily dependent on imports. Led by semiconductor production, the capitalist world became part of the production-circulation system of a handful of giant financial capital groups.

Undoubtedly, the extraordinarily high fixed investments specific to semiconductor production, the use of such large quantities of raw materials and intermediate goods, dramatically increased the average organic composition of capital, leaving very little room for surplus value to be extracted from labor. This low profit could be compensated by the extraordinarily high exploitation of labor power in other branches of production (clothing, metal, food, etc.), otherwise continuing production would have made no sense from the point of view of capital. The financial sector became the umbrella (roof) for this compensation mechanism. In a sense, the enormous labor exploitation that Nestle extracted from coffee producers fed Apple’s lithography machines, and this transition was controlled by centers such as Wall Street. That is why the era led by semiconductors was seen as a “neoliberal” era in which finance

alone determined everything.

However, after this stage, every fire on the roof (finance) would quickly spread across the world, and every small tremor that shook the delicate balance of the debt chain would cause major collapses. This period, mistakenly called neoliberalism, in which giant financial capital groups, formed by the merger of industry and banks, ensured the global division of labor through financial flows, would be a period of incessant global crises.

IV

The 1870 crisis was overcome by reviving international commodity trade; capital exports dragged commodities with them to every corner of the world.

The 1929 crisis was overcome by adding international currency trade to this dual flow, raising the US dollar, pegged to gold, to the level of a universal equivalent.

In the 1973 crisis, capital combined the production-circulation-expanded reproduction cycle to encompass all dependent country markets. The point reached is where capital cannot control the contradiction between the global social character of production and its capitalist private ownership. Beyond this point, there is no longer any possibility of maintaining the social character of production “at least within capitalist relations.” For this reason, semiconductor technologies could not create the ancillary industries that would prepare the next phase. The winds of change brought by Artificial Intelligence (AI) today are nothing more than extensions of the semiconductor phase that began in the 1980s. The contradiction of the current stage becomes most apparent with the collapse of US hegemony. The social character of production based on global division of labor and cooperation has begun to tear apart the straitjacket (i.e. the imperialist-capitalist relations) imposed on it.

The reason why the New Phase (as aptly conceptualized by C. Dağlı) entered by the imperialist

capitalist system is also the final phase of capitalist civilization lies hidden in the social character of production and circulation. And this character can now only be revealed on a global scale. A handful of financial capital groups, which monopolize all the markets of the world, including all dependent countries, are losing control (which they themselves announce with the most tragic cries in their publications), and the reason for this is this social character. So this final stage is also a stage in which the global civil war is spreading and deepening, and uprisings are crowned with victory.

This analysis, which summarizes a historically quite long period in broad strokes, highlights the helplessness of today’s rulers. Now, let’s look at this helplessness, which has left its mark on the last 25 years, in more concrete terms, accompanied by facts.

At the end of the 1990s, when the semiconductor industry’s leadership was cemented, the slogan “the internet will change the world” drove fixed capital investments in this field to frenzied levels. The monopolies, known simply as dot-com, were presented as the masters of the world, just like today. (Few remember their names now). Banks and investment funds inflated the stock prices of these companies on the stock markets. Fiber optic cables, satellites, base stations, internet search engines, supercomputers, etc., attracted most of the fixed capital investments.



However, as Table I clearly shows, despite the

dot-com craze, total fixed capital investments in imperialist countries continued to decline. This is because the profitability of dot-com investments, which offered little added value, was guaranteed by other sectors, and these sectors, since the 1980s, have flowed into dependent countries where capital is scarce and, due to this scarcity, wages are low and profits are high. We can track the speed of this flow in the “Financial Foreign Assets” column in the same table. Capital exports also play a major role in this amount, which rose from \$100 trillion to \$400 trillion in just 20 years. These twenty years (1980-2000) were years in which dependent countries were surrounded by conditions of total economic subordination, either individually or collectively. The lack of profit from fixed investments in dot-coms was offset by the high exploitation created by other industries that shifted towards dependent countries.

The 1998 Asian crisis marked a sharp and severe turning point. By the end of this crisis, the world was equipped with a financial flow system that secured the profits of extraordinarily high fixed investments in imperialist countries. The transformation accelerated to such an extent that it could be completed within a few years. Dependent country capital, collaborating with imperialist monopolies that control 70% of world trade, would henceforth send every penny it earned from international trade to imperialist centers and stock markets inflating dot-com company shares. The financial pool formed from the profits accumulated in these centers would be redistributed through debt and credit.

Table 2 summarizes the results of this redistribution. It also presents a picture of total economic subordination. The “Mark-Up” on which the table is based, translated from bourgeois economics into Marxist language, means monopoly profits earned above the average. Until the Asian crisis, the extra monopoly profits of imperialist monopolies and their collaborators in dependent countries were parallel. This is because the goods produced through this collaboration are generally consumed in the domestic market of the dependent country, and the profits realized in this way are shared between the imperialist monopolies and their collaborators in proportion to their share. Therefore, every increase in profit also increases the collaborator’s profit.

However, after the Asian Crisis, a divergence begins. While collaborators increasingly receive smaller shares of the above-average extra profit, the extra profits of imperialist monopolies skyrocket. This is because total economic subordination produces two important results in dependent countries. First, the collaborator now produces for world markets, not the domestic market; these products can find buyers at higher prices, especially in developed imperialist markets, and the imperialists pocket the enormous difference themselves. The second consequence is more significant: the collaborators lose their own capital accumulation opportunities; they are now forced to borrow from the imperialist money pool to start a business and increasingly carry out this production with imported intermediate goods and machinery, otherwise, the scale required to address broader markets cannot be achieved. We will discuss shortly how these two important changes rapidly transformed into the “Complete Economic Subordination Paradox” in the 2020s. But first, we need to look at how this global financial structure triggered the crises that began with the dot-com crisis and turned into a storm in 2000.

TABLO 2
Küresel Ekonomide Maliyet Eklerinin Gelişimi
(Mark Up)



Understanding the heroism of Yemen

Harpreet Pannu | Communist Party of Great Britain (Marxist-Leninist)

The Yemeni ‘Houthi’ Ansar Allah movement shot to prominence in late 2023 when, following the beginning of the US-Israeli genocide of the Palestinians of Gaza, the movement’s forces announced that they were shutting down access to the Red Sea through the Bab-el-Mandeb strait for all Israeli-linked shipping—a threat that they quickly proved they were totally capable of enforcing.

Despite this sudden worldwide prominence, the ‘Houthi’ movement’s origins and ideological underpinnings remain largely unknown and under-studied—primarily because this suits the interests of western imperialism, which fears the movement becoming an example for other oppressed nations to follow.

Based on a presentation delivered at Saklatvala Hall in London in June 2025, this in-depth article attempts to tear through the imperialist lies and explain the real origins of Yemen’s dominant national-liberation movement.

* * *

The term ‘Houthi’ comes from the surname of the family that founded and leads the movement and is not inherently derogatory, but the name that the movement uses to refer to itself is ‘Ansar Allah’ and this is the term that will be used in this article going forward.

Of course, imperialist-controlled media invariably refer to the movement as ‘Iran-backed Houthi rebels’, in such a blanket copy-paste manner that it can be a real eye-opener as to the level of uniformity and control that western imperialist governments truly have over their so-called ‘independent’ media.

Even the BBC, which famously refused government directives to refer to Isis as ‘Daesh’ and insists on call-

ing the terrorist group “the so-called Islamic State” in the name of ‘impartiality’ (in reality the goal was almost certainly to tacitly encourage islamophobia among the masses), refuses to apply the same impartiality to Ansar Allah by using its real name.

In fact, despite both having a background in the Shi’a side of Islam, the leaders of the Iranian revolution and Yemen’s resistance leaders come from quite different origins.

Zaydi Islam and the Yemeni resistance

As many will know, the muslim world is divided primarily into sunnis (around 80-85 percent) and shias (around 15-20 percent). This split fundamentally sprang from a difference in belief regarding who should have succeeded the Prophet in leading the muslims following his death in 632 AD. The sunnis were those who believed that the Prophet did not appoint anyone in particular as his successor, and that the field was effectively free for anyone who could win the loyalty of the muslim masses.

This is often portrayed as an early version of a ‘democratic’ outlook; in reality, this system quickly descended into a series of absolute monarchies where the sole criterion of legitimacy was whoever was brutal enough and cunning enough to manoeuvre themselves into power. In tandem, a theology was built up which preached the idea that absolute loyalty to the ruler was mandated by God under all circumstances—even if the ruler was someone who was tyrannical or a serial violator of islamic law.

The shia, by contrast, were a minority who firmly rejected the above principles. They argued through textual evidence that the Prophet had explicitly designated his close companion Ali as his successor to lead the muslims after him as per God’s direct order,

and following Ali there was to be a fixed chain of imams leading by divine decree. The shias argued that for anyone other than these imams to obtain rulership over the muslims would be unlawful, and that rejection of such rulers' legitimacy was obligatory for muslims.

The theological differences described above shine some light onto a question frequently asked by westerners: why most anti-imperialist movements in the muslim world are led by shia minorities. Centuries of savage persecution by sunni authorities, and in particular the massacre of the third shia imam, al-Husayn, along with most of his family, when he decided to make a public stand against the corrupt ruler of his time, gradually created a culture of martyrdom and resistance to tyranny among the shia in a way that does not exist in the sunni branch of Islam.

In order fully to understand the origins of Ansar Allah, we need to look deeper, into the schisms within the shia minority themselves. The overwhelming majority of the world's shias follow the Ithna Ashari (Twelver) sect, which believes in 12 divinely-appointed imams after the Prophet, the last of them being an awaited messiah who is believed to be alive to this day. These are the shias of Iran, Iraq, Lebanon, Bahrain and most shias in the Indian subcontinent.

The other two, much smaller branches are Ismailis (believing in seven imams) and Zaydis (believing in five imams). Although the numbers of adherents of these two sects are roughly similar, their geographical distribution and resulting political influence are dramatically different. Whilst Ismailis are far too dispersed amongst dozens of countries around the world to have any political relevance to speak of, the Zaydi sect quickly concentrated itself almost entirely in an area that is now northern Yemen/southwestern Saudi Arabia, forming approximately 40 percent of the population of modern Yemen.

Zaydi Shia Islam, a minority within a minority, accepts the first four shia imams but emerged from

a dispute over the fifth imam. Whilst the bulk of the shia accepted Muhammad al-Baqir as the fifth imam, a significant minority opposed al-Baqir's seemingly passive and underground opposition to the sunni ruler of the time. This minority group argued that the legitimate imam by definition must openly rise up against the illegitimate ruler, and they gathered around al-Baqir's brother Zayd, who led an armed uprising against the Ummayyad emperor/caliph of the time.

Although the uprising was crushed and Zayd was murdered, his followers held on to the new theology based on the obligation of waging armed struggle against tyrannical leadership, and set up a Zaydi kingdom/imamate in what is now northern Yemen. Ironically, aside from the stark difference in political outlook, the Zaydis are actually considered to be theologically close to Sunni Islam and are often considered as a 'halfway house' between sunnis and twelvers, to the extent that historically many anti-shia sunni chauvinist scholars would exempt Zaydis from sunni persecution—although this has changed in recent years to suit political ends, as will be mentioned later in this article.

The remote and rugged geography of northern Yemen, situated at the far end of the Arabian Peninsula, made it fertile land for a heterodox non-sunni sect of Islam to flourish largely undisturbed. For several hundred years, the Zaydi territory was nominally under the control of Ottoman and other empires, but these were never able to establish effective control and the Zaydis fiercely defended their sovereignty from all outside encroachment.

WW1 and the collapse of the Ottoman empire

Following the collapse of the Ottoman empire in 1918, the Zaydi imamate finally won formal independence as the Mutawakkilite Kingdom of Yemen. This kingdom consisted of the northwestern portion of today's Yemen, including the major cities of San'aa, Sa'dah, Ta'izz and the Red Sea port of Hudaydah. It

initially spanned well into what is now Saudi Arabia, although a war in 1934 forced the kingdom to cede three northern provinces to Saudi Arabia. For brevity's sake, what remains to Yemen of its northwestern geographical region will henceforth be referred to as northern Yemen.

The rest of what is now modern Yemen was seized by the British empire in the early 19th century and made into the so-called 'Aden Crown Colony', which lasted up until the 1960s. This part of Yemen, henceforth referred to as southern Yemen, was overwhelmingly sunni and much larger geographically but very sparsely populated, with the majority of its population concentrated around the major port city of Aden.

The Kingdom of Yemen, under the leadership of Imam Yahya Hamid-ud-Dine, became known internationally for its extreme isolationism and backwardness. A reactionary par excellence, Imam Yahya fiercely opposed the introduction of any kind of modern technology into his kingdom. Reportedly, only a single photograph of him exists, taken from a distance without his knowledge, as he rejected cameras as modern technology and insisted he be portrayed in paintings only.

Whilst gargantuan battles between decadent capitalism and advancing socialism raged outside, Imam Yahya was determined to maintain his kingdom as an island of 13th-century feudalism with medieval-style living conditions.

Naturally, the local bourgeoisie grew increasingly frustrated with this regime, culminating in a botched coup attempt in 1948 in which Imam Yahya was killed. He was succeeded by his son Ahmed bin Yahya, who was initially viewed as more liberal-minded than his father (allowing photos of himself for instance). However, very little meaningful reform took place and the bourgeois opposition was soon forced to flee underground.

Rise of Arab nationalism

Imam Ahmed ruled for 14 years, during which time Arab nationalist movements peaked across the region and nationalist-inspired military coups overthrew reactionary monarchs in Libya, Iraq and Egypt. Yemeni military officers began plotting their own coup, which they launched a few days after Imam Ahmed's death in 1962. Initially successful, the military officers under Second Lieutenant Abdullah as-Sallal declared an end to the thousand-year-old Zaydi imamate and proclaimed the Yemeni Arab Republic.

Unfortunately for the revolution, the thousand-year-old Zaydi imamate was much more resilient than the weak, colonialist-installed monarchs in Libya, Iraq or Egypt. Imam Ahmed's son, the crown prince Muhammad al-Badr, escaped to Saudi Arabia, where he quickly gained official support from the reactionary pro-western monarchy there, which did not want another revolutionary Arab nationalist republic on its border. With Saudi, British and Israeli support, al-Badr began recruiting an army from amongst the conservative Zaydi tribes in the remote northern regions of the country, sparking off the North Yemen civil war.

Egypt, then ruled by Arab nationalist icon Gamal Abdel Nasser, immediately emerged as the strongest supporter of the new republic, which also obtained support from the Soviet Union and the socialist bloc. This war raged for eight years, during which Egypt sent large numbers of ground troops to fight alongside the republican forces. The war ultimately ended in 1970 with a republican victory and Imam al-Badr left into exile in London, never to return.

An interesting side-note about this pivotal cold war struggle, largely relegated to obscurity today, is that the same Zaydi tribal forces who in 1962 were massing on the side of reaction and feudal despotism are today the main social base for the Ansar Allah revolutionaries, who largely emerged from their ranks. This is an important reminder for revolutionary analysts

always to stay aware of changes in material conditions, as today's revolutionaries can easily become tomorrow's reactionaries and vice-versa.

PDR Yemen—British Aden

Whilst this was going on, a simultaneous liberation struggle had broken out in British-controlled southern Yemen, which forced the British to grant independence in 1967. Initially Arab nationalist in orientation, in 1969 an internal coup brought a Marxist-Leninist faction to power, proclaiming the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen—the Arab world's only socialist state.

The Yemeni Arab Republic (northern Yemen) went through a number of coups and changes of government in the late 60s and 70s, often resulting in the sitting president's assassination—most notably that of the popular reformer president Ibrahim al-Hamdi in 1977. This instability came to an end by the end of the 1970s with the consolidation in power of president Ali Abdullah Saleh, who would ultimately rule uninterrupted from 1978 all the way up to the Arab Spring uprising of 2011.

President Saleh was in many respects the archetypal 'Arab dictator', particularly popularised in the western mind following the 2011 uprisings. He ruled with a mixture of iron-fisted repression and a massive elaborate network of corruption and tribal patronage that made him reportedly one of the richest men in the world by the end of his rule, despite ruling over the poorest of all the Arab countries. Whilst other contemporary 'dictatorships' in the region—for example the rule of Hafez al-Assad in Syria, Saddam Hussein in Iraq and Muammar Gaddafi in Libya—attempted at least for portions of their rule to follow a sovereigntist, anti-western and Arab nationalist line, Saleh almost never bothered with such nationalist window-dressing and openly embraced a role as a comprador whose fidelity to US imperialism (among the Arab republics) was exceeded perhaps only by president Hosni Mubarak in Egypt.

Saudi wahhabism

Whilst all this was going on, major cultural and ideological battles were being waged on Yemeni soil. The 1970s oil boom had enticed large numbers of impoverished Yemenis to Saudi Arabia and the Gulf emirates to seek relatively well-paid employment in the oil industry.

Sensing an opportunity, the Saudis began efforts to promote and proselytise the salafi-wahhabi version of Islam amongst migrant workers from other muslim countries, hoping to gain ideological soft power influence throughout the muslim world. This process heated up considerably following the 1979 Islamic Revolution in Iran, which deeply threatened the Saudi and Gulf kingdoms and whose twelver shia sect was traditionally seen as a sworn enemy by salafi-wahhabis.

Many Yemenis were accepted into religious schools and universities in Saudi Arabia, where they were indoctrinated and equipped to return to their own country to act as missionaries of the new salafi-wahhabi creed. The most notable of these was Shaykh Muqbil bin Hadi al-Wadi'i, who set up a salafi-wahhabi seminary in the town of Dammaj in northern Yemen. This onslaught by well-funded missionaries preaching a foreign faith soon instigated a backlash amongst the fiercely independent Zaydis, who began to organise and reassert their own identity.

There is a common misconception amongst westerners, that salafi-wahhabism is solely a movement of violent extremist muslims who are defined by their hatred of America and Europe and want to wage violent jihad against westerners, exemplified in the 9/11 attacks and in Isis-claimed terrorist atrocities in Europe.

In actual fact, salafi-wahhabism has always been an ideology promoted and encouraged by imperialism. Amongst the core values of the Saudi-sponsored movement is the medieval sunni concept of total loyalty to the ruler no matter how tyrannical he may be, alongside a very harsh interpretation of sharia law

that creates large-scale resentment (for imperialism to exploit), fierce persecution of Muslims following minority non-Sunni sects (causing division in society that benefits imperialism) and a general indifference towards foreign colonialism.

Shaykh Muqbil al-Wadi'i famously stated that in his view it was better to have British colonialists in charge in southern Yemen than 'godless socialists'. Even amongst the 'jihadist' Salafis of Isis and al-Qaeda, whilst they may have shed the blind loyalty to the ruler they still invariably act to fracture and shatter the societies they operate in for the benefit of imperialism.

