

Platform

April 2026 No.35

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 illustration is rendered in a flat, graphic style with some shading to suggest form and movement.





Contents

Work	Report on the International Situation and the Fundamental Tasks of the Communist International 2 V. I. Lenin
Article	History Has a Taste for Irony 14 Mücadele Birliđi (Struggle Unity, Türkiye)
	No cooperation with the war machine! Victory to Iran! 19 Communist Party of Great Britain (Marxist-Leninist)
	Steve Sweeney reports on his attempted assassination by Israeli forces .. 24 Steve Sweeney Communist Party of Great Britain (Marxist-Leninist)
	Iran's Epic Scale Counterattack, the Escalation of World War III and the Tasks of the Anti-imperialist Movement 27 Dimitrios Patelis Founding member of the Revolutionary Theory Group (Greece)
	The Imperialists Cannot Win in Any of the Four Major Theaters 33 Stephen Cho Coordinator of the Korean International Forum

Report on the International Situation and the Fundamental Tasks of the Communist International

V. I. Lenin

July 19, 1920

Comrades, the theses on the questions of the fundamental tasks of the Communist International have been published in all languages and contain nothing that is materially new (particularly to the Russian comrades). That is because, in a considerable measure, they extend several of the main features of our revolutionary experience and the lessons of our revolutionary movement to a number of Western countries, to Western Europe. My report will therefore deal at greater length, if in brief outline, with the first part of my subject, namely, the international situation.

Imperialism's economic relations constitute the core of the entire international situation as it now exists. Throughout the twentieth century, this new, highest and final stage of capitalism has fully taken shape. Of course, you all know that the enormous dimensions that capital has reached are the most characteristic and essential feature of imperialism. The place of free competition has been taken by huge monopolies. An insignificant number of capitalists have, in some cases, been able to concentrate in their hands entire branches of industry; these have passed into the hands of combines, cartels, syndicates and trusts, not infrequently of an international nature. Thus, entire branches of industry, not only in single countries, but all over the world, have been taken over by monopolists in the field of finance, property rights, and partly of production. This has formed the basis for the unprecedented domination exercised by an insignificant number of very big banks, financial tycoons, financial magnates who have, in fact, transformed even the freest republics into financial monarchies. Before the war, this was publicly rec-

ognised by such far from revolutionary writers as, for example, Lysis in France.

This domination by a handful of capitalists achieved full development when the whole world had been partitioned, not only in the sense that the various sources of raw materials and means of production had been seized by the biggest capitalists, but also in the sense that the preliminary partition of the colonies had been completed. Some forty years ago, the population of the colonies stood at somewhat over 250,000,000, who were subordinated to six capitalist powers. Before the war of 1914, the population of the colonies was estimated at about 600,000,000, and if we add countries like Persia, Turkey, and China, which were already semi-colonies, we shall get, in round figures, a population of a thousand million people oppressed through colonial dependence by the richest, most civilised and freest countries. And you know that, apart from direct political and juridical dependence, colonial dependence presumes a number of relations of financial and economic dependence, a number of wars, which were not regarded as wars because very often they amounted to sheer massacres, when European and American imperialist troops, armed with the most up-to-date weapons of destruction, slaughtered the unarmed and defenceless inhabitants of colonial countries.

The first imperialist war of 1914-18 was the inevitable outcome of this partition of the whole world, of this domination by the capitalist monopolies, of this great power wielded by an insignificant number of very big banks—two, three, four or five in each country. This war was waged for the repartitioning of the whole world. It was waged in order to decide which

of the small groups of the biggest states—the British or the German—was to obtain the opportunity and the right to rob, strangle and exploit the whole world. You know that the war settled this question in favour of the British group. And, as a result of this war, all capitalist contradictions have become immeasurably more acute. At a single stroke the war relegated about 250,000,000 of the world's inhabitants to what is equivalent to colonial status, viz., Russia, whose population can be taken at about 130,000,000, and Austria-Hungary, Germany and Bulgaria, with a total population of not less than 120,000,000. That means 250,000,000 people living in countries, of which some, like Germany, are among the most advanced, most enlightened, most cultured, and on a level with modern technical progress. By means of the Treaty of Versailles, the war imposed such terms upon these countries that advanced peoples have been reduced to a state of colonial dependence, poverty, starvation, ruin, and loss of rights: this treaty binds them for many generations, placing them in conditions that no civilised nation has ever lived in. The following is the post-war picture of the world: at least 1,250 million people are at once brought under the colonial yoke, exploited by a brutal capitalism, which once boasted of its love for peace, and had some right to do so some fifty years ago, when the world was not yet partitioned, the monopolies did not as yet rule, and capitalism could still develop in a relatively peaceful way, without tremendous military conflicts.

Today, after this “peaceful” period, we see a monstrous intensification of oppression, the reversion to a colonial and military oppression that is far worse than before. The Treaty of Versailles has placed Germany and the other defeated countries in a position that makes their economic existence physically impossible, deprives them of all rights, and humiliates them.

How many nations are the beneficiaries? To answer this question, we must recall that the population of the United States—the only full beneficiary from

the war, a country which, from a heavy debtor, has become a general creditor—is no more than 100,000,000. The population of Japan—which gained a great deal by keeping out of the European-American conflict and by seizing the enormous Asian continent—is 50,000,000. The population of Britain, which next to the above-mentioned countries gained most, is about 50,000,000. If we add the neutral countries with their very small populations, countries which were enriched by the war, we shall get, in round figures, some 250,000,000 people.

Thus you get the broad outlines of the picture of the world as it appeared after the imperialist war. In the oppressed colonies—countries which are being dismembered, such as Persia, Turkey and China, and in countries that were defeated and have been relegated to the position of colonies—there are 1,250 million inhabitants. Not more than 250,000,000 inhabit countries that have retained their old positions, but have become economically dependent upon America, and all of which, during the war, were militarily dependent, once the war involved the whole world and did not permit a single state to remain really neutral. And, finally, we have not more than 250,000,000 inhabitants in countries whose top stratum, the capitalists alone, benefited from the partition of the world. We thus get a total of about 1,750 million comprising the entire population of the world. I would like to remind you of this picture of the world, for all the basic contradictions of capitalism, of imperialism, which are leading up to revolution, all the basic contradictions in the working-class movement that have led up to the furious struggle against the Second International, facts our chairman has referred to, are all connected with this partitioning of the world's population.

Of course, these figures give the economic picture of the world only approximately, in broad outline. And, comrades, it is natural that, with the population of the world divided in this way, exploitation by finance capital, the capitalist monopolies, has

increased many times over.

Not only have the colonial and the defeated countries been reduced to a state of dependence; within each victor state the contradictions have grown more acute; all the capitalist contradictions have become aggravated. I shall illustrate this briefly with a few examples.

Let us take the national debts. We know that the debts of the principal European states increased no less than sevenfold in the period between 1914 and 1920. I shall quote another economic source, one of particular significance—Keynes, the British diplomat and author of *The Economic Consequences of the Peace*, who, on instructions from his government, took part in the Versailles peace negotiations, observed them on the spot from the purely bourgeois point of view, studied the subject in detail, step by step, and took part in the conferences as an economist. He has arrived at conclusions which are more weighty, more striking and more instructive than any a Communist revolutionary could draw, because they are the conclusions of a well-known bourgeois and implacable enemy of Bolshevism, which he, like the British philistine he is, imagines as something monstrous, ferocious, and bestial. Keynes has reached the conclusion that after the Peace of Versailles, Europe and the whole world are heading for bankruptcy. He has resigned, and thrown his book in the government's face with the words: "What you are doing is madness". I shall quote his figures, which can be summed up as follows.

What are the debtor-creditor relations that have developed between the principal powers? I shall convert pounds sterling into gold rubles, at a rate of ten gold rubles to one pound. Here is what we get: the United States has assets amounting to 19,000 million, its liabilities are nil. Before the war it was in Britain's debt. In his report on April 14, 1920, to the last congress of the Communist Party of Germany, Comrade Levi very correctly pointed out that there are now only two powers in the world that can act

independently, viz., Britain and America. America alone is absolutely independent financially. Before the war she was a debtor; she is now a creditor only. All the other powers in the world are debtors. Britain has been reduced to a position in which her assets total 17,000 million, and her liabilities 8,000 million. She is already half-way to becoming a debtor nation. Moreover, her assets include about 6,000 million owed to her by Russia. Included in the debt are military supplies received by Russia during the war. When Krasin, as representative of the Russian Soviet Government, recently had occasion to discuss with Lloyd George the subject of debt agreements, he made it plain to the scientists and politicians, to the British Government's leaders, that they were labouring under a strange delusion if they were counting on getting these debts repaid. The British diplomat Keynes has already laid this delusion bare.

Of course, it is not only or even not at all a question of the Russian revolutionary government having no wish to pay the debts. No government would pay, because these debts are usurious interest on a sum that has been paid twenty times over, and the self-same bourgeois Keynes, who does not in the least sympathise with the Russian revolutionary movement, says: "It is clear that these debts cannot be taken into account."

In regard to France, Keynes quotes the following figures: her assets amount to 3,500 million, and her liabilities to 10,500 million! And this is a country which the French themselves called the world's money-lender, because her "savings" were enormous; the proceeds of colonial and financial pillage—a gigantic capital—enabled her to grant thousands upon thousands of millions in loans, particularly to Russia. These loans brought in an enormous revenue. Notwithstanding this and notwithstanding victory, France has been reduced to debtor status.

A bourgeois American source, quoted by Comrade Braun, a Communist, in his book *Who Must Pay the War Debts?* (Leipzig, 1920), estimates the ratio

of debts to national wealth as follows: in the victor countries, Britain and France, the ratio of debts to aggregate national wealth is over 50 per cent; in Italy the percentage is between 60 and 70, and in Russia 90. As you know, however, these debts do not disturb us, because we followed Keynes's excellent advice just a little before his book appeared—we annulled all our debts.

In this, however, Keynes reveals the usual crankiness of the philistine: while advising that all debts should be annulled, he goes on to say that, of course, France only stands to gain by it, that, of course, Britain will not lose very much, as nothing can be got out of Russia in any case; America will lose a fair amount, but Keynes counts on American “generosity”! On this point our views differ from those of Keynes and other petty-bourgeois pacifists. We think that to get the debts annulled they will have to wait for something else to happen, and will have to try working in a direction other than counting on the “generosity” of the capitalists.

These few figures go to show that the imperialist war has created an impossible situation for the victor powers as well. This is further shown by the enormous disparity between wages and price rises. On March 8 of this year, the Supreme Economic Council, an institution charged with protecting the bourgeois system throughout the world from the mounting revolution, adopted a resolution which ended with an appeal for order, industry and thrift, provided, of course, the workers remain the slaves of capital. This Supreme Economic Council, organ of the Entente and of the capitalists of the whole world, presented the following summary.

In the United States of America food prices have risen, on the average, by 120 per cent, whereas wages have increased only by 100 per cent. In Britain, food prices have gone up by 170 per cent, and wages 130 per cent; in France, food prices—300 per cent, and wages 200 per cent; in Japan—food prices 130 per cent, and wages 60 per cent (I have analysed Com-

rade Braun's figures in his pamphlet and those of the Supreme Economic Council as published in *The Times* of March 10, 1920).

In such circumstances, the workers' mounting resentment, the growth of a revolutionary temper and ideas, and the increase in spontaneous mass strikes are obviously inevitable, since the position of the workers is becoming intolerable. The workers' own experience is convincing them that the capitalists have become prodigiously enriched by the war and are placing the burden of war costs and debts upon the workers' shoulders. We recently learnt by cable that America wants to deport another 500 Communists to Russia so as to get rid of “dangerous agitators”.

Even if America deports to our country, not 500 but 500,000 Russian, American, Japanese and French “agitators” that will make no difference, because there will still be the disparity between prices and wages, which they can do nothing about. The reason why they can do nothing about it is because private property is most strictly safeguarded, is “sacred” there. That should not be forgotten, because it is only in Russia that the exploiters' private property has been abolished. The capitalists can do nothing about the gap between prices and wages, and the workers cannot live on their previous wages. The old methods are useless against this calamity. Nothing can be achieved by isolated strikes, the parliamentary struggle, or the vote, because “private property is sacred”, and the capitalists have accumulated such debts that the whole world is in bondage to a handful of men. Meanwhile the workers' living conditions are becoming more and more unbearable. There is no other way out but to abolish the exploiters' “private property”.

In his pamphlet *Britain and the World Revolution*, valuable extracts from which were published by our *Bulletin of the People's Commissariat of Foreign Affairs* of February 1920, Comrade Lapinsky points out that in Britain coal export prices have doubled as

against those anticipated by official industrial circles.