Naturally, these values contrast starkly with traditional Zaydi values of religious tolerance, speaking out against unjust rulers, and resisting colonial incursion into their lands.

Following the collapse of the Soviet Union and the resulting loss of foreign support, the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen in the south, already deeply weakened following a violent civil conflict in 1986, voted for reunification with the Yemeni Arab Republic in the north. This took place in 1990, creating a united Yemen (officially the Republic of Yemen) for the first time in more than 150 years, with the northern Yemeni leader Ali Abdullah Saleh becoming united Yemen's first president and southern Yemeni leader Ali Salem al-Beidh the vice-president.

As part of the reunification, rules on opposition political parties were eased and the first multiparty elections were scheduled to take place in 1993. As part of the move to combat the spread of Wahhabism, the Zaydis formed the al-Haq party, primarily to oppose the powerful pro-Saudi al-Islah party that had been established at around the same time with President Saleh's blessing.

In 1994, the south under al-Beidh's leadership attempted to re-secede, citing discrimination and broken promises by Saleh. Saleh immediately mobilised support from influential Salafi-Wahhabi tribes, who duly announced a 'jihad' in defence of Saleh's

rule.

The southern uprising was brutally crushed, leading to longlasting resentment amongst the population that would later be weaponised by imperialism. In contrast to the trigger-happiness of the Salafi-Wahhabis, the Zaydis of al-Haq, whilst not supporting secessionism, opposed shedding the blood of fellow Yemenis and argued for a peaceful resolution of the matter, angering the Saleh regime.

Lacking any powerful sponsors or foreign donors, al-Haq's electoral performance was consistently poor, winning at its height in 1993 only two MPs and 0.8 percent of the vote—as opposed to 123 MPs for Saleh's General People's Congress (GPC) and 62 MPs for al-Islah. In addition, the party was dominated by cautious elders who generally limited themselves to promoting Zaydi interests and pushing back against Salafi-Wahhabi encroachment.

A younger and more radical faction of the party argued for a shift in focus, towards calling out the total subservience of the Saleh regime to US imperialism and opposing the USA and Israel as the ultimate sponsors of the Salafi-Wahhabi threat and the real enemies of the Yemeni people. This faction came to be embodied and led by Sayyid Hussain Badreddine al-Houthi, one of al-Haq's two MPs and the son of a highly-respected Zaydi elder.

During his time in parliament and beyond, al-Houthi became well-known for his vehement denunciations of US influence over the country, much to the embarrassment of the Saleh regime. Contrary to his contemporaries, who won election campaigns through bribery and patronage, al-Houthi campaigned with the slogan: "I won't promise you anything, but I promise I will not represent you dishonestly."

He had a reputation for repeatedly voting against foreign loans that the government wanted to take out, astutely pointing out that whilst the money received would only enrich those favoured by the regime, the crushing service payments would fall squarely on the

backs of ordinary folk.

Following the loss of his seat in 1997, al-Houthi abandoned the parliamentary route and began laying the foundations for a mass grassroots organisation in the Zaydi heartlands. He had already helped to establish a youth organisation called Shabab-ul-Mo'mineen (The Believing Youth), which organised popular school clubs and summer camps promoting Zaydi culture.

Under al-Houthi's guidance, these clubs began to take an increasingly anti-imperialist direction. Al-Houthi helped to establish clinics and hospitals and worked hard to improve electricity infrastructure in neglected rural areas, conscious that people fleeing to the cities to escape poverty were at a high risk of becoming torn from their roots and thus easy prey for pro-western ideologies.

After the 9/11 attacks, President Saleh quickly became one of the most enthusiastic allies of Bush's phoney 'War on Terror'. From 2001-04, al-Houthi gave a series of lectures in which he railed against the US presence in Yemen and warned of US-controlled NGO attempts to colonise the country's education system.

He correctly linked the various conflicts and troubles in the region back to their source: US imperialism and Zionist Israel. His lectures chimed deeply with the masses and he became a constant source of worry to the Saleh regime.

Al-Houthi's rhetoric and worldview was fundamentally based in a return to the values of Zaydi Islam, and a consistent feature of his lectures was his call for Muslims to uphold the Qur'an, particularly paying attention to verses calling for Muslims to be vigilant against Jewish and Christian plots, which he linked to the modern-day actions of the USA and Israel. As such, he would very often frame his discussion in terms of "Muslims" versus an alliance of "Jews" and "Christians".

This is where it is crucially important to judge a movement's revolutionary potential by objective, not

arbitrary, criteria—ie, it's not about what sounds nice to us or what hurts our feelings, but rather which movement is objectively weakening imperialism and which is objectively helping it.

Apologists for Zionism and imperialism will often spread the idea that any individual or movement which paints Jews in a negative light is 'like the Nazis', as if the sole defining trait of Nazism was dislike of Jews. Even amongst socialists, particularly in western countries, there is often a tendency to treat anti-Jewish prejudice as the ultimate evil, a uniquely evil form of racism worse than all others, because of the atrocities committed by the German Nazis in the 1940s.

Fundamentally this is a reactionary and Eurocentric argument that implies a static, unchanging view of history. Of course, it barely needs saying that for workers to blame all the world's wrongs on 'the Jews' is obviously a wrong and silly idea, which is as wrong and silly today as it was 100 years ago. However (and here comes the big 'but'), 100 years ago, the objective situation internationally was that the main reactionary racist ideology being promoted amongst workers and serving the interests of imperialism was antisemitism. Today, however, the equally racist ideology of Zionism serves this divide-and-rule purpose, while antisemitism has taken a back seat.

One hundred years ago, the racist ideology of antisemitism was used to justify genocide, but today it is the racist ideology of Zionism that is being used to justify genocide. And in that sense, in today's context, the racist ideology of Zionism is a much greater threat than antisemitism. Therefore, to obstruct the fight against Zionism by scaremongering about the supposed danger of 'slipping into antisemitism'—as if that is somehow worse than being an apologist for Zionist butchery—is objectively a reactionary, pro-imperialist position.

Certainly, to try and attack an organisation like Ansar Allah that plays a leading role in combating Zionism, on the basis of concern-trolling about

antisemitism—particularly in a country like Yemen that has virtually no Jewish population anyway—is an argument that should be dismissed out of hand, regardless of certain people’s ‘feelings’.

One hundred years ago, imperialism was promoting antisemitic ideology everywhere because that suited its agenda. Those promoting antisemitic arguments were the most banal dupes and tools of imperialism. This is not the case today.

Today, imperialism aggressively scaremongers about the danger of antisemitism, not because the system really cares about Jewish people’s security but because it needs to justify the existence of the Zionist settler-colony, which it needs to keep in place in order to continue to destabilise and dominate West Asia, the region with by far the largest oil reserves on the planet, and geographically crucial for transnational trade and shipping.

If any group today can be compared to the antisemites of 100 years ago, it is the anti-Islam crusaders, as fearmongering about Muslim immigration is now the primary racist discourse of the bourgeoisie.

Of course, those few who do still promote antisemitic theories about the world are not suddenly right; their ideas are still wrong and misguided, but they cannot be equated to the antisemites of 100 years ago. In the changed context of today, irrespective of their ideas being wrong or right, it has to be admitted that they have broken out of the propaganda straitjacket of imperialism, and have adopted a position directly challenging the one promoted by imperialism.

That shows they have developed the ability to think for themselves. That means despite their current wrong and misguided ideas they have the potential to become revolutionary if provided with the guidance that only a scientific understanding of imperialism can bring.

Certainly you can contrast this with the countless ‘progressive’ identity politics-obsessed, Pride flag Ukraine flag-waving ‘socialists’ who, despite their loud claims to represent and support all things ‘pro-

gressive’, have never allowed a thought that was not sanctioned by imperialism to enter their brains.

Perhaps Sayyid Hussain al-Houthi’s most well-known innovation appeared during his January 2002 lecture entitled *As-Sarkhatu fi Wajhil-Mustakbireen* (The Shout in the Face of the Arrogant), where he coined his famous *sarkha* (slogan): “God is greater! Death to America! Death to Israel! Curse be on the Jews! Victory to Islam!”

These slogans quickly became the rallying cry of the movement and are emblazoned on its official flag to this day, much to the disgust of ‘respectable’ bourgeois commentators who decry the apparent antisemitism on display.

The fact of the matter is that it is not the apparent meaning of the slogan that is important, but the deeper context and reality that it represents. On the one hand, it is perfectly possible for photogenic young European students to chant slogans of “freedom”, “democracy” and even “socialism”, and yet be mere footsoldiers of the most reactionary elements of international finance capital. We saw this during the so-called ‘Velvet revolutions’ (counter-revolutions) of 1989, when all the fine slogans about workers’ rights and ‘socialism with a human face’ merely masked a pro-US, imperialist-controlled movement bankrolled by the likes of George Soros and assorted billionaires.

On the other hand, whilst al-Houthi’s *sarkha* may sound offensive to European sensibilities, in the context of Yemen’s very conservative Islamic society it undoubtedly contained the nucleus of a blossoming anti-imperialist consciousness, since it identifies Yemen’s main enemies as the USA, Israel and Zionism, and calls for a victory to the Islamic world (ie, the entire Middle East) against these foes.

As always, pro-imperialist commentators will always try to focus on the surface dressing, whilst it is the job of serious revolutionaries to dig beyond that and understand the substance beneath.

As it turns out, US imperialism understood this very well, and US officials in Yemen were deeply disturbed

by the rapid spread of the sarkha and of al-Houthi's soaring popularity amongst the masses. They put pressure on the Saleh regime to crack down on the movement, and hundreds of people were arrested and imprisoned on various trumped-up charges, merely for chanting the sarkha at prayers and other public occasions.

However, al-Houthi refused to back down, pointing out that he had no interest in challenging President Saleh's rule and that he was only challenging what he saw as the US-Israeli infiltration of Yemen's institutions.

In June 2004, President Saleh travelled to the US state of Georgia to attend the G8 summit, where he held back-door discussions with US officials. Following his return to Yemen, he immediately launched a large-scale military action with covert US support against al-Houthi's stronghold in the rural northern regions, bombarding civilian areas with air strikes and killing and maiming hundreds of people.

Al-Houthi and his followers fought back fiercely, but ultimately he was killed by the army in a fire-fight in August 2004. The army seized his body and refused to return it to his family for almost a decade.

If President Saleh had been hoping that the budding national-liberation movement in the north would die out with the killing of its founding leader, this hope did not last long. Under the leadership of Sayyid Hussain al-Houthi's father, Sayyid Badreddine al-Houthi, the movement developed quickly into a disciplined paramilitary force and began an insurgency that led to a total of six wars between 2004-10.

The Saudi monarchy, which 40 years earlier had supported Zaydi fighters (owing to their being a reactionary force at that time), once again intervened on behalf of imperialism and began bombing the liberation fighters on behalf of the Saleh regime, whilst the USA and Britain provided logistical support and the international media turned a blind eye to the brutal, scorched-earth campaign.

However, the rebels, who now began to adopt the

name Ansar Allah, remained steadfast and secured the support of the masses, allowing them to weather all the attacks.

The inhabitants of the remote northern regions of Yemen are well-known for their rugged hardiness and warrior spirit, and their men are rarely seen outside without a dagger—known as a jambiya—tucked into their waistband. It was in this period that Sayyid Hussain al-Houthi's younger brother, Sayyid Abdul-Malik, came into prominence and began to take a leadership role, particularly after Sayyid Badreddine's death in 2010.

The situation in the north remained at a stalemate until 2011, when the so-called 'Arab spring' wave of uprisings hit Yemen—one of the few countries where a really popular revolutionary movement took hold of the masses. Following months of relentless huge anti-government demonstrations, Saleh's powerful tribal backers began defecting to the opposition one after the other, culminating in an assassination attempt on the president that reportedly left him critically injured.

Not long after this incident, Saleh finally agreed to resign and hand over the country to his vice-president, Abdrabbuh Mansur Hadi, bringing an end to his 33-year reign.

Ansar Allah played little direct role in the 2011 revolution, in which the opposition was dominated by pro-western liberals and the Saudi-aligned salafist-leaning al-Islah party. However, it used the power vacuum created during the turmoil to its full advantage by seizing control of large parts of the north, including the key city of Saada.

The movement continued to recruit and organise, pointing out that the regime had not fundamentally changed in any way. A supposed 'presidential election' was held in 2012 in which President Hadi was the only candidate allowed on the ballot paper (which did not stop western media outlets later referring to him as the 'democratically-elected' leader of Yemen!)

At this time, Sayyid Abdul-Malik al-Houthi was rou-

tinely attracting tens of thousands of people to hear his public sermons, in stark contrast to the unpopularity of the distant and technocratic new president. In particular, the Houthi movement became known for its vibrant celebrations of the prophet Muhammad's birthday—a symbolic rebuke to the influence of salafi-wahhabism which forbids this popular festival as supposed 'heresy' (in much the same way that the extreme puritans wanted to ban Christmas in revolutionary England, although the puritans were at least on the right side of the revolution!)

Additionally, in 2013, Sayyid Hussain al-Houthi's body was finally returned to his family, to be buried with full honours amidst huge crowds of supporters.

One incident that deserves attention in this period is the events at Dammaj. Dammaj was the symbolic stronghold of salafi-wahhabism in the north of Yemen, the home of a salafist seminary founded by Shaykh Muqbil al-Wadi'i in the 1980s. From the USA to Indonesia, 'students' would come to 'study' salafi-wahhabi ideology at this seminary, located awkwardly in the heartland of the Zaydis.

Matters came to a head when 'students' at the seminary reportedly began violently attacking Ansar Allah supporters. The seminary refused point-blank to cooperate with Ansar Allah's attempts to capture the perpetrators, sparking a conflict that culminated in the destruction of the seditious institute and the fleeing of its extremist occupants—a huge symbolic victory for the Zaydi Yemenis in their national-liberation struggle.

As a response, the local branch of al-Qaeda declared "holy war" against Ansar Allah, once again showcasing that supposedly 'anti-American' organisation's hypocrisy and fealty to imperialism. Saudi salafist propagandists began to spread long-winded claims that Ansar Allah supposedly followed a fringe sect of Zaydism that they claimed was close to Iran's Twelver shias, thereby making them 'infidels' (ie, acceptable targets for annihilation in the eyes of 'God')—in reality demonstrating nothing more than the ease with

which supposedly 'religious' goalposts can be moved by these puppets when it suits imperialist interests.

In late 2014, a fresh wave of mass popular protest broke out against President Hadi following his decision to implement a hike in fuel prices to meet the conditions of an IMF bailout. This was the October moment for Ansar Allah, as the resistance organisation made the fateful decision to order a full-scale march of its supporters and fighters to descend on the capital, Sanaa (which is situated in the north of the country).

Supporters of the controlled-opposition al-Islah party and other government loyalists attempted to halt the advance, but the masses sided with Ansar Allah and they were routed. At the same time, patriotic members of the military defected to support what became known as the 21 September Revolution. Despite the name, Ansar Allah did not immediately seize power, merely stationing its fighters at key positions in the capital whilst President Hadi remained formally in charge.

This uneasy truce broke down in January 2015, following a proposal by President Hadi to divide the country into six federal regions, which Ansar Allah rejected as an ill-disguised attempt at balkanisation.

President Hadi was placed under house arrest and forced to resign. He was replaced by a supreme revolutionary committee set up by Ansar Allah and led by Abdul-Malik al-Houthi's brother Muhammad, marking the formal victory of what had seemed unthinkable just a few years earlier—Ansar Allah coming to power as part of a national government of Yemen.

As expected, condemnations began pouring in from imperialist governments and their institutions and stooge regimes in the region, all of which refused to recognise the new government. Hadi escaped to Aden, where he declared himself to be the 'legitimate president' and was quickly recognised as such by the United Nations, under imperialist pressure.

As the revolutionaries marched southwards from

Sanaa, Hadi fled the country entirely and settled in Riyadh, where he would go on to serve as ‘president’ of the so-called ‘internationally-recognised government of Yemen’—a powerless group of Saudi (ie, Anglo-American)-controlled stooges.

In case the reader has not already realised, the Yemenis are a proud people who do not take kindly to attempts at intimidation. In response to the imperialist pressure campaign, massive demonstrations took place in support of Ansar Allah and the national government across the northern part of the country, and huge crowds (described in the west as “tens of thousands”, but more likely closer to a million) filled the streets of Sanaa as far as the eye could see.

With a major showdown appearing imminent, Yemen’s political parties began choosing their side. As was to be expected, the salafist al-Islah sided with the reaction, as did al-Qaeda, Isis and virtually all salafi-wahhabi figures. Most liberal parties and figures also sided with the imperialist campaign, including at least one Nobel peace prize-winning ‘pro-democracy’ activist (shock horror!)

The leaders of the Yemeni Socialist party (YSP—the former ruling party of the socialist People’s Democratic Republic, now a social-democratic party) also fled to Riyadh to join the stooges.

On the other hand, the General People’s Congress (GPC)—the former ruling party of presidents Saleh and Hadi—despite being an obvious symbol of the old regime, split into patriotic and comprador wings, with the former joining the new government set up by Ansar Allah.

A large grassroots section of the YSP also denounced their leadership’s treachery and pledged loyalty to the revolution under the banner of ‘Socialists Against the Aggression’. And number of small communist parties declared their support for Ansar Allah’s revolution, the most notable of which was the National Democratic Front party, which had previously led a Marxist-Leninist insurgency in the 1970s.

Ansar Allah and associated revolutionary forces

continued to advance into southern Yemen at lightning speed, reaching as far as Aden on the south coast. However, the movement had few roots in the southern regions of the country and lacked the mass support it enjoyed in the capital. In these regions, the masses were heavily influenced by the bourgeois-nationalist rhetoric of the so-called ‘Southern Movement’—a separatist movement that advocated the repartition of Yemen into two separate countries.

Much like their counterparts above a certain age in Germany’s eastern regions, large numbers of people in the south of Yemen remain nostalgic for the old socialist system and the security it provided. The separatists have been exploiting this sentiment to the hilt, despite the fact that their programme and rhetoric makes no mention of socialism or Marxism of any kind; rather, it is built almost entirely on inciting division and tribal prejudice against the ‘northerners’, in whom Ansar Allah are included.

Indeed, one website affiliated with the separatists has openly clamoured for imperialist intervention against Ansar Allah, citing Nato’s “humanitarian bombing” of Yugoslavia in the 1990s as a shining example of what they are seeking for Yemen!

As a result, Ansar Allah faced heavy resistance in Aden and much local hostility. Wisely, they did not persevere in trying to subjugate hostile regions. The national-liberation forces withdrew to roughly where the former north/south Yemen border had been—where they dug in and prepared to face down the inevitable imperialist intervention.