In Lancashire things have gone so far that shares are at a premium of 400 per cent. Bank profits are at least 40-50 per cent. It should, moreover, be noted that, in determining bank profits, all bank officials are able to conceal the lion's share of profits by calling them, not profits but bonuses, commissions, etc. So here, too, indisputable economic facts prove that the wealth of a tiny handful of people has grown prodigiously and that their luxury beggars description, while the poverty of the working class is steadily growing. We must particularly note the further circumstance brought out very clearly by Comrade Levi in the report I have just referred to, namely, the change in the value of money. Money has everywhere depreciated as a result of the debts, the issue of paper currency, etc. The same bourgeois source I have already mentioned, namely, the statement of the Supreme Economic Council of March 8, 1920, has calculated that in Britain the depreciation in the value of currency as against the dollar is approximately one-third, in France and Italy two-thirds, and in Germany as much as 96 per cent.

This fact shows that the "mechanism" of the world capitalist economy is falling apart. The trade relations on which the acquisition of raw materials and the sale of commodities hinge under capitalism cannot go on; they cannot continue to be based on the subordination of a number of countries to a single country—the reason being the change in the value of money. No wealthy country can exist or trade unless it sells its goods and obtains raw materials.

Thus we have a situation in which America, a wealthy country that all countries are subordinate to, cannot buy or sell. And the selfsame Keynes who went through the entire gamut of the Versailles negotiations has been compelled to acknowledge this impossibility despite his unyielding determination to defend capitalism, and all his hatred of Bolshevism. Incidentally, I do not think any communist manifesto, or one that is revolutionary in general,

could compare in forcefulness with those pages in Keynes's book which depict Wilson and "Wilsonism" in action. Wilson was the idol of philistines and pacifists like Keynes and a number of heroes of the Second International (and even of the "Two-and-a-Half" International^[2]), who exalted the "Fourteen Points" and even wrote "learned" books about the "roots" of Wilson's policy; they hoped that Wilson would save "social peace", reconcile exploiters and exploited, and bring about social reforms. Keynes showed vividly how Wilson was made a fool of, and all these illusions were shattered at the first impact with the practical, mercantile and huckster policy of capital as personified by Clemenceau and Lloyd George. The masses of the workers now see more clearly than ever, from their own experience—and the learned pedants could see it just by reading Keynes's book—that the "roots" of Wilson's policy lay in sanctimonious piffle, petty-bourgeois phrase-mongering, and an utter inability to understand the class struggle.

In consequence of all this, two conditions, two fundamental situations, have inevitably and naturally emerged. On the one hand, the impoverishment of the masses has grown incredibly, primarily among 1,250 million people, i.e., 70 per cent of the world's population. These are the colonial and dependent countries whose inhabitants possess no legal rights, countries "mandated" to the brigands of finance. Besides, the enslavement of the defeated countries has been sanctioned by the Treaty of Versailles and by existing secret treaties regarding Russia, whose validity, it is true, is sometimes about as real as that of the scraps of paper stating that we owe so many thousands of millions. For the first time in world history, we see robbery, slavery, dependence, poverty and starvation imposed upon 1,250 million people by a legal act.

On the other hand, the workers in each of the creditor countries have found themselves in conditions that are intolerable. The war has led to an unprece-

dented aggravation of all capitalist contradictions, this being the origin of the intense revolutionary ferment that is ever growing. During the war people were put under military discipline, hurled into the ranks of death, or threatened with immediate war-time punishment. Because of the war conditions people could not see the economic realities. Writers, poets, the clergy, the whole press were engaged in nothing but glorifying the war. Now that the war has ended, the exposures have begun: German imperialism with its Peace of Brest-Litovsk has been laid bare; the Treaty of Versailles, which was to have been a victory for imperialism but proved its defeat, has been exposed. Incidentally, the example of Keynes shows that in Europe and America tens and hundreds of thousands of petty-bourgeois, intellectuals, and simply more or less literate and educated people, have had to follow the road taken by Keynes, who resigned and threw in the face of the government a book exposing it. Keynes has shown what is taking place and will take place in the minds of thousands and hundreds of thousands of people when they realise that all the speeches about a “war for liberty”, etc., were sheer deception, and that as a result only a handful of people were enriched, while the others were ruined and reduced to slavery. Is it not a fact that the bourgeois Keynes declares that, to survive and save the British economy, the British must secure the resumption of free commercial intercourse between Germany and Russia? How can this be achieved? By cancelling all debts, as Keynes proposes. This is an idea that has been arrived at not only by Keynes, the learned economist; millions of people are or will be getting the same idea. And millions of people hear bourgeois economists declare that there is no way out except annulling the debts; therefore “damn the Bolsheviks” (who have annulled the debts), and let us appeal to America’s “generosity”! I think that, on behalf of the Congress of the Communist International, we should send a message of thanks to these economists, who have been agitating for Bolshevism.

If, on the one hand, the economic position of the masses has become intolerable, and, on the other hand, the disintegration described by Keynes has set in and is growing among the negligible minority of all-powerful victor countries, then we are in the presence of the maturing of the two conditions for the world revolution.

We now have before us a somewhat more complete picture of the whole world. We know what dependence upon a handful of rich men means to 1,250 million people who have been placed in intolerable conditions of existence. On the other hand, when the peoples were presented with the League of Nations Covenant, declaring that the League had put an end to war and would henceforth not permit anyone to break the peace, and when this Covenant, the last hope of working people all over the world, came into force, it proved to be a victory of the first order for us. Before it came into force, people used to say that it was impossible not to impose special conditions on a country like Germany, but when the Covenant was drawn up, everything would come out all right. Yet, when the Covenant was published, the bitterest opponents of Bolshevism were obliged to repudiate it. When the Covenant came into operation, it appeared that a small group of the richest countries, the “Big Four”—in the persons of Clemenceau, Lloyd George, Orlando and Wilson—had been put on the job of creating the new relations! When the machinery of the Covenant was put into operation, this led to a complete breakdown.

We saw this in the case of the wars against Russia. Weak, ruined and crushed, Russia, a most backward country, fought against all the nations, against a league of the rich and powerful states that dominate the world, and emerged victorious. We could not put up a force that was anything like the equal of theirs, and yet we proved the victors. Why was that? Because there was not a jot of unity among them, because each power worked against the other. France wanted Russia to pay her debts and become

a formidable force against Germany; Britain wanted to partition Russia, and attempted to seize the Baku oilfields and conclude a treaty with the border states of Russia. Among the official British documents there is a Paper which scrupulously enumerates all the states (fourteen in all) which some six months ago, in December 1919, pledged themselves to take Moscow and Petrograd. Britain based her policy on these states, to whom she granted loans running into millions. All these calculations have now misfired, and all the loans are unrecoverable.

Such is the situation created by the League of Nations. Every day of this Covenant's existence provides the best propaganda for Bolshevism, since the most powerful adherents of the capitalist "order" are revealing that, on every question, they put spokes in one another's wheels. Furious wrangling over the partitioning of Turkey, Persia, Mesopotamia and China is going on between Japan, Britain, America and France. The bourgeois press in these countries is full of the bitterest attacks and the angriest statements against their "colleagues" for trying to snatch the booty from under their noses. We see complete discord at the top, among this handful, this very small number of extremely rich countries. There are 1,250 million people who find it impossible to live in the conditions of servitude which "advanced" and civilised capitalism wishes to impose on them: after all, these represent 70 per cent of the world's population. This handful of the richest states—Britain, America and Japan (though Japan was able to plunder the Eastern, the Asian countries, she cannot constitute an independent financial and military force without support from another country)—these two or three countries are unable to organise economic relations, and are directing their policies toward disrupting policies of their colleagues and partners in the League of Nations. Hence the world crisis; it is these economic roots of the crisis that provide the chief reason of the brilliant successes the Communist International is achieving.

Comrades, we have now come to the question of the revolutionary crisis as the basis of our revolutionary action. And here we must first of all note two widespread errors. On the one hand, bourgeois economists depict this crisis simply as "unrest", to use the elegant expression of the British. On the other hand, revolutionaries sometimes try to prove that the crisis is absolutely insoluble.

This is a mistake. There is no such thing as an absolutely hopeless situation. The bourgeoisie are behaving like barefaced plunderers who have lost their heads; they are committing folly after folly, thus aggravating the situation and hastening their doom. All that is true. But nobody can "prove" that it is absolutely impossible for them to pacify a minority of the exploited with some petty concessions, and suppress some movement or uprising of some section of the oppressed and exploited. To try to "prove" in advance that there is "absolutely" no way out of the situation would be sheer pedantry, or playing with concepts and catchwords. Practice alone can serve as real "proof" in this and similar questions. All over the world, the bourgeois system is experiencing a tremendous revolutionary crisis. The revolutionary parties must now "prove" in practice that they have sufficient understanding and organisation, contact with the exploited masses, and determination and skill to utilise this crisis for a successful, a victorious revolution.

It is mainly to prepare this "proof" that we have gathered at this Congress of the Communist International.

To illustrate to what extent opportunism still prevails among parties that wish to affiliate to the Third International, and how far the work of some parties is removed from preparing the revolutionary class to utilise the revolutionary crisis, I shall quote the leader of the British Independent Labour Party, Ramsay MacDonald. In his book, *Parliament and Revolution*, which deals with the basic problems that are now engaging our attention, MacDonald describes the

state of affairs in what is something like a bourgeois pacifist spirit. He admits that there is a revolutionary crisis and that revolutionary sentiments are growing, that the sympathies of the workers are with the Soviets and the dictatorship of the proletariat (note that this refers to Britain) and that the dictatorship of the proletariat is better than the present dictatorship of the British bourgeoisie.

But MacDonald remains a thorough-paced bourgeois pacifist and compromiser, a petty bourgeois who dreams of a government that stands above classes. Like all bourgeois liars, sophists and pedants, MacDonald recognises the class struggle merely as a “descriptive fact”. He ignores the experience of Kerensky, the Mensheviks and the Socialist Revolutionaries of Russia, the similar experience of Hungary, Germany, etc., in regard to creating a “democratic” government allegedly standing above classes. MacDonald lulls his party and those workers who have the misfortune to regard this bourgeois as a socialist, this philistine as a leader, with the words: “We know that all this [i.e., the revolutionary crisis, the revolutionary ferment] will pass . . . settle down.” The war, he says, inevitably provoked the crisis, but after the war it will all “settle down”, even if not at once!

That is what has been written by a man who is leader of a party that wants to affiliate to the Third International. This is a revelation—the more valuable for its rare outspokenness—of what is no less frequently to be seen in the top ranks of the French Socialist Party and the German Independent Social-Democratic Party, namely, not merely an inability, but also an unwillingness to take advantage, in a revolutionary sense, of the revolutionary crisis, or, in other words, both an inability and an unwillingness to really prepare the party and the class in revolutionary fashion for the dictatorship of the proletariat.

That is the main evil in very many parties which are now leaving the Second International. This is precisely why, in the theses I have submitted to the

present Congress, I have dwelt most of all on the tasks connected with preparations for the dictatorship of the proletariat, and have given as concrete and exact a definition of them as possible.

Here is another example. A new book against Bolshevism was recently published. An unusually large number of books of this, kind are now coming out in Europe and America; the more anti-Bolshevik books are brought out, the more strongly and rapidly mass sympathy for Bolshevism grows. I am referring to Otto Bauer’s *Bolshevism or Social-Democracy?* This book clearly demonstrates to the Germans the essence of Menshevism, whose shameful role in the Russian revolution is understood well enough by the workers of all countries. Otto Bauer has produced a thoroughgoing Menshevik pamphlet, although he has concealed his own sympathy with Menshevism. In Europe and America, however, more precise information should now be disseminated about what Menshevism actually is, for it is a generic term for all allegedly socialist, Social-Democratic and other trends that are hostile to Bolshevism. It would be dull writing if we Russians were to explain to Europeans what Menshevism is. Otto Bauer has shown that in his book, and we thank in advance the bourgeois and opportunist publishers who will publish it and translate it into various languages. Bauer’s book will be a useful if peculiar supplement to the textbooks on communism. Take any paragraph, any argument in Otto Bauer’s book and indicate the Menshevism in it, where the roots lie of views that lead up to the actions of the traitors to socialism, of the friends of Kerensky, Scheidemann, etc.—this is a question that could be very usefully and successfully set in “examinations” designed to test whether communism has been properly assimilated. If you cannot answer this question, you are not yet a Communist, and should not join the Communist Party.

Otto Bauer has excellently expressed in a single sentence the essence of the views of world opportunism; for this, if we could do as we please in Vienna, we

would put up a monument to him in his lifetime. The use of force in the class struggle in modern democracies, Otto Bauer says, would be “violence exercised against the social factors of force”.

You may think that this sounds queer and unintelligible. It is an example of what Marxism has been reduced to, of the kind of banality and defence of the exploiters to which the most revolutionary theory can be reduced. A German variety of philistinism is required, and you get the “theory” that the “social factors of force” are: number; the degree of organisation; the place held in the process of production and distribution; activity and education. If a rural agricultural labourer or an urban working man practices revolutionary violence against a landowner or a capitalist, that is no dictatorship of the proletariat, no violence against the exploiters and the oppressors of the people. Oh, no! This is “violence against the social factors of force”.

Perhaps my example sounds something like a jest. However, such is the nature of present-day opportunism that its struggle against Bolshevism becomes a jest. The task of involving the working class, all its thinking elements, in the struggle between international Menshevism (the MacDonalds, Otto Bauers and Co.) and Bolshevism is highly useful and very urgent to Europe and America.