It was around this time that Ansar Allah found support in the most unexpected place imaginable: from former president/tyrant Ali Abdullah Saleh. Despite having murdered the movement’s founder and hundreds of its followers on behalf of US imperialism, Saleh and his significant band of battle-hardened tribal loyalists were apparently hoping to forget the past in their quest for political revenge against those who Saleh saw as having ‘betrayed’ him back in 2011.

This was not an unusual stance in heavily-tribal

Yemen. When Saleh had waged war against the southern secession attempt in 1994, some of his main supporters had been former communist leaders whose political grudges eclipsed any concerns about principles or morals.

Given the new government's total international isolation and the gathering storm clouds of imperialist war, Ansar Allah reluctantly agreed to this alliance. This strengthened the resistance significantly, but at the cost of granting a huge propaganda gift to imperialist-aligned Arab media, which began a massive demonisation campaign to condition their populations in accepting and even supporting a war against Ansar Allah and the national government.

Meanwhile, western media preferred to ignore the situation entirely, focusing instead on promoting Ukraine's new protofascist regime and its war on the Donbass peoples.

It was also at this time that Isis, until then virtually absent from the country, suddenly decided to announce its presence and declare its 'jihad' in typical fashion—not against the US presence of course, but rather against those who dared to resist said presence. A number of devastating terrorist attacks on Ansar Allah supporters followed, killing hundreds of people.

Imperialist proxies launch war on Yemen

In March 2015, a 'coalition of the willing' was formed of a number of Arab states, led by Saudi Arabia. With the full blessing of US-British-EU imperialism, this coalition launched 'Operation Decisive Storm'—a bloody campaign of terror waged against the people of Yemen in which a near-total blockade and massive indiscriminate bombing led to the deaths of hundreds of thousands of civilians over the following three years, mostly from disease and famine. Amongst other civilian targets, the coalition warplanes deliberately bombed sewage treatment plants to poison the water supply, leading to a huge outbreak of cholera in the country.

Of course, it must be borne in mind that this was in the days when bombing schools and hospitals was still something that was supposed to be shocking, rather than something imperialism perpetrates and defends openly and routinely, as we have been seeing in Gaza for the last two years.

The south of Yemen effectively came under the joint control of Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates, the two principal countries in the imperialist-backed coalition. In addition, huge numbers of mercenaries were brought in from Sudan, effectively to be used as cannon fodder.

Western media generally avoided reporting on the war in any meaningful way. Virtually no attempt was made by any mainstream journalist to go to Yemen and investigate what was actually happening. Articles and news segments related to the war were essentially identical copy-pastes, invariably using the same buzzwords and clunky phraseology ('Iran-backed Houthi rebels', 'internationally-recognised government', etc) that told the reader/listener virtually nothing.

Failure of the 'antiwar' movement

In turn, Yemen's plight was largely ignored and dismissed by Trotskyists and other assorted western leftists. For example, the Socialist Party of England and Wales ran an article claiming that because Ansar Allah supposedly "fired on striking workers" in a single obscure incident, they were just as bad as the imperialist coalition carpet bombing the country—a ludicrous analogy that is unfortunately a typical example of Trotskyite ideology. The same article claimed that Ansar Allah runs "concentration camps", relying on Emirati state media and the British Economist (ie, the paper that Lenin himself famously denounced) as its only sources.

A handful of left-liberals attempted to raise awareness of the human tragedy and expose British and US complicity in the crimes. However, they invariably portrayed imperialism as merely 'helping the

Saudis' rather than being the ultimate directing force behind the war, and they carefully avoided expressing any sympathy for the resistance. Notably, many of these figures, such as the Democratic senator Chris Murphy, who spoke against the Yemen war, were not even consistent in taking antiwar positions, often espousing fanatically hawkish positions towards Russia and other supposed 'enemy states'.

Additionally, there was some opposition to the war from the libertarian isolationist right, exemplified by the former third-party US presidential candidate Pat Buchanan, who argued correctly that Ansar Allah was the main enemy of al-Qaeda and Isis and that the USA should therefore be supporting it "to fight terrorism". Of course, this well-meaning argument misses the whole point of the phoney 'war on terror'—which is that it was always a sham, designed to justify imperialist war, occupation and looting of resource-rich middle-eastern countries by slapping the 'terrorist' label onto them.

Triumph of the resistance

Despite the horrific violence against their people, their total isolation on the global stage (with the notable exception of Iran), and the odds stacked overwhelmingly against them, the Yemeni people under the brilliant leadership of Sayyid Abdul Malik al-Houthi fought the invaders heroically and refused to surrender.

Northern Yemen's rugged geography helped to protect it, in addition to solid public support and a remarkable lack of collaborators and informants, who all seemed to have fled south at the start of the war. Such an incredible level of societal loyalty to the resistance leadership is a rare phenomenon, perhaps comparable only to Gaza or to DPR Korea.

The only serious internal challenge to Ansar Allah's leadership occurred in late 2017, when former president Ali Abdullah Saleh suddenly declared that he was ending his alliance with Ansar Allah and joining the side of the aggressors. It seems he had been

secretly in touch with the invaders for a long time, plotting to launch an internal uprising that would catch the resistance off guard.

Saleh once famously said that he had remained in power all those years by "dancing on the heads of snakes". This time, however, he was finally bitten—fatally.

The counter-revolutionary uprising by Saleh's supporters was a total failure and was crushed within a few days, culminating in the dramatic capture and summary execution of Saleh by Ansar Allah fighters. Thus was the ignominious end of imperialism's most loyal servant in Yemen. Saleh's son Tareq fled to the south with his remaining loyalists and officially joined the pro-imperialist coalition forces, depriving the imperialists of their last significant fifth column within the ranks of the Yemeni resistance.

As the stalemate situation on the ground continued, the motley coalition that had been cobbled together in the south, consisting of al-Qaeda/Isis elements, southern separatists, salafists and various tribes affiliated with the Hadi government-in-exile, started to fall apart and fight amongst themselves.

The UAE rather cleverly focused its support on southern separatists, who still retained significant popularity, whilst Saudi Arabia continued to hold onto Hadi and his dwindling band of loyalists as the 'constitutional' president. Tensions between the two erupted into a war within a war in 2019, which ended with the UAE-backed separatists seizing control of Aden and much of the south coast and kicking out Hadi's loyalists—a further blow to the so-called 'internationally-recognised government'. The UAE also seized and effectively annexed the Yemeni island of Socotra, with virtually no media attention.

Meanwhile, Ansar Allah continued to improve its technological and military capabilities in leaps and bounds. This became apparent when, in late 2019, the resistance used drones to launch a spectacular attack on the Abqaiq-Khuras oil refinery in Saudi Arabia, temporarily crippling Saudi oil production

and sending shivers through global markets.

Imperialist media outlets and politicians rushed to blame Iran for the attack, providing no evidence other than “the impact looks like it came from the north”. In reality, blaming Iran was a face-saving exercise for western weapons-manufacturing monopolies, which were deeply embarrassed that their eye-wateringly expensive ‘state-of-the-art’ area denial systems were outsmarted so easily by cheap Yemeni drones.

Notably, mass terror bombing by the coalition largely ceased following this strike and blockade relief began to be allowed through, bringing an end to the worst of the humanitarian crisis. This clearly shows that imperialism does not show mercy or respite until it is forced to do so—usually out of fear of being given a bloody nose by an enemy powerful enough to hit back hard. This is a crucial lesson that all oppressed peoples must never lose sight of.

The exiled so-called ‘internationally recognised government’ was now in a weak position, having lost control of virtually all population centres in Yemen to either Ansar Allah or UAE-backed bourgeois separatists, whilst the successful Abqaiq-Khuras operation had put the fear of God into its Saudi allies. In 2022, the much-hallowed ‘constitutional’, ‘legitimate’, ‘democratically-elected president’ Hadi was finally forced into retirement by the Saudis, who chose a new puppet to lead the pretend government-in-exile whose legitimacy and relevance today makes Juan Guaidó look like Vladimir Putin.

Despite the total isolation and embargo of the Ansar Allah government, recognised only by Iran and Syria, living standards of ordinary Yemenis in the liberated areas remained relatively stable, whilst those in coalition-held areas began to freefall. The Yemeni central bank was effectively split in two by the war, leading to the de facto creation of two currencies. The coalition authorities in the south had engaged in mass money printing, which led to hyperinflation and impoverished the masses. Ansar Allah’s government in the north, by contrast, enforced a strict ban on the entry

of the new banknotes from their territory and successfully maintained a stable currency as a result.

Role of the Ansar Allah leadership

Ansar Allah functions somewhat like a vanguard movement; it provides leadership and spiritual guidance but it is happy to engage in governmental alliances with any patriotic party or individual that wants to help free Yemen from imperial control—such as the patriotic portion of the former ruling General People’s Congress (GPC) for example.

Day-to-day governance is handled by the supreme political council, whose leader is effectively president of Yemen (although not recognised by any country, of course). The first president of the council was Muhammad Ali al-Houthi (another of Sayyid Husain al-Houthi’s sons), who was soon replaced by Saleh Ali al-Sammad, perhaps to avoid the appearance of having too many al-Houthi family members in key positions. Al-Sammad was killed in a Saudi airstrike in 2018, to be succeeded by Mahdi al-Mashat who remains in the position to this day.

However, the ultimate power in the country lies in the hands of Sayyid Abdul Malik al-Houthi, the long-time leader of Ansar Allah. He holds no official position in the government, but his charisma and immense prestige earned through years of struggle has made him the real leader of the country, and he is generally recognised as such.

Sayyid Abdul Malik acts primarily as a spiritual leader, roughly analogous to the role of Ayatollah Ali Khamenei in Iran. He has not appeared in public since the 2014 revolution for obvious security reasons, but he regularly appears on the airwaves to give Islamic lectures and spiritual guidance, as well as political speeches which lay out Yemen’s positions and ideology in minute detail.

A notable aspect of Sayyid Abdul-Malik’s leadership style is that he makes a point of carefully explaining important political and ideological issues to the population in clear formal Arabic (aimed at the wider

Arab world as well as the domestic population), and in a very frank and honest manner. Even during heavy US-Israeli bombing in 2024, Sayyid Abdul Malik's daily Ramadan lecture series continued without interruption.

Such a leadership style, if analogies can be drawn, is perhaps somewhat similar to Russia's president Vladimir Putin or Venezuela's Hugo Chávez. It is certainly in total contrast to western politicians, who typically avoid making major speeches to the public, preferring soundbites and PR spin. The decadent imperialist bourgeois would never dream of going on telly and clearly explaining his/her real agenda to the general public.

Red Sea blockade gives tangible solidarity to Palestine

By this stage, despite the continuing division of the country, Ansar Allah had effectively won the war, in the sense that the coalition had all but given up its campaign to destroy it, or even to dislodge it from San'aa. However, the country was still ignored by western media until the autumn of 2023, when Israel began its campaign of genocide against the Gaza strip.

Ansar Allah's leadership publicly declared that, in response to the Zionist refusal to allow food or medicine into Gaza, it would impose a reciprocal blockade on Israel by physically stopping/intercepting all Israel-bound commercial shipping in the Red Sea. Friend and foe laughed, but the laughter turned to shock when Yemeni naval forces intercepted and impounded the *Galaxy Leader* in November 2023, proving that the government in San'aa did, in fact, have the capacity to follow through on its promises.

For the first time, the mass media began to pay real attention to 'the Houthis'. Imperialist talking heads spat venom on TV and in the newspapers, demanding military action to stop the 'Houthi-led attacks on commercial shipping', characterising them as mere piracy.

However, given the public disgust at the Final Solution being implemented by the Israeli fascists in Gaza, along with Ansar Allah's clear and repeated statements (which the media did their best to obfuscate) that it was only targeting Israeli shipping and only for as long as Gaza remained besieged, this propaganda had limited effect. The rise of TikTok, Telegram and other social media apps that the Zionists had a limited ability to influence (as opposed to the near-total imperialist control over mainstream media, Facebook, Instagram, etc) also helped to spread myth-busting information, particularly to members of the younger generations.

Commercial shipping to the Eilat port in southern Israel trickled to a minimum, to the point that the company operating the port ultimately filed for bankruptcy.

US air strikes fail to crush Yemeni solidarity

The US regime launched a military operation to intimidate Ansar Allah into ending the blockade and, for the first time, began direct air strikes on their forces. This campaign quickly fizzled out, as very few other countries involved themselves, and the Gulf States in particular refused to have anything to do with it, perhaps still suffering PTSD from the thrashing they had so recently received. Indeed, during the previous proxy phase of the war, Sayyid Abdul-Malik had openly challenged the USA to fight Yemen directly rather than through proxies and said that he was looking forward to that confrontation.

The blockade on the Eilat port did not stop the genocide, but it did create huge economic difficulties for the Zionists, and it did result in a massive wave of global sympathy for Yemen—even in Arab countries that had been subjected to non-stop anti-Houthi propaganda for years. For the first time, supporting Ansar Allah became a popular position, and pro-Yemen flags and slogans began to appear at Palestine protests in Britain and other western countries.

In early 2025, the blockade was temporarily paused

when Israel agreed to a ceasefire and allowed aid into Gaza. The blockade quickly snapped back into action when the genocide resumed a few weeks later, with more zionist-linked ships being confiscated and even sunk by the resistance.

Following the renewed blockade, Israel and the USA began a joint bombing campaign on Yemen (remember when they said Donald Trump had never started any wars?). At this point, however, this was arguably more of a knee-jerk and impotent response by the imperialists than anything else. The bombing campaign, like all those before it, was called off after a short time after achieving absolutely nothing beyond the murder of several hundred innocent people.

Unlike Iran and Lebanon, Yemen is quite homogenous and remote, with very few foreigners able to enter the Ansar Allah-controlled part of the country. Its people are largely rural and very conservative, with very little influence of western liberal ideas. This is in contrast with the more liberal cosmopolitan feel of Tehran (Iran) or Beirut (Lebanon), which provides a far better recruiting ground for western intelligence operatives in search of potential traitors and defectors. Moreover, there was a thorough purge of fifth columnists during the war with the Saudi-Emirati coalition, with nearly all traitors either fleeing to the south or to Saudi Arabia.

As a result, the USA and Israel for the first time found themselves blind and unable to target accurately owing to an acute lack of ground-level intelligence. At one point, they were reportedly reduced to choosing bombing targets based on random Twitter posts by zionist activists claiming to be using 'open-source information' (ie, looking at a Google satellite view to see if you can spot something that looks like it might be a military base).

The calm before the storm

Looking back, it is truly incredible to see how far the Yemenis have come since the days of Sayyid Hussain al-Houthi's early anti-imperialist activism. A solid activist base was built with strong links to the masses,

which then developed into a formidable paramilitary force that fought through years of war with the Saleh dictatorship, faced down the west-backed salafis and various al-Qaeda/Isis mercenaries, seized power, endured years of genocidal bombing and blockade by imperialism's regional proxies, and has most recently triumphed against a direct intervention by the USA and Israel combined.

At the time of Sayyid Hussain's murder, no one could have guessed that his blood would end up watering such a blossoming tree of resistance.

Yemen now faces the calm before the storm. The situation may be relatively peaceful today, but there can be absolutely no doubt that imperialism is planning something major against the liberated government of the north; it is simply too powerful and too dangerous to be left alone. Northern Yemeni security forces are already involved in breaking up Mossad networks that have been sent to infiltrate the country.

Yemen will come under attack again, that is certain. And we can also be sure that the next attack will be accompanied by a huge propaganda campaign aimed at demonising Ansar Allah—maybe on a 'women's rights', 'anti-terror' or 'anti-islamic' pretext.

When that onslaught comes, it will stop being trendy to support Yemen. That is when anti-imperialists and revolutionaries deserving of the name will need to remain steadfast in their support for Ansar Allah, regardless of the abuse that will undoubtedly be heaped on the Yemeni branch of the regional Axis of Resistance.

The resistant people of Yemen have become a shining light for oppressed people all around the world, and it is in all our interests that they should continue to be victorious in their life-and-death struggle with the dark forces of zionism and Anglo-American imperialism.

*Long live anti-imperialist Yemen, under the leadership of Ansar Allah and Sayyid Abdul-Malik al-Houthi!
Imperialism out of the middle east!*

What does the sacrifice of the 32 Cubans signify, and what is the dirty role of the renegades acting on orders in WWII?

Dimitrios Patelis | Founding member of the Revolutionary Theory Group (Greece)

Contents

- Partial readjustment of imperialist tactics and the mafia-style dastardly raid to kidnap Venezuela's anti-imperialist leader
- The despicable reaction of the renegades to the attempted regime change operation in Venezuela
- What does the internationalist self-sacrifice of the 32 Cuban fighters signify for the character of WWII, and how are renegades shamefully burying it?
- On the wretchedness of immoral metaphysical 'philosophy' and the hypocrisy of apostates
- The vile deceit of the renegades is being repeated in the imperialist attempt at regime change in Iran
- Can class and political confrontation at the local level be detached from the stakes of WWII?
- The need to crush both the renegades and the deception of 'equal distances' is vital for the movement
- In conclusion: the awakening of consciences and the escalation of the anti-imperialist struggle

Partial readjustment of imperialist tactics and the mafia-style dastardly raid to kidnap Venezuela's anti-imperialist leader

At approximately 2:00 a.m. on 3 January, imperialist United States forces launched air raids on multiple locations throughout northern Venezuela, including the capital, Caracas. The main purpose of the attack was to arrest and kidnap Venezuelan President Nicolás Maduro and his wife, Cilia Flores.

However, the fairy tale of US gangsters enjoying a carefree stroll in Caracas was ignominiously overturned. 1. According to information from comrades

in Venezuela, the flight of six helicopters carrying special forces troops from the Delta detachment was accompanied by 150 US aircraft, including a new electronic warfare aircraft which can neutralise all telecommunications and radar tracking systems through signal jamming within a 100-kilometre radius.

The attack was not easy, triumphant or bloodless.

- Total number of deaths: On 7 January 2026, Venezuelan Interior Minister Diosdado Cabello said that 100 people were killed and around 100 others were injured in the attack.

- Military casualties: The deaths of at least 56 military personnel have been confirmed, including 32 Cuban military and police personnel stationed in the country and 24 members of the Venezuelan security forces, mainly the presidential guard.

- Civilian casualties: Reports of civilian deaths from the bombings in urban areas of Caracas and Catia La Mar have emerged, although the exact number remains under investigation.

- US casualties: The US President stated that there had been no American fatalities, but the Pentagon confirmed that seven American soldiers had been wounded, two of whom remained hospitalised following the operation.

Clearly, there has been a cover-up of US military casualties in the fighting. This is not only for reasons of public and international prestige, a cover up of the mafia-style attack With the Hollywood glamour of an 'unbeatable, brilliant, lightning-fast, and bloodless' operation for the invader; it is also to manipulate North American and international public opinion. After all, the US president has the right to conduct

military operations without congressional approval only when the country is under direct attack.