Here we must ask: how is the persistence of such trends in Europe to be explained? Why is this opportunism stronger in Western Europe than in our country? It is because the culture of the advanced countries has been, and still is, the result of their being able to live at the expense of a thousand million oppressed people. It is because the capitalists of these countries obtain a great deal more in this way than they could obtain as profits by plundering the workers in their own countries.

Before the war, it was calculated that the three richest countries—Britain, France and Germany—got between eight and ten thousand million francs a year from the export of capital alone, apart from other

sources.

It goes without saying that, out of this tidy sum, at least five hundred millions can be spent as a sop to the labour leaders and the labour aristocracy, i.e., on all sorts of bribes. The whole thing boils down to nothing but bribery. It is done in a thousand different ways: by increasing cultural facilities in the largest centres, by creating educational institutions, and by providing co-operative, trade union and parliamentary leaders with thousands of cushy jobs. This is done wherever present-day civilised capitalist relations exist. It is these thousands of millions in super-profits that form the economic basis of opportunism in the working-class movement. In America, Britain and France we see a far greater persistence of the opportunist leaders, of the upper crust of the working class, the labour aristocracy; they offer stronger resistance to the Communist movement. That is why we must be prepared to find it harder for the European and American workers’ parties to get rid of this disease than was the case in our country. We know that enormous successes have been achieved in the treatment of this disease since the Third International was formed, but we have not yet finished the job; the purging of the workers’ parties, the revolutionary parties of the proletariat all over the world, of bourgeois influences, of the opportunists in their ranks, is very far from complete.

I shall not dwell on the concrete manner in which we must do that; that is dealt with in my published theses. My task consists in indicating the deep economic roots of this phenomenon. The disease is a protracted one; the cure takes longer than the optimists hoped it would. Opportunism is our principal enemy. Opportunism in the upper ranks of the working-class movement is bourgeois socialism, not proletarian socialism. It has been shown in practice that working-class activists who follow the opportunist trend are better defenders of the bourgeoisie than the bourgeois themselves. Without their leadership of the workers, the bourgeoisie could not remain in

power. This has been proved, not only by the history of the Kerensky regime in Russia; it has also been proved by the democratic republic in Germany under its Social-Democratic government, as well as by Albert Thomas's attitude towards his bourgeois government. It has been proved by similar experience in Britain and the United States. This is where our principal enemy is, an enemy we must overcome. We must leave this Congress firmly resolved to carry on this struggle to the very end, in all parties. That is our main task.

Compared with this task, the rectification of the errors of the "Left" trend in communism will be an easy one. In a number of countries anti-parliamentarianism is to be seen, which has not been so much introduced by people of petty-bourgeois origin as fostered by certain advanced contingents of the proletariat out of hatred for the old parliamentarianism, out of a legitimate, proper and necessary hatred for the conduct of members of parliament in Britain, France, Italy, in all lands. Directives must be issued by the Communist International and the comrades must be made more familiar with the experience of Russia, with the significance of a genuinely proletarian political party. Our work will consist in accomplishing this task. The fight against these errors in the proletarian movement, against these shortcomings, will be a thousand times easier than fighting against those bourgeois who, in the guise of reformists, belong to the old parties of the Second International and conduct the whole of their work in a bourgeois, not proletarian, spirit.

Comrades, in conclusion I shall deal with one other aspect of the subject. Our comrade, the chairman, has said that our Congress merits the title of a World Congress. I think he is right, particularly because we have here quite a number of representatives of the revolutionary movement in the colonial and backward countries. This is only a small beginning, but the important thing is that a beginning has been made. At this Congress we see taking place a union

between revolutionary proletarians of the capitalist, advanced countries, and the revolutionary masses of those countries where there is no or hardly any proletariat, i.e., the oppressed masses of colonial, Eastern countries. It is on ourselves that the consolidation of unity depends, and I am sure we shall achieve it. World imperialism shall fall when the revolutionary onslaught of the exploited and oppressed workers in each country, overcoming resistance from petty-bourgeois elements and the influence of the small upper crust of labour aristocrats, merges with the revolutionary onslaught of hundreds of millions of people who have hitherto stood beyond the pale of history, and have been regarded merely as the object of history.

The imperialist war has helped the revolution: from the colonies, the backward countries, and the isolation they lived in, the bourgeoisie levied soldiers for this imperialist war. The British bourgeoisie impressed on the soldiers from India that it was the duty of the Indian peasants to defend Great Britain against Germany; the French bourgeoisie impressed on soldiers from the French colonies that it was their duty to defend France. They taught them the use of arms, a very useful thing, for which we might express our deep gratitude to the bourgeoisie—express our gratitude on behalf of all the Russian workers and peasants, and particularly on behalf of all the Russian Red Army. The imperialist war has drawn the dependent peoples into world history. And one of the most important tasks now confronting us is to consider how the foundation-stone of the organisation of the Soviet movement can be laid in the non-capitalist countries. Soviets are possible there; they will not be workers' Soviets, but peasants' Soviets, or Soviets of working people.

Much work will have to be done; errors will be inevitable; many difficulties will be encountered along this road. It is the fundamental task of the Second Congress to elaborate or indicate the practical principles that will enable the work, till now carried on in

an unorganised fashion among hundreds of millions of people, to be carried on in an organised, coherent and systematic fashion.

Now, a year or a little more after the First Congress of the Communist International, we have emerged victors over the Second International; it is not only among the workers of the civilised countries that the ideas of the Soviets have spread; it is not only to them that they have become known and intelligible. The workers of all lands are ridiculing the wiseacres, not a few of whom call themselves socialists and argue in a learned or almost learned manner about the Soviet “system”, as the German systematists are fond of calling it, or the Soviet “idea” as the British Guild Socialists^[3] call it. Not infrequently, these arguments about the Soviet “system” or “idea” becloud the workers’ eyes and their minds. However, the workers are brushing this pedantic rubbish aside and are taking up the weapon provided by the Soviets. A recognition of the role and significance of the Soviets has now also spread to the lands of the East.

The groundwork has been laid for the Soviet movement all over the East, all over Asia, among all the colonial peoples.

The proposition that the exploited must rise up against the exploiters and establish their Soviets is not a very complex one. After our experience, after two and a half years of the existence of the Soviet Republic in Russia, and after the First Congress of the Third International, this idea is becoming accessible to hundreds of millions of people oppressed by the exploiters all over the world. We in Russia are often obliged to compromise, to bide our time, since we are weaker than the international imperialists, yet we know that we are defending the interests of this mass of a thousand and a quarter million people. For the time being, we are hampered by barriers, prejudices and ignorance which are receding into the past with every passing hour; but we are more and more becoming representatives and genuine defenders of this 70 per cent of the world’s population, this mass

of working and exploited people. It is with pride that we can say: at the First Congress we were in fact merely propagandists; we were only spreading the fundamental ideas among the world’s proletariat; we only issued the call for struggle; we were merely asking where the people were who were capable of taking this path. Today the advanced proletariat is everywhere with us. A proletarian army exists everywhere, although sometimes it is poorly organised and needs reorganising. If our comrades in all lands help us now to organise a united army, no shortcomings will prevent us from accomplishing our task. That task is the world proletarian revolution, the creation of a world Soviet republic.

Notes

[1] The Second Congress of the Communist International met from July 19 to August 7, 1920. The opening session was held in Petrograd and the subsequent sessions in Moscow. It was attended by over 200 delegates who represented workers’ organisations of 37 countries. Apart from delegates representing the Communist parties and organisations of 31 countries, there were delegates from the Independent Social-Democratic Party of Germany, the Socialist parties of Italy and France, Industrial Workers of the World (Australia, Britain and Ireland), the National Confederation of Labour of Spain and other organisations.

Lenin directed all the preparatory work before the Congress. At its first session he made a report on the international situation and the fundamental tasks of the Communist International. Throughout the Congress, in his reports and speeches, Lenin fought uncompromisingly against the opportunist Centrist parties, who were attempting to penetrate into the Third International, and levelled sharp criticism at the anarcho-syndicalist trends and “Left” sectarianism of a number of communist organisations. Lenin took part in the work of various commissions and delivered reports and speeches on the international situation and the fundamental tasks of the Communist International, the national and the colonial questions, the agrarian question and the terms of admission into the Communist International. Lenin’s theses on the fundamental tasks of the Second Congress of the Communist International, the national and the colonial questions, the agrarian question and the terms of admission into the Communist International were endorsed as Congress decisions.

The Second Congress laid the foundations of the programme, organisational principles, strategy and tactics of the Communist International;—Editor.

[2] This international organisation was being set up at the time by the Centrist socialist parties and groups which had left the Second International under pressure from the revolutionary masses. The International Union of the Socialist Parties, as the new organisation

was officially called was formed at a conference in Vienna in February 1921 and; was also known as the Two-and-a-Half or Vienna International. Professing opposition to the Second International, the leaders of the Two-and-a-Half International actually pursued the same opportunist and splitting policy on the most important questions of the proletarian movement and tried to make the new organisation a counter-balance to the growing influence of the Communists among the workers. Lenin wrote, “The gentlemen of the Two-and-a-Half International pose as revolutionaries; but in every serious situation they prove to be counter-revolutionaries because they shrink from the violent destruction of the old state machine; they have no faith in the forces of the working class”

In May 1923 the Second International and the Two-and-a-Half International united to form the so-called Labour and Socialist International;—Editor.

[3] Guild socialists—a reformist trend in the British trade unions which arose before the First World War. They denied the class character of the state and sowed illusions among the workers that it was possible to get rid of exploitation without the class struggle, by establishing, on the basis of the existing trade unions, special associations of producers, so-called guilds whose federation was to take over industrial management. In this way the guild socialists hoped to build socialism.

After the October Socialist Revolution the Guild socialists stepped up their propaganda, contraposing the “theory” of guild socialism to the ideas of the class struggle and the dictatorship of the proletariat. In the 1920s guild socialism lost all its influence on the British workers;—Editor.

History Has a Taste for Irony

Mücadele Birliği (Struggle Unity, Türkiye)

March 19, 2026

War. Destruction. Tit-for-tat retaliation. Missiles lighting up the night. Cities falling silent by day.

Nothing is ordinary anymore—and precisely for that reason, everything is. What was exceptional yesterday is routine today. The extraordinary has become commonplace.

What we are living through is a short stretch of history. This is not an anomaly, but a transitional phase: the period of dissolution and collapse of the imperialist system, and the rise of the new-socialism. No matter how “short” history may be, historical transformations do not happen overnight. They take their own time, unfold at their own pace. Yet compared to past eras, that time has shrunk to the blink of an eye.

The imperialist war launched by the US-Zionist Israel axis against Iran—now entering its third week—marks a rupture, a breaking point within this “short history.” Future historians will single it out, much like September 11 or the war in Ukraine.

The attack on Iran is not merely a war to “seize resources.” Various geopolitical motives—each of them tangible—certainly play their part. Taken together, they carry considerable weight. But to stop there is to miss the forest for the trees. Without placing at the center the unraveling of imperialism, the drive toward full annexation, global uprisings, the mobilization of workers and toilers everywhere against the existing system, the global revolutionary situation, and civil war, it is impossible to grasp the essence of this process. The imperialist war against Iran, like those in Ukraine and Venezuela, like Cuba—which is next in line today—and the wars awaiting their turn in the Far East, is a direct reflection of the collapse of the imperialist-capitalist system. It is a stage in the project to halt and reverse that decline—a project whose opening move was the provocation of the

September 11 attacks.

At this stage, the US, Israel, and their regional proxies have set their sights on Iran. The aim is clear: to break Iran’s resistance, to fragment it, to force it into submission. To instill fear in the peoples of the world, to reaffirm the irresistible might of US imperialism after its “success” in Venezuela, to reshape the region around Israel’s security, to deliver a heavy blow to China, to drive a wedge between Russia and China via the Caspian and Central Asia, and ultimately to reestablish its own hegemony. By shattering the core alliance that indirectly bolsters the world revolutionary process—Russia, China, North Korea—Washington hopes to tilt the global civil war in its favor. That is the calculus.

The madman in the White House—hamstrung by the Epstein files—entered the war against Iran not only under pressure from Zionist Israel but in line with this broader framework. This is not merely a “Zionist conspiracy.” Such factors certainly exist. But what matters is the convergence of interests. And this imperialist war has been in the making for at least a quarter of a century. Iran was the last name on the list handed to Wesley Clark after September 11.

Because Iran, despite all its contradictions, has not surrendered to imperialism. It has not fully opened itself to global capital. It has resisted the process of full subjugation. This is where the problem begins. For imperialism, the “problem” is not being an enemy. It is “being able to act independently.” Because imperialism does not want freedom—it wants domination. That is why the attack is not ideological. It is economic. It is structural.