Public acknowledgement of casualties would pose a significant risk, potentially including impeachment. In order to establish his sole authority to wage war, the Führer needs to silence any talk of US losses. WWII requires new forms of instrumentalisation of fascism by the Axis.^[1]

This brutal raid is the first instance of a partial tactical adjustment of imperialism outlined in the latest US National Security Strategy being implemented in WWII.^[2]

The despicable reaction of the renegades to the attempted regime change operation in Venezuela

What would the left, especially the self-proclaimed communists, do in a country that is completely subjugated by transnational institutions of the axis?

Did the 'Communist' Party of Greece mention the US's murderous invasion of Venezuela and the abduction of the country's legitimate president? If so, how did they respond?

According to the 'K'KE website, on 3 January 2026, 'Trump claimed that Maduro had been arrested and deported from Venezuela', quoting the Associated Press 'news' without comment. Only brainless, uneducated mouthpieces of the axis would present the abduction of a sovereign country's legitimate leader by imperialism as 'deportation'. Deportation is the act of removing a foreign national from a sovereign state for reasons of public interest (administrative deportation) or as a security measure imposed by a criminal court (judicial deportation). It is a measure imposed only on foreign nationals for reasons related to national security or public order. By using this wording, the editors effectively recognise the US invader as the legitimate authority of Venezuela that is deporting Maduro!

One could argue that the authors merely reported the situation 'according to Trump'. Fair enough. But

why did they not comment on this 'view of Trump' in any way? Were they afraid of tarnishing it? In politics, not commenting on an issue or taking a stance already constitutes a stance on the presented opinion. This stance is, in principle, positive.

The subsequent guilty behaviour, accompanied by clumsy 'corrections', confirms the above judgement. Following widespread criticism, they replaced the legal-political verb 'deported' with the 'neutral' spatial 'removed', initially in the title and later in the article.

In a statement issued on 3 January 2026 regarding Venezuela, the Press Office of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Greece ('K'KE) notes, among other things:

'The USA is bathing Venezuela in blood as well. [...] The true objective of the US imperialist intervention is to plunder the country's energy wealth and align the region with its economic and geopolitical interests, against its competitors, Russia and China...!' In other words, the official 'K'KE position is practically justifying the US invasion of Venezuela and 'overthrowing of the Maduro government' as a reasonable response to competitors such as Russia and China in the context of expected inter-imperialist conflicts over energy wealth.^[3]

In other words, the official 'K'KE position:

1. Does not explain why they label this an 'imperialist intervention' rather than an 'inter-imperialist conflict'. Does the infamous 'imperialist pyramid' dogma, which states that 'all countries in the imperialist stage are imperialist', no longer apply?
2. Is justifying the US invasion of Venezuela and the 'overthrowing of the Maduro government' as a reasonable 'response to their competitors', Russia and China, in the context of expected 'inter-imperialist conflicts to seize energy wealth'. In this position, the attempt to overthrow the government and the gangster-style kidnapping of Maduro simply seem 'reasonable and natural'!

The Press Office of the 'K'KE saw and heard nothing

about the fierce and deadly battles aimed at seizing or kidnapping the leader of the Bolivarian Revolution and President of the country, Maduro. Or worse, they consider it justified and unworthy of mention since ‘Maduro had chosen a side, had chosen imperialists/thieves, by siding with Russia, China, etc.’!

The absurdity of these claims is clear. Given the close economic, diplomatic, political and military-technical relations with the anti-imperialist pole, how much sooner would this imperialist intervention have taken place if these relations did not exist? Of course this is a rhetorical question.

They even add that ‘Only the Venezuelan people themselves can determine the future of their country and mount a decisive response to the US imperialists.’ What does this mean in practical terms? In numerous articles and speeches by its officials, and based on the stance of its ‘brotherly’ fractionalist group (known in Venezuela and internationally as the Figuera fraction), the ‘K’KE has characterised Maduro as an illegitimate ‘social-democrat dictator’ who ‘rules through rigged elections’, ‘persecutes communists’, and ‘sells out the country to the imperialists’, and so on. In short, the ‘K’KE is in perfect agreement with the US authorities’ accusations and basically considers that ‘the dictator Maduro must be overthrown because he lacks legitimacy’!

Incidentally, the real, massive Communist Party of Venezuela (as opposed to Figuera’s ‘K’KE-aligned fraction) is the second most voted parliamentary party in the country and participates in the ruling front.

However, if Maduro ‘must be overthrown because he lacks legitimacy’, then the US’s actions in invading the country and kidnapping him are probably justified! The only ‘disagreement’ lies in a mere procedural detail: ‘Who has the right to determine developments in the country?’ In other words, who is entitled to carry out regime change: the US or the local opposition, i.e. US agents? Did the leaders of this ‘democratic opposition’ not call on the US to

‘intervene and restore order’? Here, the ‘K’KE took a clear ‘revolutionary stance’ on the process, rather than the essence: They support the overthrow of Maduro in full alignment with the axis, with one caveat: the overthrow must be carried out by the ‘local opposition’ of US agents! Let us not allow the US to take the job away from the ‘honest and guileless local opposition’.

What does the internationalist self-sacrifice of the 32 Cuban fighters signify for the character of WWII, and how are renegades shamefully burying it

After widespread criticism and a three-day delay, the website of the bureaucratic clergy finally deigned to write: ‘32 Cuban soldiers fell in the battle with the invaders in Venezuela’.^[4] Under the headline, they once again confined themselves to republishing the Associated Press report with no comment. It seems that the bourgeois media is more reliable for our bureaucracy than the assessments of the revolutionary forces. Perhaps this love affair with the credibility of the Associated Press warrants a special clinical study.

Not a word about the significance of the sacrifice of the 32 Cubans in the battle to defend Venezuela’s president. Clearly, the bureaucratic mechanism is suffering from severe intolerance and writer’s block and will continue to do so until it comes up with a ‘new’ plausible mixture of rotten rubbish to feed to its flock. They are struggling to reconcile the inescapable fact of Cuban internationalism with the nonsense of their ‘imperialist pyramid’.

Even more delayed was the mention of Cuba’s involvement by the ‘International Relations Department of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Greece’, notorious for its apostasy and subversive-divisive role in the World Communist Movement, which came at noon on 7 January.

What does this statement tell us?

1. It ‘condemns the latest provocative threats by US

imperialism against the people of Cuba and other peoples, emboldened by the imperialist intervention in Venezuela.’

2. It ‘expresses its solidarity with the people and the Communist Party of Cuba, and extends its heartfelt condolences for the 32 Cuban fighters who lost their lives to the fire of the US military machine during the attack in Venezuela.’

3. It states that ‘The people and the Communist Party of Cuba, drawing on their revolutionary legacy, will resist subversive actions and all forms of hardship arising from the escalation of imperialist aggression [i.e. ‘all imperialists’: the US, the People’s Republic of China, Russia, Iran, etc.—note by D.P.] in Latin America and Caribbean.’

Above, we saw how the ‘K’KE justifies imperialist intervention in Venezuela.

The most important thing, of course, is not what the document proclaims in order to muddy the waters, but what it does not dare mention: what the bureaucracy avoids like the plague. What exactly were the Cuban heroes doing in Venezuela? What was the purpose of this special mission of the Armed Forces of Socialist Cuba that cost 32 brave soldiers their lives?

The communists and the Cuban people did their duty in defending the anti-imperialist Bolivarian revolutionary process. This is what they have done since the beginning of the Chavistas’ rise to power:

- With thousands of doctors and nurses, they established and strengthened the country’s health system, training thousands of Venezuelan citizens in medical and nursing specialties.
- They carried out an unprecedented project to eradicate illiteracy and reorganise the education system with thousands of teachers.
- Thousands of Armed Forces and Security Forces personnel contributed to training and reorganising the relevant institutions in Venezuela.

In the spirit of international solidarity, Venezuela is reciprocating to the island of freedom by shouldering the main responsibility for supplying Cuba with oil.

The United States has moved quickly to cut off this supply, primarily through a naval blockade and the hijacking of tankers.

The Cuban people have now done the same, at a critical stage in the escalation of WWIII when the financial oligarchy of the imperialist axis have launched a new theatre of operations. The imperialist axis led by the US, after Ukraine, Palestine, Iran, Yemen and all West Asia, the countries of the Sahel and all of Africa, and the Caucasus, is now brutally and predatorily attacking Venezuela, targeting Cuba, Colombia, Nicaragua, Mexico, the Caribbean and all the peoples of Latin America.

From the perspective of the progressive forces, the most fundamental class characteristic of WWIII, which the ‘K’KE bureaucracy diligently conceals, is the urgent task of crushing the monocacy of the US-NATO-EU-Zionist imperialist axis. This involves redefining the global balance of forces and reducing imperialism’s ability to extract surplus value from the global working class in the form of monopoly superprofits (the main vehicle for which is the control of financial flows and transactions through the global currency). This must be achieved by cutting off Monopoly Capital from its regional and global sources of parasitism. This is the ABCs of Leninism in conditions of imperialism and WWIII, and of the general crisis of the global capitalist system!^[5]

It is exactly this brutal and barbaric aggression that urgently calls for the consolidation of all national liberation movements and anti-imperialist forces, spearheaded by global early socialism and the communists!^[6]

It was precisely this duty that our comrades from socialist Cuba heroically responded to when they took up arms in Venezuela, as did our fearless comrades from the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea (who are equally despised by every sell-out bureaucracy) in Kursk!

This is exactly what the bureaucracy is trying to cover up, ineptly conniving to deceive with vagueness

and blatant lies. Exhibiting incredibly slow reflexes and in the wake of widespread criticism also of their selective mutism, they issued a statement that said nothing about the above central task to which the Cubans responded heroically.

For the bureaucrats, the 32 brave Cuban soldiers simply ‘lost their lives to the fire of the US military machine during the attack on Venezuela!’ In their narrative, there is no imperialist axis on the offensive in WWII; no irreconcilable contradictions breeding and fuelling war; no camps in this war; no united anti-imperialist front in which Cuba, the pioneering country of early socialism, is bravely and militantly participating. Instead, they depict an impersonal ‘US military machine’ that opened fire during a random attack in Venezuela, where the Cubans happened to be.

Why are they doing this? Because they can’t bring themselves to say out loud what they’ve been whispering to their flock for years: that supposedly no socialist country exists in the world today, not even Cuba. That in the imperialist stage, supposedly all countries automatically become imperialist and/or pursue imperialist policies. That supposedly, the Leninist distinction between imperialist, dependent, etc. countries is meaningless and ‘anyone who sets anti-imperialist tasks believes in the ‘theory of stages’ and is an ‘opportunist who stands under the banner of the bourgeoisie’!^[7]

On the wretchedness of immoral metaphysical ‘philosophy’ and the hypocrisy of the renegades

We have to draw attention to the fact that when, amid the rapid escalation of the most class-based of all previous wars, WWII, some spout unscientific and unfounded slogans such as ‘All countries are imperialist/thieves’ and exclaim, ‘I condemn imperialism no matter where it comes from’, they are simply admitting their alignment with the most wretched moral-political ‘philosophy’ of the bourgeoisie and

the vulgar ideological constructions and dogmas of reactionary abstract humanism and ‘non-violence’.

Logically and methodologically, this slogan is equivalent to the proven hypocrisy of the bourgeois platitude, ‘I condemn violence no matter where it comes from!’ The latter clearly states one thing: ‘I reject any version of rebellion and revolution from below, the working class and the people. Therefore, in practice, I accept the monopoly on the use of violence (as defined by Max Weber) by capital organised into a state and by the ruling class, and its state and non-state instruments!’ How does this happen? Very simply, violence is detached from the objective historical, economic, and social causes that give rise to it—inequality, the satisfaction of some people’s needs at the expense of others, exploitation, oppression, competition, and alienation—and is transformed into an abstract evil that is both omnipresent and omnipotent.

So, according to this metaphysical conception of violence, what remains? Only one ‘solution’: its metaphysical excommunication and exorcism—the moralising of the ethical ‘rejection of violence no matter where it comes from’. Such metaphysical slogans depoliticise the people by abstractly generalising that ‘all politics is violent and dirty’, and therefore ‘all revolutionary movements are violent and unacceptable’.

How does this bureaucracy understand imperialism within the framework of the anti-Leninist, irrational dogma of the ‘imperialist pyramid’? In a similar way to the metaphysical dogma of abstract bourgeois ‘anti-violence’.

Imperialism is detached from the objective, concrete, historical, economic and social causes that give rise to it: when and where it emerges (in which countries) the stage of development of the productive forces, the stage of development of the relations of production of capital (concentration and centralisation of production, subordination of industrial capital to banking and finance, etc.), the level of correlation

between the extensive and intensive development of capital that affects global inequality in a certain way, to what extent vestiges of pre-capitalist structures still exist, the emergence of a handful of rentier-parasite countries (Lenin), the establishment of a mechanism for extracting surplus value on a global scale through monopoly superprofits and the consequent use of the world as prey for colonialism and neo-colonialism.

In fact, what is ignored here is the effect that the rise and fall of the global revolutionary process, socialist revolutions, and associated anti-imperialist movements and revolutions have on the conditions and limits of the capitalist system.

Thus, imperialism turns into a dead letter, it becomes synonymous with capitalism in general—an omnipresent, all-encompassing abstract ‘evil’! It is so a historically abstract that it is ultimately identified with capitalism in general, since monopoly is deliberately identified with ‘joint-stock companies’, a form of capital characteristic of early capitalism in Venice, for example. Consequently, they consider that ‘the economic essence of monopoly capitalism, i.e. imperialism, is considered to be the formation and domination of all the basic sectors of a capitalist economy by large joint-stock companies (monopolies).^[8] Thus, the concept of imperialism becomes overstretched and redundant. This confusion is exacerbated by the deliberate deception of equating the terms ‘imperialist stage’ and ‘imperialist state’!

Thus, according to this anti-Leninist, metaphysical conception of imperialism held by our opportunists, only one solution remains: the metaphysical excommunication and exorcism of imperialism, in other words, the abstract moralising of ‘rejecting imperialism no matter where it comes from’. This unequivocally rejects any real anti-imperialist, national liberation or anti-colonial struggle, uprising or revolution from below by the working class or peoples. In practice, they therefore accept the monopoly of imperialist war waged by interstate entities with claims to global governance, the financial oligarchy

based in imperialist countries and the aggressive US-NATO-EU-Zionist axis! At the same time, this opportunism—the fifth column of the axis—slanders and discredits the forces of socialism and anti-imperialism, undermining any hope and prospect for humanity!

It is precisely this unscientific ‘anti-imperialist’ manipulation that is peddled by every renegade fraudster who arbitrarily labels as ‘imperialist’ not only countries dependent on imperialism with an average or below-average level of development of its productive forces, and countries that are victims of systematic colonial and neo-colonial exploitation by monopoly capital, but also those countries of early socialism that continue socialist construction with their national and historical specificities.

Any anti-imperialism under this slogan—crude deception, is labelled ‘imperialism’ and/or ‘imperialist policy’ by the bureaucracy masquerading as ‘orthodoxy’, and is unequivocally condemned and cast out.

This is not an error or the result of an insufficient understanding of Marxism-Leninism, as some well-meaning comrades continue to believe. They do not grasp the nature of the degeneration and opportunistic mutation of what remains of the ‘K’KE. It is a deliberate class stance in favour of the imperialist axis. It is a mission and a set of duties that serve the enemy!

Thus, we can see how this perverse, abstract ‘anti-imperialism’ of ‘equal distances’, like bourgeois abstract ‘anti-violence’ and ‘anti-totalitarianism’, means accepting and reinforcing the monopoly of aggression by real—not imaginary—imperialist powers and their transnational institutions. This is clearly revealed by the escalating conditions of WWII. As we have demonstrated, ‘equal distances’ are the veil of NATO, since they practically exonerate and whitewash their own imperialist coalition—the one into which the ruling class has dragged Greece. It is in this ideological and political superstructure

that the degenerated opportunist bureaucracy lives, feeds and reproduces itself. This abstract 'anti-imperialism' is also linked to their abstract, ahistorical 'communism'.^[9]

If they were, therefore, consistent with their pharaonic nonsense about the 'imperialist pyramid' and their stance of 'equal distances', the bureaucracy should openly denounce Cuba right now because it 'chose an imperialist/thief' in WWII! In other words, they should denounce Cuba for choosing to stand with the anti-imperialist and socialist forces today, and for paying for this conscious internationalist choice with blood!

This, however, would highlight the Perissos bureaucracy's apostasy, betrayal and disgrace even more clearly. In recent years, they have taken on the role of 'vanguard' in attempting to disorientate, subvert, divide and dissolve the global anti-imperialist and communist movement.

The renegades are expressing their 'heartfelt condolences' to Cuba, just as they did to the Syrian Communist Party in July 2025 when they buried the great anti-imperialist and anti-Zionist fighter and General Secretary of the Syrian Communist Party, c. Ammar Baghdash who was persecuted by imperialism, after they had cynically condemned him to eight months of silence and obscurity.

Their 'heartfelt condolences' to Cuba are therefore nothing more than 'crocodile tears': a bureaucratically perfunctory, fake, feigned grief designed to deceive the world once again and fulfil their 'public relations' obligations towards Cuba. It is also an obligation towards that section of the people and their flock who continue to honour the Cuban Revolution and every other socialist revolution and country of early socialism, despite the bureaucracy's efforts to undermine it. Since they cannot lash out at Cuba here and now, they are concealing and silencing Cuba's dedication to the internationalist anti-imperialist cause and the defence of popular leader Maduro.

The vile deceit of the renegades is being repeated in the imperialist attempt at regime change in Iran

Perhaps the bureaucrats made a mistake in their response to the imperialist attacks on Venezuela and Cuba. Have they adopted a more sober view of the aggression of the imperialist axis against Iran?

Consider how the same 'yes, but' narrative is expressed in relation to Iran:

'The Communist Party of Greece condemns the provocative threats by the USA of a new imperialist military attack on Iran, in cooperation with the state of Israel, within the framework of broader imperialist competition [...] We once again emphasize that developments in Iran must be decided by the Iranian people themselves, who are fighting for their rights against the anti-popular policies of the government and the bourgeois state. These policies have fuelled inflation, kept wages at extremely low levels, employed repression against popular mobilizations, leading to the killing of protesters, and banned the activities of the Communist Party (Tudeh) and the exercise of political rights. The people of Iran alone are competent to determine the political and social developments in their country.'^[10]

Recently, a consistent 'observation' has emerged. The axis and its supporters always claim that the countries they target have 'anti-popular government and state policies which have triggered inflation, kept wages very low, used repression against popular mobilisations, killed protesters, prohibited the exercise of political rights', and so on!