Reformists vs. Conservatives

Under normal circumstances, the bourgeois classes

of capitalist countries are expected to integrate into the imperialist chain—into the payment and trade systems shaped under US hegemony, into the free circulation of capital and goods. Offshore networks, unrestricted access to global real estate markets, production reduced to a mere link in supply chains—all of this presupposes voluntary (or if you prefer, servile) submission to imperialist domination. If a capitalist country refuses to voluntarily integrate into this chain for historical, political, cultural, or other reasons, it will face pressure and resistance not from the imperialist masters, but first and foremost from its own bourgeoisie. The choice is not personal; it is dictated by class interests.

Nevertheless, there are countries—and there will continue to be—that resist full subjugation and total submission due to historical, cultural, internal economic, and social reasons. This is inevitable. Each must be assessed on its own terms. While there are commonalities, they also contain differences.

Iran's resistance to full subjugation encompasses both economic and historical-cultural dimensions. It is a country that experienced a historical rupture with the 1979 revolution, paid a heavy price in the eight-year war with Iraq that followed, and has remained outside the imperialist-capitalist chain. It is a society with a deep-rooted anti-imperialist vein and tradition. The clerics who seized power after the revolution were, in a sense, representatives of Iran's traditional bazaar class—the middle strata. Under the constant pressure of sanctions, no powerful comprador monopoly class capable of integrating into the imperialist system emerged. This segment remained weak. Nevertheless, with roots going back to the Shah era, this faction has increased its power over the past half-century and emerged as a political tendency finding expression in the “reformists.”

Differences of opinion among individuals within a country's leadership are normal. But when these differences crystallize into a political tendency, we must speak not of personal views but of class con-

tradictions. The reformist-conservative divide in Iran is, at its core, a clash between two distinct economic power blocs.

The reformists are the modern bourgeoisie-capital groups engaged in import-export, seeking integration into global markets. They advocate reducing tensions, lifting sanctions, and integrating into the global economy. They favor tighter ties with international finance capital. In effect, they are the willing supporters—even executors—of the process of full annexation. This segment constitutes the material foundation of this political approach. Apart from Raisi and Ahmadinejad, it was always the reformists who won recent presidential elections.

The conservative faction, by contrast, is rooted in the traditional commercial bourgeoisie: bazaar merchants, religious foundations (bonyads), and established networks within the state apparatus. Sustained by oil revenues and semi-public economic structures, they defend a form of state capitalism and resist opening up to the “outside”.

Ultimately, both represent bourgeois rule. For workers and toilers, nothing changes: both currents aim to keep them under control.

Yet Iran is a country of 90 million—a vast working class whose interests are entirely separate from these factions: demanding political freedoms, women's liberation, and national rights. For decades, these millions have been in almost constant motion, at times sparking major uprisings.

This is the social composition. When the US-Zionist Israeli aggression began, internal contradictions were quickly pushed into the background. Under different circumstances, an external war might have elicited different reactions. But when the leading imperialist power and its rabid dog in the region launched a joint attack—with such reckless disregard for all human values and judgment—the equation changed. The killing of elementary school children by Tomahawk missiles alone provoked a collective response. The imperialist-Zionist alliance, which believed that

toppling the top clerical leadership would trigger collapse and popular uprising, faced the exact opposite outcome.

Not only that: this war has also produced—and continues to produce—consequences in terms of confronting imperialism head-on, resisting it, shaking the imperialist system of domination, and exposing the limits and weaknesses of the imperialist-Zionist gang. Indirectly, it impacts world revolution and the liberation struggles of workers and toilers. Any potential victories against the imperialist-Zionist alliance provide a great moral boost to the peoples of the world. That is why, across all continents now, toilers sympathize with and support the resistance being waged by Iran.

A War Without a Traditional Front

This war has no traditional fronts—and consequently no rear. It is a network: spreading, deepening, boundless.

Missiles. Drones. Cyberattacks. Proxy forces. All parts of a single war. The entire geography has become a battlefield.

On one side stands a colossal military force deemed “unbeatable”: US imperialism and “untouchable” Israel, with combined war budgets approaching \$1 trillion. On the other, an Iran that lacks even an air force—a country that could be “destroyed with a single strike”—with a military budget of \$10-20 billion. The chasm is staggering. Under these conditions, Iran’s decision to resist seemed irrational. Hence Witkoff’s remark: even after the massive US buildup, “President Trump cannot understand why Iran has not yet surrendered.”

But Iran did not surrender. It accepted the war thrust upon it. It suffered massive losses from the very first strike—but held firm. It adopted a strategy and tactics designed to nullify the enemy’s technological superiority. We are witnessing how a colossal military power (USA) can begin to lose a war.

It is instructive to observe how a country with stra-

tegic depth has successfully stood up to a Zionist entity lacking such depth—a global giant struggling with logistical problems. Seeing the fragility of the imperialist-Zionist alliance—drunk on power, too arrogant to see beyond its own nose—is a source of joy for the world’s peoples. The rising sympathy for Iran across the globe is proof of that. Every loss suffered by this evil hub, which has been a scourge upon the peoples, brings a separate joy.

Iran implemented what some have termed a “mosaic defense.” The aim was to draw a militarily far superior enemy into its chosen battlefield. Time is a crucial factor: rapidly depleting the enemy’s strength, wearing them down. By relying on strategic depth, it has established a defensive posture capable of weathering heavy blows within its own territory.

As expected, the imperialist-Zionist alliance struck with overwhelming force at the very outset. Their fundamental military strategy is: strike first, strike with all your might, bring the enemy to its knees. They use all their capabilities to achieve results immediately—and to that end, they do not hesitate to commit any massacre or genocide. The result?

Khamenei and his command staff were killed at the start of the war. An elementary school was bombed, killing 168 girls. Air bases, airports, missile launch sites, Iranian ships in the Persian Gulf—all targeted. Even the areas around nuclear facilities were struck. Cries of “victory” rang out from the very first move. A massive propaganda machine kicked in.

But within an hour, Iran began to retaliate systematically. The first strike was not against Israel, but against US bases across the Gulf: Qatar, Bahrain, Kuwait, the UAE, Saudi Arabia, Jordan, Iraq. Radars, air and naval bases, ammunition depots.

Iran’s military tactic was simple, rational, and effective: quantity over quality. A large number of low-cost attack vehicles can produce more effective results than a small number of high-quality ones. On the first day, hundreds of missiles and over a thousand drones were launched. Air defense systems could not

withstand such an intense barrage. Starting with the early warning radar in Bahrain, the regional radar network was shattered in short order.

The goal of an intense attack is not just to hit targets—it is to wear down enemy systems. All radar and defense equipment exposes itself under such pressure. Locations are identified. Ammunition runs out. Radars become exhausted. Gaps form in the defense network.

There is also an economic dimension: thousands of drones costing \$20,000 each force the enemy to expend defense munitions worth several million to tens of millions of dollars per unit—often multiple interceptors per drone. Defense expenditures skyrocket. Every lost radar, every lost air defense battery, means billions more.

In short, the defense systems of all Gulf countries and the US-Zionist Israel were activated to counter Iran's massive swarms of cheap drones and older missiles. They operated continuously. Radars were exposed. Locations were pinpointed. This was the first phase: forcing the door open.

Then came the second phase: fewer missiles, more selective strikes, higher precision. The old stockpiles had served their purpose. More advanced systems were brought online.

Was this a choice? Yes. Was it a necessity? Also yes. Because simultaneously, launch pads were being struck, warehouses targeted, logistics under pressure. This plan was the intersection of strategy and necessity. Saturation was complete. Attrition had taken place. Now it was time to break through.

No system is infinite. Iron Dome, Arrow, Patriot, David's Sling—all powerful, all limited.

The math is simple: cheap attack vehicles, expensive defense systems. In a protracted war, the balance shifts. After a while, defense no longer "stops" attacks—it merely "reduces damage." This is the new reality.

From Invulnerability to Fragility

Israel was built on the myth of invulnerability: absolute security, uninterrupted superiority.

Yet now Tel Aviv is ablaze. Haifa is a target. Everywhere is a target. There is no rear anymore. Sirens are part of daily life. Shelters have become living spaces. And most importantly, the desire to leave is growing. Staying is getting harder. As the population thins, the economy contracts. As the war drags on, costs mount.

What is the greatest threat to a state? An external enemy? No. Internal disintegration. This is the most critical, most challenging moment for the Zionist entity. Don't be fooled by the cries of "We killed Laricani, we killed the Intelligence Minister." Even if they kill them—and more—they are the ones now teetering on the edge of the abyss. One step remains. After that, they will plunge.

Whether Netanyahu and those around him survive is a mystery. Dubious videos do nothing to dispel the doubts. But that is not the main issue. The main issue is this: nowhere in Israel is safe anymore. This is the new reality—and beyond all propaganda, it will determine the course of the war.

The war is not being fought along a single front: massive airstrikes against Iran; increasingly effective missile and drone strikes on Israel; ground battles with Hezbollah along the southern Lebanon border; relentless bombing of US bases in the Gulf; the severing of energy pipelines at sea. Five fronts, one war.

This structure eliminates the concept of a classic victory. Because no front closes—it merely shifts. As fragility increases, so does the risk. Escalation becomes almost inevitable.

The US has failed to achieve its objectives on the ground. Aircraft carrier strike groups have withdrawn over a thousand kilometers from Iran. The USS Ford will return to Crete without ever entering the conflict. Military bases in Gulf countries have been virtually wiped off the map. The selective closure of the Strait of Hormuz under Iranian control,

the transformation of yuan trade into a ticket for passage, the revelation that the US Navy lacks the ability to open the strait, the rejection of Trump's call to NATO and allies to "send a fleet to open the Strait of Hormuz"—all indicators that the war is turning against the US-Israel axis, and that this is becoming increasingly evident as time passes.

Once the situation reached this point, the US-Israel duo attacked Iran's energy infrastructure. Gas facilities in South Pars were bombed. The White House had previously been displeased by Israel's bombing of fuel depots in Tehran—worried about oil prices. But it is no longer in a position to consider such concerns. A dead donkey fears no wolf.

When the facilities in Tehran were struck, Iran said, "If you attack our energy infrastructure again, we will strike the energy facilities of all countries in the region." Following the attack on South Pars, Iran struck facilities in Saudi Arabia and Qatar. Oil prices briefly rose above \$120, then dropped to \$110. If Iran's retaliations continue, it is widely expected that prices will surpass \$200.

We are now at this stage of the war. Everything depends on who can hold out longer—economically, militarily, socially, and politically.

Zionist Israel has suffered its greatest crisis. It has sustained an irreparable wound. A process of disintegration and collapse has begun. The prolongation of the war deepens this process. And this is where the danger grows.

The "existential threat" to the Zionist entity grows stronger by the day. An apartheid regime with an unknown stockpile of nuclear weapons, having established genocide and savage aggression as its core political line, where unimaginable religious fanaticism has risen to the highest echelons of the state—Zionist Israel edges closer to the use of nuclear weapons with each passing day.

Who will win? As it stands, the question is misguided. Because one side has already lost a great deal. The crisis of imperialism deepens. US power

erodes. Regional actors act more autonomously. The war drags on. These are concrete facts. Unless Iran suddenly surrenders completely, these facts will not change, and the process will not reverse.

History, with its dark sense of irony, is playing out one of its grandest games. Through the immense resistance it has shown in its existential struggle and its commendable military strategy, Iran is working for world revolution. It pays a heavy price but refuses to surrender. Its enemy draws closer to global defeat with each passing day.

For the peoples of the world, a monumental victory is taking shape on the horizon.

No cooperation with the war machine! Victory to Iran!

Communist Party of Great Britain (Marxist-Leninist)

When protests began in Tehran on 28 December, western populations were deluged with footage and commentary aimed at convincing us that a movement of popular street protest was gathering momentum. These ‘popular protests’, we were told, were met with brutal repression by an ‘illegitimate regime’. And, on cue, we were presented with an ‘alternative’ leader: the son of the shah (king) who had been deposed in 1979. Apparently without any irony, ‘Crown Prince’ Reza Pahlavi was presented by his British sponsors as the leader of a rising ‘democracy movement’.

So far, so par for the regime-change playbook. But things from that point did not go according to the imperialist plan. Iran exhibited unsuspected capabilities and resilience, tracking down users of Elon Musk’s Starlink network, who had been given the terminals by western intelligence agencies in order to receive instructions on fomenting chaos and terrorist violence on Iranian streets.

Once again, while a Hollywood-style psyop aimed to stir up emotions and convince its audiences that black was white and white was black, the truth was diametrically opposed to the imperialist media machine’s carefully constructed narratives.

The protests initially began as a result of steep inflation and a sudden currency collapse, which had a huge impact on bazaaris (small shopkeepers)—a crisis that US treasury secretary Scott Bessent has admitted came about as a result of deliberate manipulations by western financiers. That is: the Iranian shopkeepers’ troubles were a direct result of an ongoing economic war whose aim is to make life as difficult as possible for the population.

Open admissions of illegality

As President Donald Trump announced his intention of “protecting the protestors” (agents), and swore that his government would launch bombing raids if the number of dead passed 500, western media gleefully egged him on by claiming ever higher casualty numbers (1,000, 2,000 ... 36,500!), at the hands of the Iranian state. In reality, some 3,000 people were killed, the vast majority by west-backed terrorists.