ATTENTION! There is no mention of the causes of the 'inflation, low wages', etc. Not a word about the economic strangulation of the target country, orchestrated by imperialism through blockades and sanctions against not only the target country and its people, but also all entities, countries and companies, both public and private, that dare to cooperate with or conduct economic transactions with the sanctioned country! The intended consequence of this is a deterioration in the people's standard of living, causing

indignation and protests. This dissent is deliberately funnelled towards ‘spontaneous movements’ to overthrow anti-imperialist and anti-neocolonialist governments that are inconvenient for the axis.

Coincidence? Of course not! It is an integral part of the opportunists’ agenda and necessary for their pro-regime role in covering up imperialist crimes. The bulk of axis propaganda is crudely staged: it is not the perpetrator who is blamed for cutting off oxygen supply, but the people and their government are to blame for their own suffocation! They are implicitly but clearly always to blame, since ‘they have not yet overthrown their own government or actively helped their external ‘saviours’ to overthrow it’! Whether the government of the target country has been democratically elected by an overwhelming majority or if it enjoys legitimacy and popular acceptance is of no concern to the schemers.

Can class and political confrontation at the local level be detached from the stakes of WWII?

It is a fact that every confrontation, every political conflict and every change in the balance of forces at national and international levels is organically intertwined with the major field of class struggle in the rapidly escalating WWII.

Whether violent or ‘peaceful’, imperialist interventions and attempts at regime change in countries deemed undesirable by the axis of aggression through ‘colour revolutions’ (coups), the installation of the axis’s mouthpieces in power and appointed proxy regimes, or even a combination of brutal intervention and civil war, are nothing more than forms of escalation of class struggle on a global scale, organically integrated into the framework of WWII. Under these conditions, no task of internal political confrontation within individual countries can be metaphysically detached from the broader conflict of WWII.

For this reason, crushing the imperialist axis of

aggression is of existential importance for the movement and survival of humanity. This requires forming and developing a victorious front at all levels, with communists meticulously redefining their strategy and tactics locally and globally. On this basis, any undermining of the united frontal struggle must therefore be systematically exposed and combated, regardless of the guise or label it appears under (e.g. ‘class purity’ in each individual country, neoliberal postmodern rights activism, nationalism, aggressive bourgeois atheism/anticlericalism etc.).

The need to crush both the renegades and the deception of ‘equal distances’ is of vital importance for the movement

There are no ‘equal distances’. Today, the idea of ‘equal distances’ is the loincloth covering blatant rotten subservience to the US-NATO-EU-Zionist imperialist axis.

There is no longer any room for bourgeois niceties, ‘good manners’, or ‘political correctness’ towards the exposed renegades—the traitors of the communist movement who claim to be the ‘only orthodox and consistent ones’, while acting as a fifth column for imperialism within the ranks of the movement.

The renegade Kautsky and the ‘orthodoxy’ of the Second International had chosen the same role during WWI—keeping historical proportionality in mind—and by Stinas and a significant portion of the Trotskyists-Archaeo-Marxists during WWII in Greece.

Lenin, Stalin, Dimitrov and other brilliant leaders, taught us that if apostasy within the ranks of the movement during wartime is not uncovered and decisively crushed, the revolutionary movement has no chance to win!

Those who take issue with the wording of this exposure of apostasy and reject the necessity of exposing this criminal fraud simply do not understand the need for a split and purge within the world communist movement today. They are effectively calling

on Lenin to rewrite his work ‘The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky’ with a ‘softer’ title, such as: ‘The Proletarian Revolution and Our Beloved Pal Kautsky’!

It’s time to put an end to delusions and confusion! The dividing line is clear and unambiguous. Many refuse to recognise this, invoking unity and the need for consensus within the left and the communist movement. Unity on what basis? On the abstract principles of ‘loving one another’ and ‘not using harsh language’? Or on ‘not calling opportunists renegades’ in case we upset the bureaucracy and those who still harbour illusions? Are the labels ‘harsh’ today, while the realities of imperialist aggression in WWII and the opportunists’ capitulation to the axis are ‘soft and lenient’?

Finally, what are some ‘consensual’ and ‘well-meaning’ people ultimately seeking today? Is it the victory of anti-imperialist and communist forces, the defeat of the axis, or is it perhaps to avoid upsetting the proven fifth column of the enemy—the most dangerous form of opportunism in WWII?

We must put an end to well-meaning delusions! The ‘K’KE bureaucrats are not mistaken; they do not merely lack scientific revolutionary theory and understanding. They are cynically carrying out a mission to undermine the movement in WWII. It is a mission that they have undertaken on a national and international scale.

In times of crisis and war, unity is impossible without a clear, Leninist distinction between the forces of revolution and the forces of covert counter-revolution, if we do not clearly separate our positions on matters of life and death in strategy and tactics. Lenin insisted on the need to decisively separate ourselves from Russian and Western European revisionists and opportunists. ‘Before we can unite, and in order that we may unite’ he wrote, we must first of all draw firm and definite lines of demarcation. Otherwise, our unity will be purely fictitious, it will conceal the prevailing confusion and binder its radical elimina-

tion.’^[11]

The question, then, is how long we will allow this fifth column of the axis to continue to deceive and manipulate?

In conclusion: the awakening of consciences and the escalation of the anti-imperialist struggle

The escalation of WWII is rapidly and massively awakening consciences.

The self-sacrifice of the brave DPRK soldiers on the Ukrainian front and the courageous Cuban soldiers in Caracas is becoming a beacon that illuminates the path to mobilising in the anti-imperialist struggle.

The demarcation between life and death in WWII has long been clear to those who possess revolutionary theory and methodology for judgement and action. The forces of opportunism bear enormous responsibility for destroying the critical and creative relationship between their congregation, cadres, members and followers, and Marxist-Leninist science, as well as the corresponding consistent revolutionary attitude towards life. This hinders even the possibility of scientific research and findings being widely perceived on a large scale.

War can rouse the masses of the working class and ordinary people from their intellectual and practical lethargy. War generates events that awaken consciences more effectively and quickly than ordinary enlightenment and propaganda.

With their sacrifice, the 32 Cuban heroes upheld the honour of Cuba, early socialism, Latin America and all the peoples of the world. They clearly and practically demonstrated the scientifically substantiated demarcation in conditions of the escalating WWII: either with the imperialist axis of aggression or with the world Anti-imperialist Communist Front.

This is precisely what the World Anti-Imperialist Platform was formed and is acting towards, with the following objectives:

1. To coordinate and develop a united front of the

forces of anti-imperialism and socialism on a global scale, to crush the number one enemy of humanity: the axis of aggression of the US-NATO-EU-Zionism.

2. To expose and crush the disorientating, subversive and divisive ideological constructions and practices of the opportunists, revisionists and renegades everywhere, who act as agents of the axis within the movement, and

3. To cultivate, develop and consolidate communists around the world who are consistent in their revolutionary theory and practice. Without their pioneering and selfless internationalist struggle, no living, breathing front is possible.

This is the only consistent revolutionary and internationalist stance today.

Notes

[1] See 'On the Relationship Between Imperialism and Fascism in the 21st Century'

[2] See 'Changes in strategy or adjustments to imperialism's tactics in World War III?'

[3] The USA is bathing Venezuela in blood as well. The people of Venezuela will prevail!

[4] '32 Cuban soldiers fell in the battle with the invaders in Venezuela'

[5] See 'The Three Component Parts and Three Driving Forces of the Global Revolutionary Movement'

[6] See 'Aspects of the national question and anti-imperialism during WWII'

[7] See also '10 Commandments of the most volatile opportunism and revisionism', 'The escalation of the opportunist drift and the consequent revisions of revolutionary theory' and 'Renegades drifting towards the Symplegades of opportunism, shipwrecked between Scylla and Charybdis (dogmatism & revisionism)' Part 1 & Part 2

[8] V. Opsimos, a member of the Economics Department of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Greece. 'China: Capitalist Development and "Market Socialism"', Rizospastis, 4 January 2026

[9] See 'Why does the imperialist axis adore such 'communists?'

[10] Department of International Relations of the Communist Party of Greece, Jan 15, 2026 'The KKE condemns the provocative threats by the USA of a new imperialist military attack on Iran'

[11] Lenin Collected Works, Progress Publishers, 1964, Moscow, Volume 4, pages 351-356.

Collective Hero, “Nicolás—From Yare to Miraflores”

Stephen Cho | Coordinator of the Korean International Forum

January 24, 2026

This article is a film review of “Nicolás”, a movie depicting the life of Nicolás Maduro.

Maduro is the people, and the people are Maduro. Maduro is Cilia, and Cilia is Maduro. Whether in the era of Chávez or in the era of Maduro, Cilia is the first combatant. Cilia remains by his side even during his days in Manhattan. Maduro is a hero and a collective. He is the representative of the collective hero. The heroic struggle of Maduro and Cilia is giving birth to countless other Maduros and Cilias. Venezuela will not be shaken by imprisonment of one or two people. This is the Bolivarian Revolution. It is the revolution of Venezuela and of Latin America, pioneered and carried forward together by Chávez, Maduro, Cilia, and the collective heroes of Venezuela.

As the words he engraved on a baseball in his childhood once said, challenges are unavoidable when one chooses revolution. His father taught him: “Challenges in life will make you brave. One day, you’ll be a man and the challenges will be even bigger. That’s when you’ll need to fight for a cause that is actually worth it.” Maduro was kidnapped and imprisoned before reaching Miraflores, and he was kidnapped and imprisoned after arriving there as well. Maduro’s words—spoken in the past when he was abducted by lackeys of US imperialism and faced an uncertain death, asking to inform it to the “MBR-200”—now echo in his “V” sign for victory, signaling “We shall win,” sent from today’s terrible situation of being kidnapped directly by US imperialism. An individual may be defeated, but the collective is never defeated.

In Yare, Nicolás was “Verde.” This name, given by Hugo Chávez, is not read merely as wordplay or humor. Chávez entrusted Nicolás with the mission of serving as his bodyguard, placing his life in his hands,

and Nicolás accompanied Chávez, watching closely and learning from him. Then Chávez entrusted the “Comuna” and passed away first. In Miraflores, Nicolás was Maduro. Inheriting the legacy of Chávez, he built more houses even under much more difficult conditions, increased economic independence, and practiced “Comuna o Nada.” He spoke and acted consistently, with the same calm tone he once used to incite strikes.

The plot line and the emotional line intertwine and spiral together, and the carefully built love line of the protagonists whispers that this film is not a documentary but art, warming the viewer’s heart. From *Mañana* and *Bochniche* toward the Bolivarian Revolution, Venezuela advances; within that “historical project,” the collective heroes who shine like stars—and at their very center, the love and struggle of Maduro and Cilia—are always future-oriented, optimistic, confident of victory, and passionate. Likewise, there is the scene in which Maduro, who chose Cuba—the major league of revolution—rather than America, the major league of baseball, stands on a beach in Havana and shouts “El pueblo unido jamás será vencido (The people united will never be defeated)” together with international comrades. Maduro’s destiny as he walks the path of revolution is inevitably intertwined with the destiny of Venezuela and the destiny of Latin America.

The film begins with non-fiction and fiction running parallel, but soon fiction penetrates non-fiction until, at the end, they become completely one. The documentary is art, and the art is a documentary. It remains faithful to the typification techniques of realism, while at the same time breaking down the boundaries between documentary and art. The dialectic realized by the production team weaves history

and reality, society and family, collective and individual, and struggle and love into one, eloquently arguing that only art makes this difficult task possible. In 'Nicolás,' each cinematic element maintains its distinct characteristics, while they simultaneously form an organic synthesis, vividly depicting the yesterday, today, and tomorrow of Maduro, who represents the collective hero of our time.

Ninety years ago, the International Brigades who fought in the Spanish Civil War sacrificed their lives for the revolution, shouting "¡No Pasarán!" If fascism were to pass through Spain, France would be next—then Western and Eastern Europe. Today, if imperialism passes through Venezuela, Cuba will be next—then Central and South America. Venezuela is Latin America, and it is the entire world. Any true communist, internationalist, or anti-imperialist must support and defend the Bolivarian Revolution of Venezuela. The thirty-two heroes born of Cuba gave their lives to protect this Venezuela's Bolivarian Revolution. They are the red stars illuminating the night sky of Caracas—collective heroes who will shine forever in the hearts of humanity.

Hugo Chávez became a target of imperialism as he devoted everything to the Bolivarian Revolution. Maduro, too, did not fear that path, considering it a supreme honor. Chávez, dying at the hands of the US imperialism, stood in the pouring rain before the people and shouted "¡Hasta la Victoria Siempre!" in the final period of his life. Whenever it rains, the people of Venezuela recall that image of Chávez. And today, Maduro, abducted by the US imperialism, is sending the signal of "¡Venceremos!" to his comrades and to the people. The Trump imperialist government made the people of Venezuela, the people of Latin America, and the people of the world its enemies. The unprecedented abduction drama committed by US imperialism will be recorded in history as an unprecedented error that hastened the strategic defeat of imperialism.

Just as Chávez had his Yare period, Maduro now has

his Manhattan period. Jorge Rodríguez, the leader of the revolutionary organization to which Maduro belonged, lost his life due to torture by the CIA's puppet henchmen. A difficult historical task has been placed upon Delcy Rodríguez: to carry on the spirit of her revolutionary father under entirely new conditions. Along the path of the Bolivarian Revolution once taken by Chávez and Maduro, countless heroes are now emerging like mushrooms after the rain. Chávez's "Firm Opinion" recommending Maduro as president overwhelms Trump's "Absolute Resolve" to abduct Maduro. The appearance of the unprecedented villain Donald Trump only intensifies the dramatic intensity of 'Nicholas.' The land of the collective hero, Venezuela, will never be defeated.

Héroe colectivo, “Nicolás—De Yare a Miraflores”

Stephen Cho | Coordinador del Foro Internacional Coreano

24 de enero de 2026

Este artículo es una crítica cinematográfica de “Nicolás”, una película que retrata la vida de Nicolás Maduro.

Maduro es el pueblo, y el pueblo es Maduro. Maduro es Cilia, y Cilia es Maduro. Ya sea en la era de Chávez o en la era de Maduro, Cilia es la primera combatiente; Cilia permanece a su lado incluso durante sus días en Manhattan. Maduro es un héroe y un colectivo. Es el representante del héroe colectivo. La lucha heroica de Maduro y Cilia está dando nacimiento a innumerables Maduros y Cilias. Venezuela no se sacudirá por el encarcelamiento de una o dos personas. Esta es la Revolución Bolivariana, es la revolución de Venezuela y de América Latina, iniciada y llevada adelante conjuntamente por Chávez, Maduro, Cilia y los héroes colectivos de Venezuela.

Tal como decían las palabras que grabó en una pelota de béisbol en su infancia, los desafíos son inevitables cuando se elige la revolución. Su padre le enseñó: “Los desafíos en la vida te harán valiente. Algún día serás un hombre y los desafíos serán aún mayores. Ese será el momento en que necesitarás luchar por una causa que realmente valga la pena”. Maduro fue secuestrado y encarcelado antes de llegar a Miraflores, y también fue secuestrado y encarcelado después de haber llegado allí. Las palabras de Maduro—pronunciadas en el pasado cuando fue secuestrado por los lacayos del imperialismo estadounidense y enfrentó una muerte incierta, pidiendo que se informara al “MBR-200”—hoy resuenan en su signo de “V” de victoria, señalando “Venceremos”, enviado desde la terrible situación actual de haber sido secuestrado directamente por el imperialismo estadounidense. Un individuo puede ser derrotado, pero el colectivo

jamás es derrotado.

En Yare, Nicolás era “Verde”. Este nombre, dado por Hugo Chávez, no debe leerse simplemente como un juego de palabras o una broma. Chávez confió a Nicolás la misión de servir como su escolta personal, poniendo su propia vida en sus manos, y Nicolás acompañó a Chávez, observándolo de cerca y aprendiendo de él. Luego Chávez le confió la “Comuna” y partió antes. En Miraflores, Nicolás fue Maduro. Heredando el legado de Chávez, construyó más viviendas incluso en condiciones mucho más difíciles, incrementó la independencia económica y practicó “Comuna o Nada”. Habló y actuó con coherencia, con el mismo tono sereno que una vez utilizó para incitar huelgas.

La línea argumental y la línea emocional se entrelazan y giran en espiral juntas, y la línea amorosa cuidadosamente construida de los protagonistas susurra que esta película no es un documental sino arte calentando el corazón del espectador. Desde Mañana y Bochniche hacia la Revolución Bolivariana, Venezuela avanza; dentro de ese “proyecto histórico”, los héroes colectivos que brillan como estrellas—y en su centro mismo, el amor y la lucha de Maduro y Cilia—están siempre orientados al futuro, son optimistas, confiados en la victoria y apasionados. Asimismo, está la escena en la que Maduro, quien eligió Cuba—las grandes ligas de la revolución—en lugar de Estados Unidos, las grandes ligas del béisbol, se encuentra de pie en una playa de La Habana y grita “El pueblo unido jamás será vencido” junto con camaradas internacionales. El destino de Maduro, al caminar el camino de la revolución, está inevitablemente entrelazado con el destino de Venezuela y el destino de América Latina.

La película comienza con la no ficción y la ficción corriendo en paralelo, pero pronto la ficción penetra en la no ficción hasta que, al final, se convierten completamente en una sola. El documental es arte, y el arte es un documental. Permanece fiel a las técnicas de tipificación del realismo y, al mismo tiempo, rompe las fronteras entre el documental y el arte. La dialéctica realizada por el equipo de producción teje historia y realidad, sociedad y familia, colectivo e individuo, y lucha y amor en una sola trama, argumentando de manera elocuente que solo el arte puede hacer posible esta difícil tarea. En Nicolás, cada elemento cinematográfico mantiene sus características distintivas, mientras que simultáneamente forman una síntesis orgánica, retratando vívidamente el ayer, el hoy y el mañana de Maduro, quien representa al héroe colectivo de nuestro tiempo.

Hace noventa años, las Brigadas Internacionales que lucharon en la Guerra Civil Española sacrificaron sus vidas por la revolución, gritando “¡No Pasarán!”. Si el fascismo pasaba por España, Francia sería la siguiente, y luego Europa Occidental y Oriental. Hoy, si el imperialismo pasa por Venezuela, Cuba será la siguiente, y luego Centro y Sudamérica. Venezuela es América Latina, y es el mundo entero. Todo verdadero comunista, internacionalista o antiimperialista debe apoyar y defender la Revolución Bolivariana de Venezuela. Los treinta y dos héroes nacidos de Cuba dieron sus vidas para proteger esta Revolución Bolivariana de Venezuela. Son las estrellas rojas que iluminan el cielo nocturno de Caracas, héroes colectivos que brillarán para siempre en los corazones de la humanidad.