There followed six weeks of military brinkmanship as the USA amassed a growing air and naval force in and around the region, alongside highly-publicised threats and ‘negotiations’ in which it was demanded that Iran give up all right to the development of nuclear weapons (which the country’s leaders have repeatedly stated they do not want)—and then that it also sacrifice its civilian nuclear activities, terminate its ballistic weapons programme and cut off all support for liberation forces across the region.

This combination of stick and carrot—regime-change attempts, economic sabotage, military threats and psychological operations combined with ‘negotiations’ and proffered ‘concessions’ if the targeted country will fall into line with imperialist diktat—is a playbook we are becoming far too familiar with. As in the case of Venezuela, however, the new twist is the open admissions of criminality—to the extent of bragging about activities that were previously carried out covertly (since they are, in fact, illegal under international law, even if they are standard practice for imperialist powers).

Former US secretary of state Mike Pompeo and others publicly declared that the violence in Iran was being stoked from outside, and that Israeli Mossad agents were embedded among (ie,

directing) the ‘protestors’.

‘Women’s rights’ as a pretext

Western media are keen to convince the wider world that imperialist meddling in Iran is purely altruistic: We’re on a mission to free Iran’s women! But it is clear that the Iranian people themselves do not consider that women’s rights begin and end with religious or cultural clothing or customs.

Moreover, we cannot help noticing the glaring contradiction between this concern for the ‘human rights’ of Iranians and more than two years of burying the human rights of Palestinians under the rubble of Gaza. Nor has it escaped our notice that the imperialists began their latest war on Iran by massacring 165 innocent schoolgirls in Minab.

As communists, we are in favour of the separation of religion and state. But this is a matter for the Iranian people to resolve without outside interference. As anti-imperialists, we must recognise that modern Iran has done far more to liberate the mass of working-class and peasant women and children from poverty, ignorance and feudal servitude, and to modernise Iranian social and economic life, than did the previous regime of the puppet shah and his western big oil handlers.

Today, illiteracy has been wiped out and women are represented in all the professions, making up more than half of university graduates. The average Iranian woman now has better security, better education, and a higher level of culture than the average working-class British woman. Workers of both sexes are far better off there than in most parts of the oppressed world, and even in much of the imperialist world.

Bikinis and hairdos are not the primary concern of ordinary people in a society faced by the choice between imperialist servitude and sovereign development. There are bound to be women in Iran who would prefer to go without traditional head coverings, but there are also many who view them as

a rejection of west-imposed ‘values’. It is, after all, just possible that most Iranian women do not consider the consequences of receiving this particular freedom from western hands—such as seeing their families impoverished, their society destroyed, their bodies commodified and their daughters forced in large numbers into sexual slavery—to be a price worth paying.

In fact, polls today show that a higher proportion of Iranian women than Iranian men want their government and military to fight the USA and Israel to the bitter end, with no suggestion of compromise, and definitely no surrender to the imperialist warmongers!

Iran’s predictable response to US war

In the early hours of 28 February, and under cover of ongoing negotiations, the USA and Israel initiated an all-out blitzkrieg against Iran, launching missiles from ships and planes across the region and murdering any political or military leader within their reach, including the country’s supreme leader, Ayatollah Ali Khamenei, who was killed at home with several members of his family.

This act on its own has outraged the Iranian masses and cemented national unity, bringing millions to the streets in mourning and defiance, and with the demand for revenge on their lips. The imperialists are actually bragging about having murdered a simple-living, highly respected 86-year-old man whose entire life was dedicated to the cause of his people’s freedom, and who was revered not only by Iranians but by shia muslims all over the world. Moreover, it has been revealed that he chose to stay at his home office rather than taking to a shelter that was not available to every one of his compatriots.

Let nobody be in any doubt: this is an unprovoked war of aggression against a sovereign nation—the highest crime against humanity. In law and according to every progressive tenet, Iran is in the right and deserves our full support in its just war of self-de-

fence.

President Trump has more than once expressed his “surprise” at the robust response of Iran to US aggression. Yet it has long been clear what would happen if hostilities were reignited. Last June, the Iranians allowed the Americans an off-ramp when Israel started a war and then begged for a ceasefire, but they made it clear: this time, we have limited ourselves to defensive measures; next time, we will go on the offensive, and we will be targeting the entire machinery of US regional domination.

And so it has transpired. Iran has proven itself to be well equipped with both intelligence and precision munitions. It has undoubtedly had technical support from both Russia and China on the intelligence front, just as many years ago it had help from Syria and the DPR Korea when it began to develop its missile and tunnel warfare programmes.

By targeting the radar for US and Israeli missile defences first, Tehran has essentially blinded the aggressors. And by saturating their air defences in the early days of the war, it has depleted the missile arsenals of every US regional ally. Iranian drones can now be seen flying unmolested in the skies over Tel Aviv, which formerly possessed the world’s most complex and expensive layered defence—and this is despite the active participation of US, British and French fighter jets in Israel’s defence.

US bases, soldiers and ‘embassies’ (ie, spy hubs), CIA stations, and the big tech data centres used for AI intelligence processing have all been hit by Iran right across the Gulf. And it is notable that the destruction of many of these military assets has been celebrated by ordinary workers. Saudi forces have already had to be sent over the ‘Friendship Bridge’ to help quell a nascent uprising in the small island statelet of Bahrain, where the destruction of the USA’s Fifth Fleet naval base was followed by mass rioting in support of what is widely seen as a region-wide war for liberation from imperialist domination.

The vital Strait of Hormuz has been closed to all

US-aligned shipping, causing panic in markets and big spikes in energy, shipping and commodity prices, all of which are set to rise higher in the weeks to come. The inflationary consequences will inevitably impact working people worldwide, and no blustering assurances from Trump can alter the fact that the USA has started something it is not in a position to stop on any but the most humiliating terms.

Meanwhile, the Zionist state is also suffering serious blows. Genocidal Israeli politicians, soldiers, bases and infrastructure have all been successfully targeted, while a plan to invade Lebanon under cover of the war backfired spectacularly, bringing the Hezbollah resistance force back into the fray after 14 months of meticulous observation of an entirely one-sided ‘ceasefire’. Ordinary people in south Lebanon are suffering greatly, having no air defences to save them from brutal Israeli bombardment, but the resistance is already inflicting serious damage on the IDF invaders and on their settlements in the north of occupied Palestine (aka Israel).

Iraqi resistance forces also joined the war from the first day, targeting US bases on Iraqi soil, while mass demonstrations outside the vast militarised US ‘embassy’ in Baghdad had to be repelled with live fire as the protestors started fires and tried to break into the hated compound.

The complicity of comprador stooge regimes from Beirut to Baghdad, Jordan to Bahrain are once again being highlighted to the mass of angry Arab workers, and the imperialist-backed elites who rule over them are increasingly exposed, with their US sponsors incapable of providing adequate air cover, never mind with troops to quell rising unrest.

Panic in ruling circles

The constant changing of supposed motivations (freeing women; stopping nukes, make that all missiles; making Israel safe; destroying resistance; taking control of the oil ...) and projections (the war will last a few days, a few weeks, a few months, as long

as necessary; there will be no boots, there will soon be Kurdish, Syrian, Azeri, somebody's boots on the ground ...) from US politicians are emblematic of a spreading panic amongst the strategists as the promised short war, easy victory and swift regime change have all failed to materialise.

The longer the war goes on, the worse the aggressors' position becomes, both militarily and economically. Meanwhile, Iran has planned for a long war of attrition and has made its aims and objectives crystal clear: the complete evacuation of US troops and dismantlement of all its military infrastructure in the region, and the complete surrender of Israel.

Moreover, it is very clear that the White House is under considerable pressure from US financiers. Just as the blatant under-reporting of US casualties (Iran claims 500, the Pentagon claims six!) is aimed at preventing a mass rebellion of US workers, Trump's pronouncements about the state of the campaign generally (we've won; we're about to win; it'll definitely be over very soon; there will be no protracted war) can be read more as PR statements aimed at calming the markets than as reflections of reality.

The increasingly rabid behaviour of US imperialism and its allies and proxies is not a sign of strength, but of desperation. Faced with global capitalism's worst-ever economic crisis, with Nato's humiliating defeat at the hands of Russia in Ukraine, and with its total failure to destroy the middle-eastern Axis of Resistance, the US ruling class is trying to convince the world that it remains militarily invincible and economically supreme.

Maintaining confidence in the dollar and in the US economy is becoming harder by the day as various anti-imperialist nations, led by Russia and China, work steadily to build alternative trade routes and payment mechanisms that are beyond the reach of western monopoly control.

We should be clear that the ultimate targets of imperialist warmongering are Russia and China. Only the destruction of these countries' sovereignty and their

dismemberment and looting by western corporations could bring about the influx of wealth that would allow for a 'reset' of the crisis-ridden global capitalist economy.

The financiers are hoping to repeat the bonanza that saved their system in 1991, when western corporations moved in to feed on the wealth of the former socialist nations. In their 'grand chessboard' plans, Syria (that bastion of anti-zionist and anti-imperialist sovereignty in the middle east) was a 'stepping stone' to Iran, and Iran and the DPRK are 'stepping stones' to Russia and China.

The openly-declared aim of the imperialists is to isolate and pick off the nations of the anti-imperialist bloc one at a time, each time targeting the one that seems to be weakest. This was, in fact, the reasoning that led Nato to provoke its war against Russia, which the imperialists believed to be a weak link in the chain that would quickly fall to their economic and military assault.

With the spectacular failure of that calculation, and with their economic crisis exacerbated instead of ameliorated, the imperialists are more desperate and more reckless.

What now?

For us in Britain, we should be clear that our own government is fully complicit in this illegal, aggressive war, no matter the verbal contortions of Sir Keir Starmer. British bases in the Indian Ocean, Cyprus and Gloucestershire are all being used, and British jets and naval assets have been deployed.

In the situation we now face, it is urgent that we redouble our efforts to rebuild both our trade unions and our antiwar movement, which are tied hand and foot to the imperialist Labour party and led by unaccountable career bureaucrats. Without mass organisations that really serve our interests, it is very difficult for workers to bring about the change we need, whether that be decent pay, conditions and services or an end to imperialist warmongering and

domination.

Making common cause with the Iranian people today means organising ourselves to demand an end to all British military, propaganda, diplomatic and economic warfare against Iran, as well as opposing all Britain's support for the zionist regime in Israel.

And it means building a really anti-imperialist antiwar movement that is able to harness our collective power to stop the British ruling class joining the bloodthirsty US imperialists in rampaging across the globe.

Rebuild our mass working-class organisations!

No cooperation with the imperialist war machine!

Victory to Iran!

Steve Sweeney reports on his attempted assassination by Israeli forces

Steve Sweeney | Communist Party of Great Britain (Marxist-Leninist)

Our comrade Steve Sweeney sent us this report after he and his crew were almost wiped out by a missile fired from an Israeli jet in southern Lebanon on 19 March. Steve runs the Lebanon desk for RT, which is one of the very few news organisations that has been covering the renewed genocidal assault by Israel there.

Of course, our members and viewers will have seen what happened by now. You've seen the footage of the airstrike, which we are 100 percent sure was deliberately targeted.

This was an assassination attempt, an attack on journalists, a war crime, and we're very lucky to be alive. We escaped with relatively minor injuries. I had a shrapnel wound that entered my left arm; it went through the muscle.

The health workers did a fantastic job in patching us up and we'll be back out in the field in no time at all. We're not going to be deterred by any stretch of the imagination.

Health workers systematically targeted by Israel

These health workers, they are the heroes. They're incredibly brave and they're working under extreme conditions. Of course, they are also a target themselves. More than 30 of their colleagues have been killed since 2 March—12 of them in one strike in a massacre. The Zionists are, of course, saying without any evidence that the medical facilities and ambulances are being “used by Hezbollah for military purposes”, effectively saying that they are now a legitimate target.

I've been on the scene of a lot of these strikes.

I've been in the back of an ambulance, I've worked alongside the civil defence workers who were doing a heroic job, and there was no evidence whatsoever to back the claims of the Zionists, as you'd expect.

Back in 2024, the health workers themselves were again under attack. They even removed the roof logos identifying their vehicles as ambulances, because instead of protecting them, which they are supposed to do under international law and the Geneva conventions, their medical insignia was making them a target.

I have absolutely no doubt that this was an attempt to silence us. There's been a lot of discussion on social media, asking why we were there when Israel had already said that it was targeting the bridges. Of course, we went there.

We went to a bridge, the Qasmiyeh bridge, which had already been destroyed—there's not much of it left. There was no way that any vehicle could cross it. People could walk across it but, importantly, it sits right beside a Lebanese military post.

When we spoke to the Lebanese army, they told us: “Yes, you're clear to film, it's okay.” In other words, it was safe. If it wasn't safe, they would have known about it, because the Israelis would have got a message to them via Unifil (United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon) to say that they were going to target the bridge and that anyone nearby should make sure that they're in a place of safety, which is what they did when they targeted the bridge before.

When people say that we were ‘reckless’ to go there, we have to say that this is Lebanese sovereign territory and it's not up to the Israelis to tell us where we can go and when. We are experienced war cor-

respondents, and Ali Rida, my colleague and a very dear friend, is from south Lebanon. This is his land; the land belongs to him, so it's not up to the Zionists to say where he can and cannot go to his own land.

Ethnic cleansing and resistance in south Lebanon

But the real story, of course, is not about us.

What we were going there to report on was the attacks on the bridges, which are in effect part of the ethnic cleansing operation of the largely Shia community of south Lebanon.

The Israeli operation aimed to cut the south off from the rest of the country, and about a third of the country's territory, home to one million people, has been cleared. Twenty percent of the Lebanese population have been internally displaced.

This is an ethnic cleansing operation on a scale even larger than the 1949 Nakba, and it's been very long in the planning. In fact, it predates even the formation of the state of Israel. The Zionists have wanted this land south of the Litani River because they think it's their biblical right, part of 'Greater Israel', which is why we've seen many attempts over the years to take this land. In the 1980s, it was the so-called 'security buffer zone', policed by internal proxies, Christian compradors and the South Lebanese Army.

Now we've seen it rebranded as the 'Trump Economic Zone'—a 'regeneration' project that would see the forced expulsion of hundreds of thousands of people from their land. The Israelis have spent the last 15 months preparing the ground for this, with the wholesale destruction of settlements along the border area, incursions, house detonations, the spraying of chemicals to destroy crops and the use of white phosphorus—all in order to lay the ground for an invasion and occupation.

What we were also reporting on was the heavy blows that have been inflicted on the Zionists by the resistance forces.

The Israelis cannot fight a ground war, so the only

way that they could take this land would be by the use of internal proxy forces, whoever they may be, whether they're from this country or brought in from elsewhere.

There's talk of the Americans and the Israelis policing the zone under the guise of the 'Trump Economic Zone'. But the invaders are getting their arses handed to them on a plate—more than 30 Israeli Merkava tanks have already gone up in flames.

The battle for Khiyam is one of the key battlegrounds. This is a hugely strategically important town because of its elevated position. Whoever controls this land effectively splits the eastern, central and western sectors of southern Lebanon. It gives great vantage points in terms of surveillance and for launching attacks, and they can monitor everything that happens in the area.

But the IDF is not able to get a toehold here because of the resistance. Now Hezbollah is organising itself in smaller units using guerrilla tactics and the resistance forces have a number of defensive lines; second and third line defensive positions that they're holding and which they've built up for decades. The Zionists are going to find it very, very hard to penetrate those.

I think they've been surprised by the scale of the resistance that they're facing—not just inside Lebanon, but also in terms of the cross-border attacks, which we have to say are targeting Israeli military facilities and the illegal settlements. I think they've been incredibly surprised.

Just to put it into perspective, back in 2006, Israel had 10,000 troops occupying southern Lebanon. It boosted this to 30,000 during the latter stages—military strategy dictates that an invading army needs something like a ratio of three to one (attacking to defending soldiers) in order to be able to take and maintain control of occupied land.

Now there is a different strategic balance and prospect altogether. We think something like 80,000 troops would be needed to control that part of the country south of the Litani River. This, of course,

would be unsustainable—the Zionists would suffer even more casualties as a result, and I think it would be unpalatable for the Israelis to see so many of their people coming home in body bags.

The situation on the ground here now is pretty intense. The Dahiya district of southern Beirut has been evacuated as the Israelis target civilians and civilian infrastructure. This is deeply embedded in Israeli military strategy—their so-called ‘Dahiya doctrine’ was named after these southern suburbs. But they’re not getting it all their own way.

Regarding our work as journalists, I just want to reiterate the point that Israel knows everything that happens in the south of Lebanon.

It monitors our phones. It reads our messages. It listens to our conversations. It has the most advanced surveillance technology in the world. It uses artificial intelligence, not only to spy and survey but also to identify targets. It has the most advanced military technology.

This is an imperialist war: it’s backed to the hilt by Britain, and it’s backed to the hilt by the United States. And this is a colonialist project in service of imperialism—the Zionists want to occupy more territory as part of the ‘Greater Israel’ project.

So I hold the British government responsible for what was essentially an assassination attempt on me. I will be taking advice on this, and considering my next steps, which could include pursuing a legal case against the British government.

Iran's Epic Scale Counterattack, the Escalation of World War III and the Tasks of the Anti-imperialist Movement

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

There is an escalation in the scope and intensity of World War III (WWIII). While the conflict with Russia in Ukraine has been ongoing for over four years in a protracted war of attrition, the US and Israel launched operations against Iran on 13 June 2025. This so-called '12-day war' saw them soundly defeated, despite the Iranians not utilising their full potential, and they hastened to fall back, pretending that they 'achieved their objectives'.

Further escalation occurred in Latin America on 3 January 2026, when the US launched airstrikes on multiple locations across northern Venezuela, including the capital Caracas, as part of a mafia-style operation to kidnap Venezuelan President Nicolás Maduro and his wife Cilia Flores. This marked an escalation of aggression throughout Latin America, with a focus on the Caribbean, and ultimately on Cuba, the first country of early socialism on the American continent. The aim is to escalate the inhumane energy, food and economic strangulation of the country in order to achieve 'regime change' and/or military occupation.

In the US, two official documents were released in parallel: the 'National Security Strategy' and the 'National Defence Strategy' (NDS) in December 2025 and January 2026^[1] respectively. These documents—at least in their published sections—present a rather peculiar narrative: they attempt to revive the 'Monroe Doctrine', while largely obscuring their true objectives. They avoid naming Russia and China as their main enemies directly. These texts have deceived many people who believed that the US regime would honestly limit itself to the so-called 'Western Hemisphere'. Some even took these words, a smokescreen for the world, at face value only to be disillusioned by

the massive concentration of firepower in the Indian Ocean and the US-Israeli attack on Iran, which began on 28 February 2026. This proves that the major military operation—the opening of a new, large-scale theatre of operations for World War III—is taking place in Southwest Asia, not Latin America. We observe that the conflict is escalating and intensifying rapidly, in conjunction with a surge in information warfare, disinformation and psychological warfare.

The imperialist axis is struggling to maintain the strategic initiative, which provides it with an advantage, but does not guarantee ultimate victory. It seeks to regain power in order to establish a global dictatorship and secure its neo-colonialist hegemony. Since the victory of the bourgeois counter-revolution and the launch of capitalist restoration in the USSR and other early socialist countries in Europe, it has acted methodically and pre-emptively. It used the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia as a testing ground and a general rehearsal for scenarios involving the combined use of bribery, deception, 'divide and conquer' tactics (utilising nationalist, religious and regional hatred, artificial borders, and client states), brute force, proxy wars, 'colour revolutions', interventions and regime change operations.

The open wound of Yugoslavia is a model of 'controlled chaos' through 'Balkanisation', with the potential for all disputes and conflicts to be reignited. Following the dissolution of the Soviet Union, this is being orchestrated not only for the dismantling of Czechoslovakia, Iraq, Libya, Syria, Sudan, Somalia and Yemen, but also, prospectively, Russia itself (with flashpoints in the Transcaucasus, Transnistria and Donbass), Iran and China. This is evident in imperialism's manoeuvres in the Armenia-Azerbai-

jan conflict over Nagorno-Karabakh, characterised by the rapid NATOisation of both ‘age-old enemies’ and the active involvement of the US, UK, France, Turkey and Israel.

This model is also being applied to client states that emerged from the dissolution of the USSR in Central Asia, using many ethnic, cultural and religious vehicles. A typical example of this is the Organisation of Turkic States (OTS). The latter’s stated objectives include the promotion of multilateral cooperation among Turkic-speaking states, the strengthening of political, economic, commercial, transport and cultural ties; the protection, teaching and promotion of shared Turkic history, language, culture, education and traditions; economic integration, and the standardisation of defence specifications (as in NATO) etc., all under Turkey’s leadership. Typical is also the case of the partnership between Turkey and Israel in the dismantling and occupation of Syria, as well as in providing Azerbaijan’s armed and security forces with strong operational support, organisation and command, equipment, and training, as well as the effort to create a *fait accompli* against Russia and Iran via the Turkey-Azerbaijan connection and the ‘Zangezur’ land corridor.

The aggressor axis is methodically escalating WWII through successive asymmetric pre-emptive strikes against each consecutive ‘weak link’ of the opposing socialist and anti-imperialist forces. This escalation takes place across multiple levels of preparation and a wide range of capabilities and priorities, involving flexibility and the identification of opportunities in battle and opportunistic risk-taking.

What gives the imperialist axis of aggression the ability to take the strategic initiative, beyond its accumulated economic and military-technical power, which has largely been sustained despite its decline, is the theoretical and practical organisational inadequacy of the opposing pole, and its inability to oppose the axis as a cohesive entity.

The current efforts to dismantle Russia in the pro-

tracted Ukrainian theatre of operations through sanctions, etc., have led to the Trump administration’s increasingly fascist shift in priorities towards the supposed ‘distancing’ from the Ukrainian theatre of operations. This will draw in the European component of the axis economically and militarily, providing the US with greater monopoly superprofits and the flexibility to launch surprise attacks in other theatres and on other fronts.

Could the current attack on Iran have begun without the preceding events of the breakup of Yugoslavia, the two wars in the Persian Gulf against Iraq^[2], the ‘Arab Spring’, the dissolution of Yemen, Libya and Syria, the protracted genocide in Palestine and the attacks on Lebanon, Hezbollah and the ‘Axis of Resistance’ as a whole?

This context also includes repeated attempts to undermine and dismantle the BRICS and the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation (SCO), including Argentina’s withdrawal and Brazil’s temporary retreat (under Bolsonaro) and subsequent return (under Lula), as well as the instrumentalisation of India as a ‘weak link’, with Modi’s infamous official visit to Israel (which ‘coincided’ with the Taliban-Pakistan conflict in Afghanistan) literally on the eve of the attack on Iran.

Here, the axis exploits the most primitive Islamophobic tendencies of the Indian capitalist oligarchy, combined with the painful legacy of British colonialism’s artificial creation of states (India, Pakistan and Bangladesh, with Kashmir as the ‘apple of discord’ and potential trigger for a massive ‘destabilising arc’). Around 250 million Muslims live in India.

The Indian ruling class was therefore called upon by the axis powers to provoke this war by leveraging their diplomatic and economic influence over the Taliban, in order to divert Pakistan’s attention and forces from the planned attack on Iran. Furthermore, Pakistan, an Islamic nuclear power, is the key gateway for the Belt and Road Initiative, a highly important programme for mutually beneficial cooperation and

international infrastructure within the global supply chain being created by China. This initiative offers an alternative to projects controlled by the axis. A key strategic objective of the axis is to undermine and defeat the People's Republic of China.

Pakistan, for its part, has historically been a web of contradictions and a focal point of international conflict. Alongside Saudi Arabia, it played a decisive role in the war against the Soviet Union in Afghanistan. It has developed relations with the People's Republic of China, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the Islamic Republic of Iran, including in the field of missile technology. Following a U.S.-backed coup in April 2022, the former Prime Minister of Pakistan, Imran Khan, who was aligned with BRICS, was ousted. Pakistan's intelligence agencies and armed forces are heavily infiltrated by the CIA and MI6. At the same time, however, Pakistan cannot survive without China.

The Iranians were deceived for a second time and drawn into diversionary negotiations by the US, which served as a pretext for the treacherous and murderous attack by the US-Zionist alliance against them. Similarly, the Russians—with their own share of responsibility—were deceived and drawn into the infamous and pretextual Minsk 1 (September 2014) and Minsk 2 (February 2015) agreements by the US, NATO and the EU, ostensibly to end the war in the Donbass region. In reality, as the leaders of the imperialist states cynically admitted, they aimed to deceive the Russians in order to allow the axis powers to heavily arm the Nazi regime in Kiev.

On 28 February 2026, the most aggressive circles of the financial oligarchy set in motion the war machine of the US and the Zionist entity—the proxy state of Israel, to launch coordinated military strikes against Iran, initiating a major armed conflict.

With this attack, the escalation of WWII is not merely linear, quantitative, or extensive. It is a qualitative and fundamental escalation. Never before in history has such a significant force of the US war

machine, including its navy and air force and the dozens of bases and infrastructure located in strategically important satellite countries, been struck. Never before has the Zionist entity suffered blows of such large scale and strategic importance. For the first time, we have witnessed such a massive retaliatory strike against the vanguard, advanced infrastructure and power projection outposts of the axis.

A major lesson drawn from the axis' latest attack on Iran is the following: this imperialist aggression did not just encounter serious resistance, but also suffered humiliating blows resulting from a systematic and effective counterattack. For the first time in WWII, we also have the establishment of 'red lines' that are not softened or gradually abandoned through concessions under pressure from the aggressor, but rather adhered to in a coordinated, planned and decisive manner by the counterattacking defenders.