Hugo Chávez se convirtió en un objetivo del imperialismo al dedicarlo todo a la Revolución Bolivariana. Maduro tampoco temió ese camino, considerándolo un honor supremo. Chávez, muriendo a manos del imperialismo estadounidense, se paró bajo la lluvia torrencial frente al pueblo y gritó “¡Hasta la Victoria Siempre!” en el período final de su vida. Cada vez que llueve, el pueblo de Venezuela recuerda esa imagen

de Chávez. Y hoy, Maduro, secuestrado por el imperialismo estadounidense, está enviando la señal de “¡Venceremos!” a sus camaradas y al pueblo. El gobierno imperialista de Trump convirtió al pueblo de Venezuela, al pueblo de América Latina y al pueblo del mundo en sus enemigos. El drama de secuestro sin precedentes cometido por el imperialismo estadounidense quedará registrado en la historia como un error sin precedentes que aceleró la derrota estratégica del imperialismo.

Así como Chávez tuvo su período de Yare, Maduro ahora tiene su período de Manhattan. Jorge Rodríguez, el dirigente de la organización revolucionaria a la que pertenecía Maduro, perdió la vida debido a la tortura de los esbirros títeres de la CIA. Una difícil tarea histórica ha sido colocada sobre Delcy Rodríguez: continuar el espíritu de su padre revolucionario bajo condiciones completamente nuevas. A lo largo del camino de la Revolución Bolivariana recorrido una vez por Chávez y Maduro, innumerables héroes están emergiendo ahora como hongos después de la lluvia. La “Opinión Firme” de Chávez recomendando a Maduro como presidente abruma la “Determinación Absoluta” de Trump de secuestrar a Maduro. La aparición del villano sin precedentes Donald Trump sólo intensifica la intensidad dramática de Nicolás. La tierra del héroe colectivo, Venezuela, jamás será derrotada.

The Accelerated Strategic Defeat of US Imperialism

Stephen Cho | Coordinator of the Korean International Forum

January 12, 2026

On January 3, the world has awakened. US imperialism invaded Venezuela, and the people have become even more conscious. Imperialism cannot exist without plunder and invasion. The United States proved this by openly declaring the seizure of oil shortly after. The people of Venezuela, the peoples of Latin America, and the peoples of the world are rising. US imperialism achieved temporary, tactical victories, but it has accelerated its permanent, strategic defeat. This is the inevitable conclusion of the January 3 operation—“Operation Absolute Resolve.” On this very day in history, Manuel Noriega of Panama was captured, and Qasem Soleimani of Iran was assassinated. Yet, through these imperialist crimes, the United States has become further isolated, and the anti-imperialist consciousness and spirit of resistance among the people have strengthened—not only in the countries directly affected, but globally. The awakened people are never defeated.

1.

Two facts have recently been confirmed. On January 3, the US Department of Justice removed the “Cartel of the Suns” charge from its indictment against President Nicolás Maduro. What does it mean to pin such a charge on the foreign president to launch a military operation for his capture, and then drop that very charge at the moment of actual prosecution? Even for the brazen Trump administration, this was apparently too far to go. While repeatedly stating falsehoods may make them appear true, it confirms that such claims cannot withstand the strict standards of a court of law. If, by chance, a situation like the debate between Georgi Dimitrov and Hermann Göring at the Leipzig Trial of 1935 were to occur and result in acquittal, the fallout would be disastrous.

With this move, the US government has completely forfeited even its flimsy flimsy pretext.

On January 6, the US government announced it would seize and sell 30 to 50 million barrels of Venezuelan oil. The Trump administration is no longer hiding its hand regarding the January 3 operation. For the ruling party to win the November 2026 midterms, oil prices are the ultimate key. Due to the fallout of the “tariff wars,” the administration’s approval ratings have fallen to the 30s—not just because of the weakening dollar’s hegemony, but because of soaring prices. Ultimately, what voters feel in their bones are oil prices, inflation rates, and stock prices. To keep the “AI Bubble” from bursting, they must cut interest rates to save the stock market; and since they cannot stop inflation, they attempt to offset it with \$2,000 stimulus checks. In the end, what remains is the oil prices, and the outcome of the election is now being determined by how far oil prices can be pushed down. The Trump administration’s entire focus is concentrated on electoral victory politically, and on lowering oil prices economically.

In November 2025, the United States released its National Security Strategy (NSS). This document lays out the Trump administration’s strategy and tactics—in other words, its objectives, means, and methods. Its essence can be summarized up in a single phrase: a shift from the “Indo-Pacific Strategy” to a “New Monroe Doctrine.” Simply put, realizing it is no longer feasible to control the entire world, the United States has decided to secure firm control over its own “backyard,” the Western Hemisphere and the Americas. Accordingly, it aims to wrap up the war in Ukraine in Eastern Europe—much like the “Gaza Peace Plan” in West Asia (the Middle East)—and in East Asia, to manage China and the Democratic Peo-

ple's Republic of Korea (DPRK) in order to avoid wars in Taiwan and the 'Republic of Korea (ROK),' while turning the Americas into the US "backyard." That is, the United States has shifted its strategy from Eurasia to the Americas. The change in its NSS reflects not the US strength, but its vulnerability.

This is why, since taking office, the Trump administration has sought to negotiate with Iran and Russia and to initiate dialogue with China and the DPRK, while at the same time, in the "Western Hemisphere," asserting claims over the Americanization of Greenland, the transformation of Canada into the 51st US state, the ownership of the Panama Canal and a monopoly over Venezuelan oil. To that end, it has identified Venezuela as the essential factor in enforcing its strategy and went ahead with the abduction of President Nicolás Maduro. US imperialism strikes anti-US, anti-imperialist states in different ways: it attacks Venezuela militarily through the kidnapping of its president; it is hammering Brazil economically by imposing 50 percent tariffs. By contrast, it has thrown its weight behind pro-US, pro-imperialist Argentina providing a \$20 billion currency swap to ensure that pro-US fascist forces emerge victorious in their elections. By actively interfering in the presidential elections of Honduras and Chile, Washington is accelerating the "Blue Tide" in Latin America.

The United States has established non-interventionism in Europe and Asia and interventionism in the Americas as its basic policy lines, and is strongly putting them into practice. The redeployment of the USS Gerald R. Ford nuclear-powered aircraft carrier, previously operating in the Mediterranean, to the Caribbean for strikes against Venezuela was part of this effort. The United States is withdrawing its military force from Eurasia and shifting it toward the Americas. In the months surrounding the announcement of its NSS, the place where the United States has focused its attention and capabilities is Venezuela, which is the frontline of Latin America. The Trump administration is moving in line with the NSS.

The transition from unipolarity to multipolarity means that the power of China and Russia is becoming as formidable as that of the United States. Trump, being quick-calculating and pragmatic in everything he does, knows full well that he cannot win a fight against China and Russia. He is well aware that the United States has degenerated into an imperialism in chronic crisis—an old, toothless lion—with a national debt of 38 trillion dollars and annual interest payments exceeding its defense budget. Now, before even its remaining claws are worn away, he regards that the best course of action is to delay the decline of US hegemony by using its still-superior naval power to seize oil tankers and by coercing vulnerable small nations.

And China and Russia are more accurately than anyone else reading both the situation and the inner intentions of the United States. While China and Russia learn strategy and tactics by enjoying Go and chess, the United States only knows poker, relying on little more than bluffing, it is said. Therefore, it is not difficult for China and Russia to see through the US bluff. It did not take long for Xi Jinping and Vladimir Putin to grasp Trump's "Art of the Deal." For instance, it is a recognized fact that at the APEC summit held in the 'ROK' in late October 2025, China emerged victorious in the trade war against the United States by leveraging its rare earth elements. This is why Trump declares that China is the main enemy and initiates a "tariff war," yet primarily beats down his own allies while shrinking back when actually facing China.

Trump's "New Monroe Doctrine," also known as "Donroe Doctrine," is a tantamount to a declaration that the bluffing against China and Russia is no longer of any use—and that it will no longer be attempted. It means Washington intends to bet only on the Americas with the chips and cards it currently holds. In other words, this signifies that it will not intervene in Russia's consolidation of Ukraine or China's incorporation of Taiwan. Of course, historically,

the Novorossiia region of Ukraine and Taiwan were parts of Russia and China, respectively, but no one in the world views Venezuela as a part of the United States. As the United States moved toward a sudden invasion of Venezuela, China's push toward a reunification war with Taiwan is gaining momentum. China urgently organized a three-day encirclement exercise of Taiwan from December 29 to 31, 2025, which was akin to a final rehearsal.

2.

World War 3 is already underway. The storm of World War 3, ignited by imperialism, has swept from Ukraine in February 2022, through West Asia in October 2023, and is now blowing toward East Asia. Had it not been for the war deterrence and strategic patience of the DPRK and the heroic uprising of the 'ROK' people, the war in the 'ROK' would have erupted. The war in the 'ROK' immediately spills over into the war in Taiwan and expands into a war in East Asia with the participation of Japan and the Philippines. Once a war in East Asia breaks out, World War 3 will enter its full swing.

In August 2023, the leaders of the United States, Japan, and the 'ROK' gathered at Camp David to effectively form an "Asian version of NATO." To operationalize this "Asian version of NATO," the trilateral joint military exercise "Freedom Edge" was conducted in June 2024. In July 2024, the imperialist camp held the NATO Washington Summit, finalizing the political preparations for the "Pacification of NATO." Its military preparations were simultaneously completed through a series of joint exercises from June to August 2024, including "Freedom Edge," "RIMPAC," and "Ulchi Freedom Shield." So, the consistent sequence of events immediately thereafter—the invasion of Kursk against Russia in August, the concentrated strikes on Hezbollah in Lebanon in September, the military offensives including drone attacks on Pyongyang from September to November, and the military coup in the

'ROK' in December—cannot be a mere coincidence. In December 2024, the imperialist camp succeeded in toppling the anti-imperialist Assad regime in Syria.

With Trump's victory in the US presidential election in November 2025, the contradictions within the imperialist camp are accelerating. Even conservative media recognize the contradictions within the imperialist camp, referring to them as the contradiction between the so-called "Globalists" and the Chauvinists, and treat this matter with serious concern. Yet, strangely, the Globalists are proving to be even more bellicose than the Chauvinists. It is the Globalists who ignited the wars in Ukraine and West Asia, and it is also the Globalists who are seeking to spark a war in East Asia.

The traditional political spectrum of the Globalists falls within the right-wing social democracy, while that of the Chauvinists belongs to conservatism. Generally, conservatism has been more bellicose due to its direct ties with the military-industrial complex, but now the situation is the opposite. Within the US Republican Party, the Neocon forces have been almost purged.

The essence of chauvinism is social exclusivism. It does not respect "differences" and seeks to eliminate "otherness." The Chauvinists as distinguished from Globalists are chauvinists in a narrow sense. Globalists themselves are chauvinists in a broad sense, because it is the Globalists who are the main forces behind the wars in Ukraine and West Asia, deploying Ukraine's chauvinist Neo-Nazis and Israel's chauvinist Zionists at the forefront.

Fascism is the representative political expression of chauvinism. If the persecution of foreigners is seen as its lowest-level symptom, then war against foreign states is its highest-level symptom. While German Nazis in the past escalated the persecution of foreigners to the point of mass murder in Auschwitz, today's Chauvinists have, at least for now, not reached that level. However, regarding war policies, the Globalists have already surpassed even the Nazis through the

wars in Ukraine and West Asia. In fact, the Globalists have put forward the descendants of Bandera—the most vicious pro-Nazis in history—at the forefront of the war in Ukraine, and have likewise deployed the most notorious Zionists for the war in West Asia. In other words, while the Globalists, through their cunning proxy wars, have already carried out war against foreign states—the highest expression of fascism—at the level of the Nazis of the past, the Chauvinists have, at least for now, not yet carried out the persecution of foreigners—the lowest expression of fascism—at the Nazis’ level. For the Globalists to denounce the Chauvinists as fascists is a classic case of the pot calling the kettle black.

Today, for the Globalists—the most bellicose forces within the imperialist camp driving World War 3—the existence of Trump, the leader of the Chauvinists, is a thorn in their side. It is by no means a coincidence that the assassination attempt on Trump occurred on July 13, immediately after the NATO Washington Summit in July 2024, where war preparations were vigorously accelerated. At that time, Globalists were openly inciting the assassination of Trump, and the attempt on his life was neither the first nor the last. The assassination of Charlie Kirk, often referred to as “Little Trump,” on September 10, 2025, must be understood in the same context.

The Globalists wish to eliminate Trump and his forces not because they are anti-imperialist, but because they are anti-globalist. Trump and his followers are not anti-imperialist forces; they are imperialist forces. However, these two major forces within the imperialist camp have now reached such a hostile stage that they must eliminate one another to survive. For instance, the US chauvinist regime is mobilizing the National Guard in the US cities controlled by Globalists. Meanwhile, the Globalists have gone as far as producing the film “Civil War” to openly declare their intent to kill the president attempting a third term. That the contradictions within the United States are spiraling toward a civil

war is an objective phenomenon acknowledged even by conservative media in the United States.

Historically, the United Kingdom adopted non-interventionism in continental European conflicts as its primary diplomatic strategy. At the same time, it strengthened its dominance and interference over its colonies, such as South Africa, India, Australia, and Canada. Imitating this diplomatic policy, the United States put forward the “Monroe Doctrine”—a plan to refrain from intervening in the affairs of all of Europe, including including the United Kingdom, while turning Latin America into its own “backyard.” The diplomatic history of the United States is nothing other than a process of alternating between “non-interventionism” and “interventionism” to serve its national interests and imperialist greed.

It is inherent nature of imperialism: intervention when strong, non-intervention when weak. In the present day, the United States has no power to encompass the entire world and intervene in every issue. In this multipolar era, it is actually logical for the United States to designate the Western Hemisphere, including Latin America, as its own “backyard” and focus its efforts there. As long as the United States remains imperialist, it can never abandon its ambition to expand its territory and strengthen its dominance by any means necessary.

Precisely at this point, a fundamental difference arises between Globalists and Chauvinists within the United States regarding their objectives and the means. In this sense, the emergence of MAGA was inevitable. “Make America Great Again” implies that America is no longer great, and “America First” is another concept for non-interventionism. Therefore, within MAGA, a split is bound to occur regarding the scope of non-intervention: whether it applies “outside the American continent” or “outside the United States.” Indeed, the invasion of Venezuela and the kidnapping of Nicolás Maduro have ignited such debates, and these internal conflicts are intensifying further. As the Trump forces draw closer to war,

they will face domestic and international accusations of being just “Another Deep State,” “chauvinists no different from the Globalists,” and “unprecedented fascists.”

The imperialist Trump forces are limiting the US national strategy to the Western Hemisphere, including the Americas and are mobilizing all national capabilities to achieve this goal. This is why it is no coincidence that Trump administration invaded Venezuela yesterday to pressure the Rodriguez government and are pressuring the Danish government today to seize control of Greenland.

3.

While World War 2 was a confrontation between the anti-fascist camp and the fascist camp, World War 3 is a confrontation between the anti-imperialist camp and the imperialist camp. Nazi Germany not only attacked the socialist Soviet Union but also occupied other imperialist nations like France, and attacked the UK and the United States. This made it possible for the socialist Soviet Union and the imperialist United States and UK to form a united front under the common goal of anti-fascism.

However, as the history following World War 2 proves, this was not a permanent strategic united front but a temporary tactical united front that lasted until the defeat of the fascist forces. To deny the necessity of such a tactical united front is the error of Trotskyite left-wing deviation and “leftist closed-doorism.” Conversely, to mistake a tactical united front for a strategic united front is the error of Eurocommunism-style right-wing deviation and “rightist open-doorism.”

Eurocommunism is communism in name only; in terms of the political spectrum, it is merely at the level of the social-democratic left. Social democracy—not only its right wing but also its left wing—is revisionist and opportunist, having no connection to revolution, and is essentially counter-revolutionary. It is not surprising at all that the recent social-demo-

cratic left in Europe, following the social-democratic right, is being denounced as the “Zionist Left.” The Globalists and imperialist warmongers, centered on the social-democratic right, are putting their all-out efforts into instigating war, making the intensification of World War 3 their top priority.

From a strategic and tactical standpoint, the communist forces within the anti-imperialist camp must draw in the social-democratic left to form a tactical united front. At the same time, they must deepen the contradiction between Chauvinists and Globalists through tactical cooperation with Chauvinists. Tactical cooperation does not mean joining hands in solidarity like a tactical united front; rather, it means focusing on preferentially striking the common enemy regarding the issue of war—the most critical issue of the current period. Even in this case, it is natural and necessary to simultaneously wage struggles against fascist policies domestically and imperialist policies internationally whenever they are implemented. Maintaining the independence of communist forces while promoting broad unity and solidarity under the banner of anti-imperialism—and simultaneously facilitating divisions within the imperialist camp—is the most important strategic and tactical principle of this period.

It was during the period of World War 1 that communist forces established the first socialist state, and it was after World War 2 that they formed the socialist camp and a pro-socialist national liberation camp on a global scale. History proves the truth that World War 1, which was an imperialist war, and World War 2, which began as a war between imperialists but ended as an anti-fascist war, served as the optimal opportunities for strengthening communist and anti-imperialist capabilities.

It is a scientific prospect that the ongoing World War 3 will culminate in the defeat of the imperialist camp and the victory of the anti-imperialist camp, leading to a dramatic strengthening of communist and anti-imperialist forces. However, to realize this,

there must be strategy and tactics as an integrated system of objectives, means, and methods. Without a doubt, the anti-imperialist camp is operating systematically under such scientific strategy and tactics. The anti-imperialist camp is overwhelming the imperialist camp in every aspect: justification, capability, and operations.

On September 3, 2025, through the Victory Day parade held in Beijing, China, the world objectively confirmed who the three main forces of the anti-imperialist camp are and the extent of their might. The earlier victory Day parade in Moscow, Russia, on May 9, and the military parade in Pyongyang, the DPRK, on October 10, celebrating the 80th anniversary of the Party's founding, also fully demonstrated the military power of the anti-imperialist camp. Not only Russia, but also China and the DPRK are all nuclear-missile superpowers armed with hydrogen bombs and hypersonic missiles. No imperialist nation dares to wage war against these anti-imperialist military powers.