This is a clear demonstration that an anti-imperialist revolution that won against a monarcho-fascist puppet regime, a revolution that enjoys deep rooted popular support, displays remarkable vitality, dignity and effectiveness in confronting the superior forces of the insidious invader. This has been proven despite the ravages of time, the unrelenting external economic and military pressure and the inevitable corruption and bureaucratisation of any revolutionary process that crystallises into a state formation. Iran has shown that it has backbone, guts and principles, and the will to fight back. This is tremendously encouraging. Even if the war were to freeze in place today, Iran would already have won. What Iran and the Axis of Resistance have achieved so far is a victory; a brilliant victory for the global anti-imperialist movement.

In any armed conflict (war, uprising, revolution), success hinges on clearly defining the strategic objective and the corresponding tactical means and ways for achieving victory, as well as firmly assuming strategic initiative with unwavering determination.

The aggressor axis is suffering, among other things,

from a lack of strategic purpose in this operation. This embarrassing deficiency is evident in the repeated and erratic rhetorical evasions of Trump and other leaders. This is the second time that the doctrine of betting on the spectacular collapse of a country's system through the decapitation of its leadership has proven utterly ineffective, following the mafia-style kidnapping of Maduro. This is especially true when imperialist adventurism is directed against a people with a unique history and profound culture.

Despite Iran's leadership having institutionally and morally renounced the prospect of acquiring nuclear technology for military purposes, the effectiveness of its armed forces' defence and counterattacks using conventional weapons demonstrates an extremely high level of scientific, technological and industrial development. This is particularly evident in the fields of radio detection and electronic warfare, aerospace, missile technology, and unmanned aerial vehicles. Iran possesses a variety of liquid—and solid—fuelled missile systems, including ballistic and sub-ballistic, cruise and hypersonic missiles, as well as a multitude of submunitions and multiple independent precision-guided warheads.

The expansion and deepening of the theatre of operations is unprecedented. Iran exclusively controls the Strait of Hormuz, a fact with enormous implications for the global economy, as well as for energy and food security. The reactivation of the Axis of Resistance in Iraq, Syria, Lebanon and Yemen is also notable. Ansar Allah (referred to by Western media in a racist contemptuous way as the 'Houthis'), who are fighting against the instruments of Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates in Yemen, have the ability to close the Bab el-Mandeb Strait, which connects the Arabian Sea with the Red Sea and is of strategic importance for global shipping.

The loss of extremely expensive, strategically vital and, in the medium term, irreplaceable systems and infrastructure signals the humiliation of an enemy seeking global domination. Forcing the enemy's air-

craft carriers and escort ships to flee, destroying their strategic-range and critical radio-location systems and bases, as well as their extremely expensive Airborne Early Warning & Control and aerial refuelling aircraft, depleting their extremely expensive anti-aircraft and anti-missile ammunition, and significantly neutralising and destroying them, all attest to Iran's gradual but steady assumption of strategic initiative in the conflict.

Israel's geographically limited habitable land area and the spatially concentrated distribution of its energy infrastructure, transportation hubs and industry (primarily missile, chemical and nuclear industries, as well as the military-industrial complex, which is closely linked to that of the US) make the consequences of Iran's increasingly more precise and destructive missile strikes terrifying. This intensifies the existential anxiety of the Israeli oligarchy, as it is highly likely that its territory could become uninhabitable due to a potential major ecological disaster resulting from the release of chemical, radiological and other pollutants.

The Iranian people's response to the imperialist attack thus far constitutes a proud victory for anti-imperialism. However, it also reveals structural weaknesses within the socialist and anti-imperialist pole. Failure to overcome these weaknesses in a timely manner could be disastrous. Unfortunately, this pole is far from being a coherent entity, both at the level of a coalition of states and at the level of a global movement. The qualitative and substantial escalation of WWIII highlights this inadequacy, which borders on self-sabotage when it is reduced to abstract diplomatic declarations and ambivalent or even divisive stances and practices. A notable example of this is India's leadership, which, after embracing the Zionist entity, swiftly condemned Iran for its alleged aggression against regional countries (i.e. U.S.-Israeli outposts and bases). At the same time, if not having providing the U.S. with coordinates for the sinking of the unarmed Iranian frigate

IRIS Dena following an official visit to India (with a crew consisting mainly of cadets from the Iranian Naval Academy) it did not respond to this barbaric and treacherous act. This, at the very least, constitutes an amoral stance. At the same time, the Indian leadership co-signed a resolution by the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation condemning the US attack on Iran. Afterwards, India negotiated free passage for Indian-flagged ships through the Strait of Hormuz.

Similarly, a leading segment of Russia's capitalist oligarchy has not only cosied up to the US leadership and Trumpism, hoping for at least a partial easing of sanctions, but has also sent a delegation of Russian lawmakers to the US, reinforcing scenarios of Russia aligning with the US against China, the DPRK, etc. At the same time, top circles of Russia's political leadership and ideological apparatus are openly boasting about the profits their capitalist oligarchy is making from rising hydrocarbon prices caused by imperialist attacks in the Caribbean and the Persian Gulf. The Russian oligarchy is displaying a similarly ambivalent stance towards the Zionist entity, citing the large proportion of Russian and Russian-speaking citizens within it, as well as the dual or exclusive citizenship of a significant portion of the oligarchy and its business operations in Israel.

The most aggressive circles of the global financial oligarchy are organically linked to the racist and colonialist ideology and practice of Zionism for historical reasons, and are capable of instrumentalising states, transnational institutions and political personnel for their interests. From this perspective, the question of who is leading whom in this war (the U.S. leading Israel, or vice versa) is a false dilemma.

Furthermore, the Epstein scandal has significant ethical and political implications. It has revealed: 1. the extent of the involvement of the Israeli intelligence and foreign espionage agency (Mossad), as well as other intelligence agencies, in a transnational, para-state network of human trafficking and extreme corruption involving the global 'elite'. This

network also functions as a mechanism for blackmailing, manipulating, and controlling individuals and groups, as well as 2. the extent of exploitation and abuse, including ritual cannibalism, to satisfy the most eccentric and perverse appetites of a global 'elite' who are ruthless even in the face of the most heinous crimes. This is all due to a complete absence of oversight and accountability, resulting in a regime of total impunity.

The representatives of this oligarchy—this self-proclaimed 'elite' who regard the criminal abuse and ritual murder of women and children as the norm—have not the slightest hesitation regarding war crimes, genocide or the potential use of tactical nuclear weapons if conventional weapons prove ineffective in their aggression.

The targeting of 170 girls at an elementary school in Minab with two precision-guided 'Tomahawk' missiles (a double-tap strike, with the second attack coming one hour later to target paramedics, parents and teachers gathered at the scene) from the very first day of the attack was a symbolic, ritualistic act of blackmail against the Iranian people, in the spirit of this perverse impunity. They are specifically targeting educational institutions, healthcare facilities, public services and cultural heritage sites! Imperialism strikes with fury at universities, research centres, scientists, researchers, teachers, students, the academic and scientific community. As if they wanted to take revenge on the vital forces of knowledge and conscience that have enabled the Iranian people to stand tall with dignity and achieve true, not spurious, emancipation for women, motherhood and children. These forces have also enabled the creation of technological achievements such as satellites, medical technologies and hypersonic missiles. Despite talent-scouting across the globe, the US has still not managed to match these achievements.

From this perspective, the effective counterattack against the axis oligarchy also takes on a symbolic, moral, and aesthetic dimension of nemesis and

catharsis in the name of the people and humanity against the unprecedented scale and perversion of the capitalist oligarchy's hubris.

The ground trembles beneath the feet of the occupiers at the 800 US bases in 80 countries from the moment revolutionary, anti-imperialist Iran reminded us of the obvious fact: no people who host foreign bases and armies on their soil can be considered sovereign. Furthermore, if a country allows its territory to be used to launch an attack on another country, it becomes an accomplice to the crime and is therefore justifiably targeted in self-defence!

The goals of the World Anti-Imperialist Platform are becoming increasingly urgent in light of the new escalation of WWII. The scientific, theoretical and practical organisational foundation for forming an anti-imperialist movement on national, international and global scale is an indispensable condition for humanity's survival and our urgent revolutionary and humanitarian duty!

The martyrs and heroes of the anti-imperialist struggle in Palestine, Lebanon, Iraq, Yemen, Iran, Syria, Venezuela, Cuba, and around the world are calling to us!

*IMMEDIATE EXIT FROM EU-NATO!
CLOSE THE US-NATO BASES AND KICK OUT THE
OCCUPATION TROOPS!
CRUSH THE US-NATO-EU-ZIONIST AXIS IN IRAN
& ALL FRONTS
VICTORY FOR THE FORCES OF SOCIALISM AND
ANTIIMPERIALISM!
UNITY WITH THE GOALS OF THE FRONTAL
STRUGGLE OF THE PEOPLES' HOPE, THE WORLD
ANTIIMPERIALIST PLATFORM!*

Notes

[1] See for example Patelis D. *Changes in strategy or adjustments to imperialism's tactics in World War III?* Platform No.32 January 2026

[2] The First Gulf War (1990-1991) was an armed conflict in which a coalition of 34-42 countries led by the United States and acting under

a UN mandate 'liberated Kuwait following Iraq's invasion'. It began with Operation Desert Shield, and escalated into Operation Desert Storm, which involved the destruction of Iraqi infrastructure. The war formally ended in 1991. The Second Gulf War, also known as the Iraq War, began in 2003 without a UN resolution. It was an invasion led by the US and a coalition of 40 countries as part of the broader 'war on terror', which overthrew Saddam Hussein's regime. The U.S. justified Operation Iraqi Freedom on the grounds of alleged weapons of mass destruction, leading to a prolonged occupation and instability in the region.

The Imperialists Cannot Win in Any of the Four Major Theaters

Stephen Cho | Coordinator of the Korean International Forum

March 20, 2026

The imperialist US has ignited the war in Iran, which immediately escalated into a broader war in West Asia. The conflict in West Asia, in turn, is accelerating the outbreak of war in East Asia, marking the full-scale escalation of World War 3.

The Trump faction has now become principal war criminals who have hastened the full-scale arrival of World War 3 through imperialist wars of aggression. The US chauvinists are now exposed as unprecedented fascists, surpassing even the globalists in their infamy.

The war in East Asia would further catalyze the war in Eastern Europe, and the Central American theater would be no exception. West Asia, East Asia, Eastern Europe, and Central America have become the primary battlegrounds of World War 3—the frontlines of national and class liberation where the anti-imperialist camp and the imperialist camp confront each other.

The imperialist camp is committing a fatal error by opening multiple theaters simultaneously while failing to secure a victory in even a single one. Their “New Cold War” stratagem, plotted through the lens of World War 3, is already being thwarted by the overwhelming offensive of the anti-imperialist forces.

The Trump administration is currently mired in severe political and economic crises. As a consequence of the “tariff wars,” inflation has skyrocketed, causing public opinion to deteriorate sharply. The forced deportation of Latinos and other immigrants, combined with the outbreak of “Minneapolis incidents,” has further soured public sentiment. With the US Supreme Court ruling the tariffs illegal, the

Trump administration’s trade policy has hit a major deadlock. To make matters worse, the “Epstein Files” scandal—which allegedly implicates not only Trump but also Melania—has stripped the administration of its remaining moral authority and perceived legitimacy. As a result, the ruling Republican Party has suffered crushing defeats in every election held since Trump’s inauguration. Most notably, they lost in Texas—a state where they won by a landslide in the last presidential election—and even in the MAGA stronghold of Georgia, the Democratic candidate managed to secure first place in the initial round of voting.

The Trump administration has committed a fatal strategic blunder by instigating the war in Iran and West Asia—and further driving the push toward conflict in East Asia—thereby overturning the very “Western Hemisphere-First” strategy specified in NSS 2025 (Nov. 2025) and NDS 2026 (Jan. 2026). Even within the US, condemnations are pouring in, labeling the Iran war as “a war for Israel, not for America.” Even Tucker Carlson, a journalist who has long supported Trump, denounced the war in Iran as an “absolutely disgusting and evil” decision. The film “Wag the Dog” is becoming a literal reality.

Despite taking the risk of reversing his own policy framework, Trump—far from burying unfavorable political and economic issues—is facing a deepening crisis of governance amidst record-low initial approval ratings for the war. In Iran, a hardline supreme leader with “Imam-level” authority has emerged. Furthermore, oil prices, which once soared to \$120, are on a trajectory to surpass \$150 and potentially reach \$200. In a state of hyperinflation, the US will have no choice but to hike interest rates, which

could trigger a stock market crash and push the US economy to the brink. Consequently, the Trump faction and the Republican Party are guaranteed a total defeat in the November midterm elections, leading to an immediate “lame duck” status. The war in Iran, initiated to evade crisis, has instead become the fatal blow that amplifies it.

Until recently, US chauvinists had opposed the war in Ukraine and the Palestinian-centered conflict in West Asia. More precisely, their stance was not “anti-war” but “war avoidance.” This was not based on a pacifist ideology, but on the pragmatic assessment that such wars are unwinnable and incur catastrophic loss of life and property. Yet, they have now overturned even this position by launching the war in Iran. Unlike the globalists, who waged indirect proxy wars through Ukrainian neo-Nazis and Israeli Zionists, this is a direct war with the US at the forefront. It is no longer a localized conflict centered on Palestine, but a full-scale war encompassing the entire West Asian theater.

The maximum expression of fascist policy is war against foreign nations, while its minimum level is the persecution of foreigners and immigrants. Until recently, US chauvinists had confined themselves to the minimum level—persecuting immigrants—thereby evading accusations of being a warmongering force. However, the situation has completely changed. If the US globalists were condemned as fascists for waging proxy and localized wars, then the chauvinists—who are now conducting even more extreme direct and full-scale wars—deserve to be denounced as fascists who surpass the globalists. The US chauvinists have opened the gates of hell with their own hands.

Zionist capital (Zionist transnational capital), the core force of the imperialist camp, encompasses and controls both the globalists and the chauvinists through a “seesaw system.” By funding the election campaigns of US chauvinist forces and strategically placing its henchmen within the chauvinist

government, Zionist capital enforces imperialist war policies through extensive lobbying and public opinion manipulation. In the US system of state-monopoly capitalism, the monopoly capital that dictates national policy is Zionist capital, and the bureaucrats who execute it are the Deep State. Within the Trump administration, the anti-Deep State elements are weak, while the Deep State forces controlled by Zionist capital are driving the war in Iran with overwhelming momentum. It is no coincidence that officials of the anti-Deep State faction, such as the Director of the National Counterterrorism Center, have resigned in succession in opposition to the Iran war.

Trump’s dilemma left him with no choice but to carry out the war in Iran as planned by Zionist capital, and the world is now witnessing a domino effect of war as the conflict spreads to West Asia, East Asia, and Eastern Europe. The cunning of Zionist capital is starkly revealed in its decisive push for a full-scale escalation of World War 3 by utilizing the US chauvinists, who had previously opposed such a global conflict. Netanyahu’s notorious “40-year long-cherished desire”—a war against Iran—has been realized through the foolish chauvinist, Trump. The war in Iran is an imperialist war of aggression initiated by the chauvinist US government, instigated by Zionist Israel under the manipulation of Zionist capital.

The war criminals responsible for the war in West Asia are clearly the imperialist United States. The Trump administration—a chauvinist and imperialist government—is responsible for launching the wars in Iran and broader West Asia. If the war in West Asia escalates into a full-scale phase, it will inevitably lead to a war in East Asia. That East Asian war would mark the full-scale escalation of World War 3, making the Trump administration criminally responsible for it.

The war in West Asia is currently the only regional war. When the US and Israel attacked Iran, Iran retal-

iated by striking Israel and US military bases in Arab countries around the Persian Gulf. Alongside Iran, Hezbollah in Lebanon, Ansar Allah in Yemen, and Shia militias in Iraq immediately joined the anti-US and anti-Israel struggle. The war in Ukraine is still a conflict within a single country, and the war in East Asia has not yet begun. However, it is only a matter of time before wars in East Asia and Eastern Europe—the second and third regional wars—break out.

In October 2023, the war in Palestine quickly expanded into a broader war in West Asia. Hezbollah in Lebanon and Ansar Allah in Yemen joined in, and there were also clashes between Iran and Israel. However, this remained a regional war centered on Palestine—a localized conflict, confined to a limited area.

In February 2026, the war in Iran broke out and immediately expanded into a wider war in West Asia. This Iran-centered war in West Asia is not limited to Israel alone but also includes Gulf Arab countries hosting US military bases. The regional war centered on the conflict in Iran is no longer confined to a localized war; it has become a war encompassing the entire West Asian region—a region-wide, all-out war.

The United States is on the back foot in the war in Iran. Although it has secured air and naval superiority with overwhelming military power, it is increasingly being pushed onto the defensive due to Iran's resolute, determined, and calibrated countermeasures. Iran's missiles and drones are effectively targeting US bases and key points in Persian Gulf Arab countries—US allies and vulnerabilities—as well as destroying strategic military and political sites in Israel's capital and major cities.

In particular, Iran's blockade of the Strait of Hormuz has driven up oil prices sharply, pushing the Trump administration into a corner. Gulf Arab countries are in distress and pressuring the United States, while public opinion within the US is rapidly deteriorating due to soaring oil prices. A war that was

initiated to overcome the Trump administration's political and economic crisis is instead heightening that crisis. The administration, fearing that the war in Iran could become a "second Iraq War" or a "second Afghanistan War," is attempting to quickly contain the situation. However, it lacks the power to simultaneously restrain Israel's aggressive push to completely dismantle the Iranian regime and Iran's life-or-death counteroffensive. Starting a war may be easy, but ending one is never simple.

If the war in East Asia breaks out thereafter, Iran, like Russia would, will abandon its policy of "strategic patience" and shift from defense to offense. In other words, what has been a defensive West Asian war for the survival of Iran and the "Axis of Resistance" will transform into an offensive West Asian war that threatens the very existence of Israel. Iran has long prepared for a protracted war with the United States. This war in Iran is an unprepared war for the US, but a prepared war for Iran.

The war in West Asia accelerates the war in East Asia. If the very existence of the Iranian regime becomes endangered due to the initiation of a full-scale US ground war, the full-scale intervention of NATO forces, and the massive redeployment of US military power from the Western Pacific, China will finally carry out a war in Taiwan. The war in Iran is decisively pushing China toward launching a war over Taiwan.

In 1950, when the United States became bogged down in the Korean War, China immediately annexed Tibet. In 2026, if the US becomes entangled in the war in Iran, China will immediately annex Taiwan. China understands well that impatience is a problem, but so is the wait-and-see approach. Taiwan is at "the core of its core interests" and a "century-long aspiration" of the Communist Party of China. Recently, China has reorganized the Central Military Commission of the Communist Party. From December 29 to 31, 2025, China conducted an unusual and urgent

encirclement exercise around Taiwan, and less than a month after the outbreak of the war in Iran, on March 14, 2026, it once again launched threatening military drills targeting Taiwan.

The war in Taiwan by China will immediately lead to a war in the ‘Republic of Korea (ROK)’ by the DPRK. According to the DPRK-China treaty concluded in 1961 between President Kim Il Sung, who visited Beijing, and Premier Zhou Enlai, and reaffirmed in 2019 between President Xi Jinping, who visited Pyongyang, and Chairman Kim Jong Un, if either China or the DPRK wages a war against imperialism, the other will inevitably join.

The imperialist camp attempted to provoke a “Second Korean War” on the Korean Peninsula between September and November, and December 2024, but these were thwarted by DPRK’s deterrence capability, its policy of “strategic patience,” and the heroic resistance of the people in the ‘ROK.’ Now, they are once again instigating a war in East Asia through a new route—via a war in Taiwan followed by a war in the ‘ROK.’

Combining a war in Taiwan with a war in the ‘ROK’ constitutes an East Asian war. Given current trends, the US and Japan will not intervene in these wars. They lack both the will and the capability to do so. The US has long claimed it can simultaneously win wars in two or more theaters, but it has never done so even once. If the wars in Taiwan and the ‘ROK’ are considered as a single theater in East Asia, then alongside the war in Iran, they form two theaters, and with the ongoing war in Ukraine, this becomes three. Moreover, the Iran war has expanded into a broader war in West Asia, and the war in Ukraine is set to expand into a war in Eastern Europe, forming three major theaters of conflict. An imperialist power that has never even secured victory in a single theater has zero chance of winning across all of them. In addition, a war in Central America would emerge as a final theater.

China and the DPRK will seek to conclude oper-

ations within three days using tactical nuclear weapons as part of their operational plans. Three days is the cutoff point before external reinforcements can be deployed. While it would be ideal to subdue the enemy without tactical nuclear weapons, if that proves difficult, they will not hesitate to use them. China and the DPRK have long prepared and repeatedly rehearsed three-day military operation plans that include the use of tactical nuclear weapons. The only difference is that China keeps such matters undisclosed, while the DPRK makes them public. In short, a war in East Asia would be an ultra-short war, ending within a matter of days.

If the war in East Asia breaks out, it will become a full-fledged World War 3. With the East Asian war, World War 3 will enter a full-scale phase.

The war in East Asia will be followed by the war in Eastern Europe. If China and the DPRK abandon their policy of “strategic patience” and launch wars over Taiwan and the ‘ROK,’ there is no reason for Russia not to do the same. Since February 2022, Russia has applied the well-known strategy of the attrition warfare from World War 2 in the war in Ukraine for four years; it will now shift to a new, prepared strategy.

Russia will expand the battlefield from the localized area of “Novorossiya” in Ukraine to the broader regions of Eastern and Northern Europe. This is precisely what NATO has long strategically intended through its eastward expansion policy. The expansion of the war in Ukraine into a wider war in Eastern Europe means that Russia will confront NATO forces directly, rather than NATO’s proxy, the Ukrainian military. In other words, the war between Russia and NATO over Ukraine will transition from a proxy war to a direct war.

In the war in Eastern Europe, Russia’s objective would be to incorporate Ukraine and other former Soviet states into the Russian Federation, and to force countries such as Poland in Central Europe and Fin-

land in Northern Europe to withdraw from NATO, rendering them neutral buffer zones. If this objective is achieved, NATO will either be severely weakened or collapse altogether.

Russia will initially employ non-nuclear weapons such as the Oreshnik and will seek to restrain the use of nuclear weapons as much as possible. However, if the war is not concluded in the short term, it will use tactical nuclear weapons without hesitation. No NATO country—including the US, the UK or France—would dare wage a nuclear war against Russia. NATO’s collective defense system will collapse helplessly under Russia’s bold and overwhelming use of tactical nuclear weapons.

The war in Central America would be the final stand. Central America would be the fourth major theater to emerge. While the war in East Asia will be ultra-short-term, the wars in West Asia, Eastern Europe, and Central America are poised to become mid-to-long-term struggles.

The victory of the anti-imperialist camp in the Eastern Hemisphere will powerfully inspire anti-imperialist forces in the Western Hemisphere. Strong anti-imperialist countries like Venezuela and Cuba will abandon humiliating negotiations with the US and fight under a clear banner of anti-imperialism. Nations such as Colombia, Mexico, and Nicaragua will join this current. The anti-imperialist struggle in Central America will expand to South America and evolve into a region-wide resistance by all Latin American peoples.

The US lacks both the will and the capacity to engage in full-scale war, including ground operations, in Central America. Its only option is limited warfare, and even that will become further constrained.

Military and economic support from anti-imperialist powers like Russia, China, and the DPRK will flow in, accompanied by an International Brigade movement reminiscent of the 1936 Spanish Civil War. The defeat of US imperialism in Central America is only

a matter of time. Once the fever of anti-imperialism sweeps through Central America, the “Western Hemisphere Fortification” strategy will collapse before it can even truly begin.

As World War 3 intensifies, the imperialist camp will define anti-imperialist countries that inevitably employ tactical nuclear weapons as the “new axis of evil,” thereby completing the “New Cold War” structure.

Even if China, the DPRK, and Russia utilize tactical nuclear weapons in the East Asian and Eastern European theaters, the imperialist camp will remain paralyzed, unable to use tactical nuclear weapons in any theater due to the fear of Mutually Assured Destruction (MAD). Should the US launch any nuclear strike—tactical or otherwise—against China or the DPRK, those nations would immediately carry out retaliatory strikes against the US mainland. The same applies to NATO and Russia. Furthermore, under conditions where the nature of an incoming warhead—whether atomic or hydrogen—is unknown, all parties will assume the worst-case scenario and take corresponding countermeasures. As a result, the US and its allies would be in a position where they cannot utilize any nuclear weapons. Until now, the US has complacently maintained the belief that it could employ nuclear weapons without facing a reciprocal strike, assuming a state of Nuclear Primacy. However, the current reality has become the exact opposite.

Given the assumption that China, the DPRK, and Russia must be the first to employ tactical nuclear weapons, the US and Israel cannot resort to such weapons—even if the war in Iran prolongs and catastrophic consequences accumulate. The moment they use tactical nukes, they lose the ability to frame their opponents as the “new axis of evil.” This has been a consistent strategic calculation of the imperialist camp since the onset of World War 3.

Moving forward, the imperialist camp will prioritize

the fortification of the Western Hemisphere under the “New Cold War” framework, while simultaneously attempting to maintain neo-colonial control over countries in Asia and Africa still under their influence. They will desperately struggle to emerge as the final victors—as they did during the Cold War—by leading the race in cutting-edge science and technology, including AI.

However, as anti-imperialist countries emerge victorious in major Eastern theaters, it is unthinkable that other countries in the East or Latin America in the Western Hemisphere will submit to imperialist slavery. In the realm of advanced technology, the anti-imperialist camp holds an absolute advantage, driven by the collective cooperation of the masses and inexhaustible resources.

Faced with the collapse of global hegemony and deepening political and economic crises, the imperialist bloc provoked World War 3 as a last resort through its “New Cold War” stratagem. Yet, this fatal error has only accelerated its ultimate downfall. Those who play with fire will perish by it. The imperialist camp cannot win in even one of the four major theaters. The people united will never be defeated. The final victory of World War 3 belongs to the anti-imperialist camp.