Today, the representative battlefields of World War 3 are two: Eastern Europe, centered on Ukraine, and West Asia, including Palestine. East Asia, encompassing Taiwan and the 'ROK,' is where a conflict is imminent. In this sense, they are referred to as two major battlefields and three major battlefields. Regarding the primary theaters of World War 3, the strategically important point is that the United States can no longer achieve simultaneous victory on two battlefields. The wars in Ukraine and West Asia prove the truth that the United States has failed to win even one, let alone two. In fact, after World War 2, the United States has never once won on two fronts simultaneously, despite its grandiose rhetoric. In this regard, it is only natural that the Trump administration's national security strategy shifted its focus from Eurasia to the Americas, choosing the "New Monroe Doctrine" over the "Indo-Pacific Strategy." This is a declaration that the United States will no longer engage in bluffing, such as the "Win-Win Strategy"

(simultaneous victory in two theaters), whose impossibility is now known to the entire world. It is an expression of will, a "absolute resolve," to maintain a firm grip on the immediate vicinity of the United States—regions where China and Russia cannot yet dispatch nuclear carrier strike groups, especially the Caribbean and Latin America.

Therefore, under the current conditions where the US strategy has been confirmed, the anti-imperialist camp, including China, the DPRK, and Russia, has no reason to delay a decisive offensive any longer. In strategy and tactics, impatience is a problem, but a wait-and-see approach is also a problem. This is precisely why China hurriedly conducted Taiwan encirclement drill in late December as if it were a final rehearsal. Immediately after the US invasion of Venezuela on January 3, the DPRK also conducted a hypersonic missile launch drill on January 4 under the direct command of Chairman Kim Jong Un, shielding the anti-imperialist nation and warning imperialist United States. The hypersonic missile Hwasong-11Ma, which is to be equipped with tactical nuclear warheads, is reported to be mounted on the DPRK's nuclear-powered submarine, the construction of which is nearing completion. For China, the economic importance of Iran is incomparably vast. As Iran faces its greatest crisis due to "Color Revolutions" with the US imperialist economic blockade, the Taiwan encirclement drill must be seen as carrying a message of international solidarity not only for Venezuela but for Iran as well. On January 8, Russia also launched the formidable hypersonic missile "Oreshnik" at Europe's largest gas storage facility in Lviv, Ukraine. This attack took place immediately after Putin's residence was attacked, President Nicolás Maduro was kidnapped, and the "Coalition of the Willing" announced it would dispatch troops to Ukraine following a peace agreement.

Everything is connected. As the United States invades Venezuela and pressures Iran, the possibility of a war over Taiwan by China is increasing accord-

ingly. Since a war in Taiwan will immediately and unconditionally expand into a war in the 'ROK,' the United States must have strategic and tactical preparations for both fronts. As the Trump administration adopts the "New Monroe Doctrine" as its national security strategy and moves deeply in that direction, its policy of non-intervention in wars in Taiwan and the 'ROK' has become more clear. In other words, the "First Island Chain"—stretching from Japan through Taiwan to the Philippines—is no longer the primary line of defense for the United States. One must take note of the fact that China's aircraft carrier group once again broke through the First Island Chain last December and moved northward, threatening Japan. Observations are gaining further weight that while the United States may be able to defend Japan and the Philippines, it will withdraw and refrain from intervening in Taiwan and the 'ROK,' which China and the DPRK regard as matters of vital importance.

China and the DPRK are likely conducting a final review of whether the US non-intervention policy is an "inducement to war" or a "deceptive tactic." Looking back, the statement made by the DPRK in October 2024—"That time is not decided by us"—was an expression directed at the potential invasion by US imperialism, while also hinting at China's level of readiness. This is the reason why the DPRK which has completed all military and political preparations since the declaration of "subjugation" at the Supreme People's Assembly on January 15, 2024, continues to maintain its strategic patience. On January 10, the General Staff of the Korean People's Army disclosed the infiltration of 'ROK' drones into the DPRK territory and issued a grave warning regarding the risk of armed conflict.

Following the success of the military parade on September 3, 2025, and the victory in the China-US economic battle in late October, China appears confident that its military and economic preparations are complete. This confidence was reaffirmed by China's strong anti-Japanese actions following the bellicose

anti-Chinese remarks of Japan's Sanae Takaichi, who, after taking power, shouted "A Taiwan contingency is a Japan contingency" to boost her low approval ratings alongside her "Sanaenomics" economic stimulus. On January 4–7, 2026, China invited the 'ROK' president to draw him in diplomatically while simultaneously dealing military and economic blows to Japan through sanctions on rare earth elements. In short, military and diplomatic tensions in East Asia are skyrocketing. The year 2026 holds a higher possibility than any other year for the explosion of the war in East Asia.

In 1936, the Spanish Civil War broke out. The fascist forces intended to seize Spain and then march toward France, Western Europe, and Eastern Europe—and consequently, that is what happened. Now, 90 years later, the 2026 invasion of Venezuela has occurred. The imperialist forces aim to seize Venezuela and then expand their reach to Cuba, Central America, and South America. The difference between the two is that this time, the outcome will be different.

During the Spanish Civil War, the International Brigades were organized under the leadership of the Comintern. Under the slogan "¡No Pasarán!," they fought a heroic three-year defense of Madrid. Although Spain eventually fell under fascist rule, the communists and anti-imperialists of the International Brigades who fought there made a crucial contribution to the victory for the anti-fascist forces in World War 2 and later became the core forces of revolutions in their respective countries. As long as one struggles alongside the people under the banner of justice, there may be temporary and tactical defeats, but there is no permanent or strategic defeat.

The banner of justice in our era is anti-imperialist independence. Anti-imperialist independence is People's Democracy, and the united people will surely prevail. Nicolás Maduro, the anti-imperialist fighter and people's leader born of Venezuela, is a hero of our time. US imperialism may imprison Maduro's body for a moment, but it can never, for all

eternity, break his spirit. History will declare Maduro's innocence, and he will surely return to the arms of the Venezuelan people. The film "Nicolás," which depicts the life of the revolutionary Nicolás Maduro, has only seen its dramatic tension intensified by the appearance of the villain of the century, Trump. Beyond Venezuela, the people of Latin America and the world are shouting the mass slogan "Free Maduro!" alongside the strategic slogan "Down with Imperialism!" as they move forward in the anti-US and anti-imperialist resistance.

US imperialism, intoxicated by temporary and tactical victories, fails to see its own permanent and strategic defeat. Since the dotard "Paper Lion" has fallen into fatal arrogance, its downfall is only a matter of time. The deeper the darkness, the closer the dawn. Venezuela is the 'ROK,' and the 'ROK' is Venezuela. Venezuela is Latin America, and Venezuela is the world. Communists, anti-imperialists, and the struggling people will resolutely block the passage of imperialism at the first line of the anti-imperialist front: Venezuela. Victory belongs forever to the struggling and united people.

¡No Pasarán! ¡Victoria Siempre! ¡Venceremos!

La derrota estratégica acelerada del imperialismo estadounidense

Stephen Cho | Coordinador del Foro Internacional Coreano

12 de enero de 2026

El 3 de enero, el mundo despertó. El imperialismo estadounidense invadió Venezuela, y los pueblos han tomado aún más conciencia. El imperialismo no puede existir sin el saqueo y la invasión. Estados Unidos lo demostró al declarar abiertamente la incautación de petróleo poco después. El pueblo de Venezuela, los pueblos de América Latina y los pueblos del mundo se están levantando. El imperialismo estadounidense logró victorias tácticas temporales, pero ha acelerado su derrota estratégica permanente. Esta es la conclusión inevitable de la operación del 3 de enero: la “Operación Resolución Absoluta”. En este mismo día de la historia, Manuel Noriega de Panamá fue capturado y Qasem Soleimani de Irán fue asesinado. Sin embargo, a través de estos crímenes imperialistas, Estados Unidos se ha aislado aún más, y la conciencia antiimperialista y el espíritu de resistencia entre el pueblo se han fortalecido, no solo en los países directamente afectados, sino a nivel global. Un pueblo despierto nunca es derrotado.

1.

Se han confirmado dos hechos recientes. El 3 de enero, el Departamento de el presidente Nicolás Maduro. ¿Qué significa imputar tal cargo a un presidente extranjero para lanzar una operación militar para su captura, y luego retirar ese mismo cargo en el momento del enjuiciamiento real? Incluso para la descarada administración Trump, esto fue aparentemente ir demasiado lejos. Si bien repetir falsedades puede hacer que parezcan verdaderas, confirma que tales afirmaciones no pueden resistir los estrictos estándares de un tribunal de justicia. Si, por casualidad, ocurriera una situación como el debate entre Georgi Dimitrov y Hermann Göring en el Juicio de Leipzig de 1935 y resultara en la absolución, las con-

secuencias serían desastrosas. Con este movimiento, el gobierno de EE.UU. ha perdido completamente incluso su endeble preo.

El 6 de enero, el gobierno de EE.UU. anunció que incautará y venderá de 30 a 50 millones de barriles de petróleo venezolano. La administración Trump ya no oculta sus intenciones respecto a la operación del 3 de enero. Para que el partido gobernante gane las elecciones intermedias de noviembre de 2026, el precio del petróleo es la clave definitiva. Debido a las secuelas de las “guerras arancelarias”, los índices de aprobación de la administración han caído al 30%, no solo por el debilitamiento de la hegemonía del dólar, sino por el aumento vertiginoso de los precios. En última instancia, lo que los votantes sienten en sus propios huesos son los precios del petróleo, las tasas de inflación y los precios de las acciones. Para evitar que la “Burbuja de la IA” estalle, deben recortar las tasas de interés para salvar el mercado de valores; y como no pueden detener la inflación, intentan compensarla con cheques de estímulo de 2,000 dólares. Al final, lo que queda es forzar la baja de los precios del petróleo, en una situación en la que esto determinará el resultado de las elecciones. Todo el enfoque de la administración Trump se concentra en la victoria electoral políticamente y en la reducción de los precios del petróleo económicamente.

En noviembre de 2025, Estados Unidos publicó su Estrategia de Seguridad Nacional (NSS). Este documento expone la estrategia y la táctica de la administración Trump; en otras palabras, sus objetivos, medios y métodos. Su esencia puede resumirse en una sola frase: un cambio de la “Estrategia del Indo-Pacífico” a una “Nueva Doctrina Monroe”. En pocas palabras, al darse cuenta de que ya no es factible controlar el mundo entero, Estados Unidos ha decid-

ido asegurar un control firme sobre su propio “patio trasero”, el Hemisferio Occidental y las Américas. En consecuencia, pretende concluir la guerra de Ucrania en Europa del Este, al igual que el “Plan de Paz de Gaza” en Asia Occidental (Oriente Medio), y en Asia Oriental, gestionar a China y a la República Popular Democrática de Corea (RPDC) para evitar guerras en Taiwán y la ‘República de Corea (ROC)’, mientras convierte a las Américas en el “patio trasero” de EE.UU. Es decir, Estados Unidos ha desplazado su estrategia de Eurasia a las Américas. El cambio en su NSS refleja no la fuerza de EE.UU., sino su vulnerabilidad.

Es por eso que, desde que asumió el cargo, la administración Trump ha buscado negociar con Irán y Rusia e iniciar el diálogo con China y la RPDC, mientras que al mismo tiempo, en el “Hemisferio Occidental”, afirma reclamos sobre la americanización de Groenlandia, la transformación de Canadá en el estado número 51 de EE.UU., la propiedad del Canal de Panamá y el monopolio sobre el petróleo venezolano. Con ese fin, ha identificado a Venezuela como el factor esencial para imponer su estrategia y procedió al secuestro del presidente Nicolás Maduro. El imperialismo estadounidense golpea a los estados anti-EE.UU. y antiimperialistas de diferentes maneras: ataca a Venezuela militarmente mediante el secuestro de su presidente; golpea a Brasil económicamente imponiendo aranceles del 50 por ciento. Por el contrario, ha respaldado a la Argentina pro-EE.UU. y proimperialista proporcionando un swap de divisas de 20 mil millones de dólares para asegurar que las fuerzas fascistas pro-EE.UU. resulten victoriosas en sus elecciones. Al interferir activamente en las elecciones presidenciales de Honduras y Chile, Washington está acelerando la “Marea Azul” en América Latina.

Estados Unidos ha establecido el no intervencionismo en Europa y Asia y el intervencionismo en las Américas como sus líneas políticas básicas, y las está poniendo en práctica con fuerza. El redespiegue del

portaaviones de propulsión nuclear USS Gerald R. Ford, que anteriormente operaba en el Mediterráneo, hacia el Caribe para ataques contra Venezuela fue parte de este esfuerzo. Estados Unidos está retirando su fuerza militar de Eurasia y desplazándola hacia las Américas. En los meses que rodearon el anuncio de su NSS, el lugar donde Estados Unidos ha centrado su atención y capacidades es Venezuela, que es la línea del frente de América Latina. La administración Trump se mueve en línea con la NSS.

La transición de la unipolaridad a la multipolaridad significa que el poder de China y Rusia se está volviendo tan formidable como el de Estados Unidos. Trump, siendo calculador y pragmático en todo lo que hace, sabe muy bien que no puede ganar una pelea contra China y Rusia. Es plenamente consciente de que Estados Unidos se ha degenerado en un imperialismo en crisis crónica—un viejo león sin dientes—con una deuda nacional de 38 billones de dólares y pagos de intereses anuales que superan su presupuesto de defensa. Ahora, antes de que incluso sus garras restantes se desgasten, considera que el mejor curso de acción es retrasar el declive de la hegemonía estadounidense utilizando su poder naval aún superior para incautar petroleros y coaccionar a pequeñas naciones vulnerables.

Y China y Rusia están leyendo con más precisión que nadie tanto la situación como las intenciones internas de Estados Unidos. Mientras China y Rusia aprenden estrategia y táctica disfrutando del Go y el ajedrez, Estados Unidos solo conoce el póquer, confiando en poco más que el farol (bluffing), se dice. Por lo tanto, no es difícil para China y Rusia ver a través del farol de EE.UU. Xi Jinping y Vladimir Putin no tardaron mucho en comprender el “Arte del Trato” de Trump. Por ejemplo, es un hecho reconocido que en la cumbre de la APEC celebrada en la ‘ROK’ a fines de octubre de 2025, China salió victoriosa en la guerra comercial contra Estados Unidos aprovechando sus elementos de tierras raras. Es por eso que Trump declara que China es el enemigo principal e inicia

una “guerra arancelaria”, pero golpea principalmente a sus propios aliados mientras retrocede cuando realmente se enfrenta a China.

La “Nueva Doctrina Monroe” de Trump, también conocida como “Doctrina Donroe”, equivale a una declaración de que el farol contra China y Rusia ya no sirve de nada, y que ya no se intentará. Significa que Washington tiene la intención de apostar solo por las Américas con las fichas y cartas que posee actualmente. En otras palabras, esto significa que no intervendrá en la consolidación de Ucrania por parte de Rusia ni en la incorporación de Taiwán por parte de China. Por supuesto, históricamente, la región de Novorossiia en Ucrania y Taiwán fueron parte de Rusia y China, respectivamente, pero nadie en el mundo ve a Venezuela como parte de los Estados Unidos. A medida que Estados Unidos avanzaba hacia una invasión repentina de Venezuela, el impulso de China hacia una guerra de reunificación con Taiwán está ganando fuerza. China organizó urgentemente un ejercicio de cerco a Taiwán de tres días, del 29 al 31 de diciembre de 2025, que fue similar a un ensayo final.

2.

La Tercera Guerra Mundial ya está en marcha. La tormenta de la Tercera Guerra Mundial, encendida por el imperialismo, ha barrido desde Ucrania en febrero de 2022, a través de Asia Occidental en octubre de 2023, y ahora sopla hacia Asia Oriental. Si no fuera por la disuasión de la guerra y la paciencia estratégica de la RPDC y el heroico levantamiento del pueblo de la ‘ROK’, la guerra en la ‘ROK’ habría estallado. La guerra en la ‘ROK’ se desborda inmediatamente hacia la guerra en Taiwán y se expande a una guerra en Asia Oriental con la participación de Japón y Filipinas. Una vez que estalle una guerra en Asia Oriental, la Tercera Guerra Mundial entrará en su pleno apogeo.

En agosto de 2023, los líderes de Estados Unidos, Japón y la ‘ROK’ se reunieron en Camp David para

formar efectivamente una “versión asiática de la OTAN”. Para operativizar esta “versión asiática de la OTAN”, el ejercicio militar conjunto trilateral “Freedom Edge” se llevó a cabo en junio de 2024. En julio de 2024, el campo imperialista celebró la Cumbre de la OTAN en Washington, finalizando los preparativos políticos para la “Pacificación de la OTAN”. Sus preparativos militares se completaron simultáneamente a través de una serie de ejercicios conjuntos de junio a agosto de 2024, incluyendo “Freedom Edge”, “RIMPAC” y “Ulchi Freedom Shield”. Así, la secuencia consistente de eventos inmediatamente posteriores—la invasión de Kursk contra Rusia en agosto, los ataques concentrados contra Hezbolá en el Líbano en septiembre, las ofensivas militares que incluyeron ataques con drones contra Pyongyang de septiembre a noviembre, y el golpe militar en la ‘ROK’ en diciembre—no puede ser una mera coincidencia. En diciembre de 2024, el campo imperialista logró derrocar al régimen antiimperialista de Assad en Siria.

Con la victoria de Trump en las elecciones presidenciales de EE.UU. en noviembre de 2025, las contradicciones dentro del campo imperialista se están acelerando. Incluso los medios conservadores reconocen las contradicciones dentro del campo imperialista, refiriéndose a ellas como la contradicción entre los llamados “Globalistas” y los Chovinistas, y tratan este asunto con seria preocupación. Sin embargo, extrañamente, los Globalistas están demostrando ser aún más belicosos que los Chovinistas. Son los Globalistas quienes encendieron las guerras en Ucrania y Asia Occidental, y son también los Globalistas quienes buscan provocar una guerra en Asia Oriental.

El espectro político tradicional de los Globalistas cae dentro de la socialdemocracia de derecha, mientras que el de los Chovinistas pertenece al conservadurismo. Generalmente, el conservadurismo ha sido más belicoso debido a sus vínculos directos con el complejo militar-industrial, pero ahora la situación

es la contraria. Dentro del Partido Republicano de EE.UU., las fuerzas neoconservadoras han sido casi purgadas.

La esencia del chovinismo es el exclusivismo social. No respeta las “diferencias” y busca eliminar la “otredad”. Los Chovinistas, a diferencia de los Globalistas, son chovinistas en un sentido estrecho. Los propios Globalistas pertenecen a los chovinistas en un sentido amplio, porque son los Globalistas quienes son las principales fuerzas detrás de las guerras en Ucrania y Asia Occidental, desplegando a los neonazis chovinistas de Ucrania y a los sionistas chovinistas de Israel en el frente.

El fascismo es la expresión política representativa del chovinismo. Si la persecución de extranjeros se ve como su síntoma de nivel más bajo, entonces la guerra contra estados extranjeros es su síntoma de nivel más alto. Mientras que los nazis alemanes en el pasado escalaron la persecución de extranjeros hasta el asesinato en masa en Auschwitz, los Chovinistas de hoy, al menos por ahora, no han llegado a ese nivel. Sin embargo, con respecto a las políticas de guerra, los Globalistas ya han superado incluso a los nazis a través de las guerras en Ucrania y Asia Occidental. De hecho, los Globalistas han puesto a los descendientes de Bandera—los pro-nazis más viciosos de la historia—a la vanguardia de la guerra en Ucrania, y del mismo modo han desplegado a los sionistas más notorios para la guerra en Asia Occidental. En otras palabras, mientras que los Globalistas, a través de sus astutas guerras por poder, ya han llevado a cabo la guerra contra estados extranjeros—la máxima expresión del fascismo—al nivel de los nazis del pasado, los Chovinistas, al menos por ahora, aún no han llevado a cabo la persecución de extranjeros—la expresión más baja del fascismo—al nivel de los nazis. Que los Globalistas denuncien a los Chovinistas como fascistas es un caso clásico de “el comal le dijo a la olla”.

Hoy, para los Globalistas—las fuerzas más belicosas dentro del campo imperialista que impulsan la

Tercera Guerra Mundial—la existencia de Trump, el líder de los Chovinistas, es una espina en su costado. No es en absoluto una coincidencia que el intento de asesinato de Trump ocurriera el 13 de julio, inmediatamente después de la Cumbre de la OTAN en Washington en julio de 2024, donde los preparativos de guerra se aceleraron vigorosamente. En ese momento, los Globalistas incitaban abiertamente al asesinato de Trump, y el intento contra su vida no fue ni el primero ni el último. El asesinato de Charlie Kirk, a menudo referido como “Pequeño Trump”, el 10 de septiembre de 2025, debe entenderse en el mismo cono.

Los Globalistas desean eliminar a Trump y sus fuerzas no porque sean antiimperialistas, sino porque son antiglobalistas. Trump y sus seguidores no son fuerzas antiimperialistas; son fuerzas imperialistas. Sin embargo, estas dos grandes fuerzas dentro del campo imperialista han alcanzado ahora una etapa tan hostil que deben eliminarse mutuamente para sobrevivir. Por ejemplo, el régimen chovinista de EE.UU. está movilizándolo a la Guardia Nacional en las ciudades de EE.UU. controladas por los Globalistas. Mientras tanto, los Globalistas han llegado al extremo de producir la película “Civil War (Guerra Civil)” para declarar abiertamente su intención de matar al presidente que intenta un tercer mandato. Que las contradicciones dentro de EE.UU. se están espiralizando hacia una guerra civil es un fenómeno objetivo reconocido incluso por los medios conservadores en los Estados Unidos.

Históricamente, el Reino Unido adoptó el no intervencionismo en los conflictos de la Europa continental como su principal estrategia diplomática. Al mismo tiempo, fortaleció su dominio e interferencia sobre sus colonias, como Sudáfrica, India, Australia y Canadá. Imitando esta política diplomática, Estados Unidos planteó la “Doctrina Monroe”: un plan para abstenerse de intervenir en los asuntos de toda Europa, incluida Gran Bretaña, mientras convertía a América Latina en su propio “patio trasero”. La histo-

ria diplomática de los Estados Unidos no es otra cosa que un proceso de alternancia entre el “no intervencionismo” y el “intervencionismo” para servir a sus intereses nacionales y a su codicia imperialista.

Es la naturaleza inherente del imperialismo: intervención cuando es fuerte, no intervención cuando es débil. En la actualidad, Estados Unidos no tiene poder para abarcar el mundo entero e intervenir en cada asunto. En esta era multicéntrica, es de hecho lógico que EE.UU. designe al Hemisferio Occidental, incluida América Latina, como su propio “patio trasero” y concentre sus esfuerzos allí. Mientras EE.UU. siga siendo imperialista, nunca podrá abandonar su ambición de expandir su territorio y fortalecer su dominio por cualquier medio necesario.

Precisamente en este punto surge una diferencia fundamental entre Globalistas y Chovinistas dentro de los Estados Unidos con respecto a sus objetivos y medios. En este sentido, el surgimiento de MAGA era inevitable. “Make America Great Again (Hagamos a Estados Unidos grande de nuevo)” implica que Estados Unidos ya no es grande, y “America First (Estados Unidos primero)” es otro concepto para el no intervencionismo. Por lo tanto, dentro de MAGA, es inevitable que ocurra una división con respecto al alcance de la no intervención: si se aplica “fuera del continente americano” o “fuera de los EE.UU.”. De hecho, la invasión de Venezuela y el secuestro de Nicolás Maduro han encendido tales debates, y estos conflictos internos se están intensificando aún más. A medida que las fuerzas de Trump se acerquen a la guerra, enfrentarán acusaciones nacionales e internacionales de ser solo “Otro Estado Profundo”, “chovinistas no diferentes de los Globalistas” y “fascistas sin precedentes”.

Las fuerzas imperialistas de Trump están limitando la estrategia nacional de EE.UU. al Hemisferio Occidental, incluidas las Américas, y están movilizándolo todas las capacidades nacionales para lograr este objetivo. Es por eso que no es casualidad que la administración Trump invadiera Venezuela ayer

para presionar al gobierno de Rodríguez y esté presionando al gobierno danés hoy para tomar el control de Groenlandia.

3.

Mientras que la Segunda Guerra Mundial fue una confrontación entre el campo antifascista y el campo fascista, la Tercera Guerra Mundial es una confrontación entre el campo antiimperialista y el campo imperialista. La Alemania nazi no solo atacó a la Unión Soviética socialista, sino que también ocupó otras naciones imperialistas como Francia, y atacó al Reino Unido y a los Estados Unidos. Esto hizo posible que la Unión Soviética socialista y los Estados Unidos y el Reino Unido imperialistas formaran un frente unido bajo el objetivo común del antifascismo.

Sin embargo, como lo demuestra la historia posterior a la Segunda Guerra Mundial, este no fue un frente unido estratégico permanente sino un frente unido táctico temporal que duró hasta la derrota de las fuerzas fascistas. Negar la necesidad de tal frente unido táctico es el error de la desviación de izquierda trotskista y el “sectarismo de izquierda”. Por el contrario, confundir un frente unido táctico con un frente unido estratégico es el error de la desviación de derecha al estilo del eurocomunismo y el “oportunismo de derecha”.

El eurocomunismo es comunismo solo de nombre; en términos del espectro político, está apenas al nivel de la izquierda socialdemócrata. La socialdemocracia—no solo su ala derecha sino también su ala izquierda—es revisionista y oportunista, no tiene conexión con la revolución y es esencialmente contrarrevolucionaria. No sorprende en absoluto que la reciente izquierda socialdemócrata en Europa, siguiendo a la derecha socialdemócrata, esté siendo denunciada como la “Izquierda Sionista”. Los Globalistas y los belicistas imperialistas, centrados en la derecha socialdemócrata, están poniendo todos sus esfuerzos en instigar la guerra, haciendo de la intensificación de la Tercera Guerra Mundial su máxima

prioridad.

Desde un punto de vista estratégico y táctico, las fuerzas comunistas dentro del campo antiimperialista deben atraer a la izquierda socialdemócrata para formar un frente unido táctico. Al mismo tiempo, deben profundizar la contradicción entre Chovinistas y Globalistas mediante la cooperación táctica con los Chovinistas. La cooperación táctica no significa unir manos en solidaridad como un frente unido táctico; más bien, significa enfocarse en golpear preferencialmente al enemigo común con respecto al tema de la guerra, el tema más crítico del período actual. Incluso en este caso, es natural y necesario librar simultáneamente luchas contra las políticas fascistas a nivel nacional y las políticas imperialistas a nivel internacional siempre que se implementen. Mantener la independencia de las fuerzas comunistas mientras se promueve una amplia unidad y solidaridad bajo la bandera del antiimperialismo—y simultáneamente facilitar divisiones dentro del campo imperialista—es el principio estratégico y táctico más importante de este período.

Fue durante el período de la Primera Guerra Mundial que las fuerzas comunistas establecieron el primer estado socialista, y fue después de la Segunda Guerra Mundial que formaron el campo socialista y un campo de liberación nacional prosocialista a escala global. La historia demuestra la verdad de que la Primera Guerra Mundial, que fue una guerra imperialista, y la Segunda Guerra Mundial, que comenzó como una guerra entre imperialistas pero terminó como una guerra antifascista, sirvieron como las oportunidades óptimas para fortalecer las capacidades comunistas y antiimperialistas.

Es una perspectiva científica que la Tercera Guerra Mundial en curso culminará en la derrota del campo imperialista y la victoria del campo antiimperialista, lo que llevará a un fortalecimiento dramático de las fuerzas comunistas y antiimperialistas. Sin embargo, para lograr esto, debe haber estrategia y táctica como un sistema integrado de objetivos, medios y

estrategias. Sin duda, el campo antiimperialista está operando sistemáticamente bajo tales estrategias y tácticas científicas. El campo antiimperialista está abrumando al campo imperialista en todos los aspectos: justificación, capacidad y estrategias.

El 3 de septiembre de 2025, a través del desfile del Día de la Victoria celebrado en Beijing, China, el mundo confirmó objetivamente quiénes son las tres fuerzas principales del campo antiimperialista y el alcance de su poder. El desfile de la victoria anterior en Moscú, Rusia, el 9 de mayo, y el desfile militar en Pyongyang, la RPDC, el 10 de octubre, celebrando el 80 aniversario de la fundación del Partido, también demostraron plenamente el poder militar del campo antiimperialista. No solo Rusia, sino también China y la RPDC son superpotencias nucleares y de misiles armadas con bombas de hidrógeno y misiles hipersónicos. Ninguna nación imperialista se atreve a librar una guerra contra estas potencias militares antiimperialistas.

Hoy, los campos de batalla representativos de la Tercera Guerra Mundial son dos: Europa del Este, centrada en Ucrania, y Asia Occidental, incluyendo Palestina. Asia Oriental, que abarca Taiwán y la 'ROK', es donde un conflicto es inminente. En este sentido, se les conoce como dos campos de batalla principales y tres campos de batalla principales. Con respecto a los teatros primarios de la Tercera Guerra Mundial, el punto estratégicamente importante es que EE.UU. ya no puede lograr la victoria simultánea en dos campos de batalla. Las guerras en Ucrania y Asia Occidental demuestran la verdad de que Estados Unidos no ha logrado ganar ni siquiera una, y mucho menos dos. De hecho, después de la Segunda Guerra Mundial, EE.UU. nunca ha ganado ni una sola vez en dos frentes simultáneamente, a pesar de su grandiosa retórica. En este sentido, es natural que la estrategia de seguridad nacional de la administración Trump desplazara su enfoque de Eurasia a las Américas, eligiendo la "Nueva Doctrina Monroe" sobre la "Estrategia del Indo-Pacífico". Esta

es una declaración de que EE.UU. ya no participará en faroles, como la “Estrategia Ganar-Ganar (victoria simultánea en dos teatros)”, cuya imposibilidad es ahora conocida por el mundo entero. Es una expresión de voluntad, una “resolución firme”, para mantener un control firme sobre las inmediaciones de los EE.UU., regiones donde China y Rusia aún no pueden enviar grupos de ataque de portaaviones nucleares, especialmente el Caribe y América Latina.

Por lo tanto, bajo las condiciones actuales donde la estrategia de EE.UU. ha sido confirmada, el campo antiimperialista, incluidos China, la RPDC y Rusia, no tiene motivos para retrasar más una ofensiva decisiva. En estrategia y táctica, la impaciencia es un problema, pero la actitud de esperar y ver (atentismo) también es un problema. Esta es precisamente la razón por la que China realizó apresuradamente un simulacro de cerco a Taiwán a fines de diciembre como si fuera un ensayo final. Inmediatamente después de la invasión estadounidense de Venezuela el 3 de enero, la RPDC también realizó un simulacro de lanzamiento de misil hipersónico el 4 de enero bajo el mando directo del Presidente Kim Jong Un, protegiendo a la nación antiimperialista y advirtiéndole al Estados Unidos imperialista. Se informa que el misil hipersónico Hwasong-11Ma, que estará equipado con ojivas nucleares tácticas, se montará en el submarino de propulsión nuclear de la RPDC, cuya construcción está cerca de completarse. Para China, la importancia económica de Irán es incomparablemente vasta. Mientras Irán enfrenta su mayor crisis debido a las “Revoluciones de Color” con el bloqueo económico imperialista de EE.UU., el simulacro de cerco a Taiwán debe verse como portador de un mensaje de solidaridad internacional no solo para Venezuela sino también para Irán. El 8 de enero, Rusia también lanzó el formidable misil hipersónico “Oreshnik” contra la instalación de almacenamiento de gas más grande de Europa en Lviv, Ucrania. Este ataque tuvo lugar inmediatamente después de que la residencia de Putin fuera atacada, el Presidente

Nicolás Maduro fuera secuestrado y la “Coalición de los Voluntarios” anunciara que enviaría tropas a Ucrania tras un acuerdo de paz.

Todo está conectado. A medida que Estados Unidos invade Venezuela y presiona a Irán, la posibilidad de una guerra por Taiwán por parte de China aumenta en consecuencia. Dado que una guerra en Taiwán se expandirá inmediata e incondicionalmente a una guerra en la ‘ROK’, Estados Unidos debe tener preparativos estratégicos y tácticos para ambos frentes. A medida que la administración Trump adopta la “Nueva Doctrina Monroe” como su estrategia de seguridad nacional y se mueve profundamente en esa dirección, su política de no interferencia en las guerras en Taiwán y la ‘ROK’ se ha vuelto más clara. En otras palabras, la “Primera Cadena de Islas”—que se extiende desde Japón a través de Taiwán hasta las Filipinas—ya no es la línea principal de defensa para los Estados Unidos. Se debe tomar nota del hecho de que el grupo de portaaviones de China rompió una vez más la Primera Cadena de Islas en diciembre pasado y se movió hacia el norte, amenazando a Japón. Las observaciones ganan más peso de que, si bien Estados Unidos puede defender a Japón y las Filipinas, se retirará y se abstendrá de intervenir en Taiwán y la ‘ROK’, que China y la RPDC consideran asuntos de vital importancia.

Es probable que China y la RPDC estén realizando una revisión final de si la política de no interferencia de EE.UU. es una “inducción a la guerra” o una “táctica engañosa”. Mirando hacia atrás, la declaración hecha por la RPDC en octubre de 2024—“Ese momento no lo decidimos nosotros”—fue una expresión dirigida a la invasión potencial por parte del imperialismo estadounidense, mientras que también insinuaba el nivel de preparación de China. Esta es la razón por la que la RPDC, que ha completado todos los preparativos militares y políticos desde la declaración de “subyugación” en la Asamblea Popular Suprema el 15 de enero de 2024, continúa manteniendo su paciencia estratégica. El 10 de enero, el Estado Mayor

General del Ejército Popular de Corea reveló la infiltración de drones de la 'ROK' en el territorio de la RPDC y emitió una grave advertencia sobre el riesgo de conflicto armado.

Tras el éxito del desfile militar del 3 de septiembre de 2025 y la victoria en la batalla económica entre EE.UU. y China a fines de octubre, China parece confiar en que sus preparativos militares y económicos están completos. Esta confianza fue reafirmada por las fuertes acciones anti-japonesas de China tras los comentarios belicosos anti-China de la japonesa Sanae Takaichi, quien, tras tomar el poder, gritó "Una contingencia en Taiwán es una contingencia en Japón" para aumentar sus bajos índices de aprobación junto con su estímulo económico "Sanaeconomics". Del 4 al 7 de enero de 2026, China invitó al presidente de la 'ROK' para atraerlo diplomáticamente mientras simultáneamente propinaba golpes militares y económicos a Japón mediante sanciones a los elementos de tierras raras. En resumen, las tensiones militares y diplomáticas en Asia Oriental se están disparando. El año 2026 tiene una posibilidad más alta que cualquier otro año para la explosión de la guerra en Asia Oriental.

En 1936 estalló la Guerra Civil Española. Las fuerzas fascistas pretendían apoderarse de España y luego marchar hacia Francia, Europa Occidental y Europa Oriental; y en consecuencia, eso fue lo que sucedió. Ahora, 90 años después, ha ocurrido la invasión de Venezuela de 2026. Las fuerzas imperialistas pretenden apoderarse de Venezuela y luego expandir su alcance a Cuba, Centroamérica y Sudamérica. La diferencia entre las dos es que esta vez, el resultado será diferente.

Durante la Guerra Civil Española, se organizaron las Brigadas Internacionales bajo la dirección de la Komintern. Bajo el lema "¡No Pasarán!", libraron una heroica defensa de Madrid durante tres años. Aunque España cayó finalmente bajo el dominio fascista, los comunistas y antiimperialistas de las Brigadas Internacionales que lucharon allí hicieron

una contribución crucial a la victoria de las fuerzas antifascistas en la Segunda Guerra Mundial y más tarde se convirtieron en las fuerzas centrales de las revoluciones en sus respectivos países. Mientras uno luce al lado del pueblo bajo la bandera de la justicia, puede haber derrotas temporales y tácticas, pero no existe la derrota permanente o estratégica.

La bandera de la justicia en nuestra era es la independencia antiimperialista. La independencia antiimperialista es la Democracia Popular, y el pueblo unido seguramente prevalecerá. Nicolás Maduro, el luchador antiimperialista y líder popular nacido en Venezuela, es un héroe de nuestro tiempo. El imperialismo estadounidense puede encarcelar el cuerpo de Nicolás Maduro por un momento, pero nunca podrá, por toda la eternidad, quebrar su espíritu. La historia declarará la inocencia de Nicolás Maduro, y seguramente regresará a los brazos del pueblo venezolano. La película "Nicolás", que describe la vida del revolucionario Nicolás Maduro, solo ha visto intensificada su tensión dramática por la aparición del villano del siglo, Trump. Más allá de Venezuela, los pueblos de América Latina y del mundo gritan la consigna popular "¡Free Maduro!" junto con la consigna estratégica "¡Abajo el imperialismo!" mientras avanzan en la resistencia anti-EE.UU. y antiimperialista.

El imperialismo estadounidense, embriagado por victorias temporales y tácticas, no ve su propia derrota permanente y estratégica. Dado que el dotard (viejo decrepito), ese "León de Papel", ha caído en una arrogancia fatal, su caída es solo cuestión de tiempo. Cuanto más profunda es la oscuridad, más cerca está el amanecer. Venezuela es la 'ROK', y la 'ROK' es Venezuela. Venezuela es América Latina, y Venezuela es el mundo. Los comunistas, los antiimperialistas y el pueblo en lucha bloquearán resueltamente el paso del imperialismo en la primera línea del frente antiimperialista: Venezuela. La victoria pertenece por siempre al pueblo unido y en lucha. ¡No Pasarán! ¡Victoria Siempre! ¡Venceremos!