

**Escalating Imperialist War
And Capitalist Barbarism:
Internationalism Is the Only Answer**



Internationalist Voice

On 28 February 2026, the United States and Israel launched a new war in the Middle East.¹ The objectives of the two countries in this conflict differ to some extent. Israel's goal is to change the regime in Iran and to shape a new strategy for the Middle East. Through regime change in Iran, the country aims to achieve a new regional strategy—one in which no power should be able, in any way, to challenge Israel's dominance in the region.

The United States, however, is pursuing a longer-term imperialist strategy. Washington seeks to neutralise China's potential allies and strengthen its strategic position globally in order to prevent the rise of Chinese power. Another objective of the United States is to weaken the position of the European bourgeoisie and other allies, so that they align more closely with its imperialist interests and operate within the framework of its hegemony.

Within this framework, in the Middle East and West Asia, the United States aims to establish a regional order based on the unquestioned hegemony of Israel—so that no power in the region can challenge this dominance and, consequently, the hegemony of the United States is also secured.

In this context, a weakened Iran, lacking regional influence and with changes in its political structure that bring a government obedient to the United States to power, could serve the imperialist objectives of Israel and the United States. Such a development, given Iran's geopolitical position, would enable the United States to pursue its long-term objectives both regionally and globally.

At the next stage—if, and this “if” is important, the plans proceed in accordance with the wishes of the United States and Israel—Turkey could also become one of the next countries in which changes are implemented. Given Turkey's membership in NATO, creating a crisis against it would not be possible through a direct military attack, but rather through the use of non-military instruments.

¹[Trump Says His War Aims 'Might Be Different' From Netanyahu.](#)

In this context, the United States and Israel carried out rapid, intense, and the most extensive airstrikes in their history against Iran. These attacks dealt a serious blow to the military apparatus of the Islamic bourgeoisie² and its leaders, and the United States and Israel expected that this Islamic bourgeoisie would collapse, enabling them to declare victory.

However, due to the ideological nature of Iran's ruling authority, as well as the prior experience and preparedness of the Islamic bourgeoisie for such circumstances—which it had anticipated in advance—the developments did not unfold according to the objectives of the United States and Israel. As a result, the conflict evolved into an asymmetric regional war.³

The response of the Islamic bourgeoisie has been to expand the conflict to a regional level and assert control over the Strait of Hormuz. Since around 90 per cent of Iran's oil is exported through the strait, and Iran continues to export oil amid the conflict, it has not been fully closed. At present, there has been no widespread mining; rather, control of the strait remains in Iranian

² We use the term “Islamic bourgeoisie” to refer to the rulers of Iran. In other words, this bourgeoisie is one whose ideological superstructure is Islamic, just as the ideological superstructure of the bourgeoisie in Israel is Judaism, and in Western countries, it is democracy. In all societies, the bourgeoisie is not simply the ruling class; rather, the ruling bourgeoisie constitutes only one segment of the broader bourgeoisie in that society.

The bourgeoisie of Western countries, and by extension their mass media—which play a key role in shaping public opinion—use the term “the mullahs” to refer to the ruling bourgeoisie in Iran. Accordingly, the right-wing of capital, ultra-reactionary groups, and adventurists in Iran's political sphere also use the term “mullah regime” to obscure its bourgeois nature.

More precisely, the Western bourgeoisie and the right-wing of capital seek to replace the Islamic bourgeoisie with a pro-Western bourgeoisie. They have absolutely no objection to bourgeois rule in principle and cannot have one from a class perspective; this approach is merely part of the obfuscation and manipulation of public opinion aimed at strengthening the pro-Western bourgeoisie.

³The Internationalist voice, some time before the outbreak of the Middle East war, examined and analysed the situation in a detailed article entitled “*Submission or War? Capitalism and the Tendency Towards Generalised Imperialist War, and the Internationalist Response*” The article explained and argued that capitalism tends towards generalised wars that spread to different parts of the world. It also outlined why the Middle East war would take the form of an asymmetric regional conflict. Recent developments indicate that the arguments of the communist left—based on historical experience and the development of capitalism—were correct, and their validity has been confirmed.

hands, and Iranian vessels continue to transit it.⁴ A complete closure of the Strait of Hormuz could occur if tensions escalate further. The regional war in the Middle East and the control of the Strait of Hormuz have acted like an earthquake on stock markets, oil prices, and the global economy.

Asia obtains around 90 per cent of its oil and gas from the countries bordering the Persian Gulf, which pass through the Strait of Hormuz; as a result, this situation has dealt a severe blow to the energy consumption of these countries. Sri Lanka has rationed fuel, Myanmar has implemented an odd-even scheme for private vehicles, Bangladesh has brought forward public holidays, and the Philippines has required government employees to work from home at least one day per week, and so on.

It should be emphasised at the outset that, although Europe has not engaged in direct military action in the Middle East war, according to statements by Mark Rutte, Secretary-General of NATO, in an interview with the BBC, Europe:

*“Europe is ‘absolutely supportive’ of US action in Iran.”*⁵

More precisely, Europe supports this imperialist war not offensively, but defensively, and is complicit in its brutality. This is neither due to the humanitarianism of the European bourgeoisie, nor does it imply that this bourgeoisie is not warlike; rather, it stems from the fact that European and American warmongers are each pursuing their own imperialist interests, which are not always aligned.

The European bourgeoisie is also aware that the weakening of Europe forms part of the objectives of this war. In this context, the President of Finland recently stated that Europe (or the European Union) could provide military

⁴ Apart from Iranian vessels, Iran has also allowed a few other ships to pass through. For example, India had seized three Iranian ships under the pretext of sanctions; however, in exchange for allowing two Indian ships to transit the strait, it released the seized Iranian vessels. More recently, a Turkish ship has also been permitted to pass through the strait.

⁵ [BBC News](#).

assistance to the United States in keeping the Strait of Hormuz open, in exchange for full U.S. support of Ukraine.⁶ This issue will be revisited later. In other words, the entire capitalist world is, in one way or another, involved in this imperialist war.

The Middle East war has, on the whole, been to Russia's advantage—economically, militarily and politically. From an economic standpoint, the conflict has helped to stimulate Russia's economy. Politically, it has become more difficult for Western countries to accuse Russia of “military aggression”, as they are either directly involved in the conflict or are supporting the war in the Middle East.

From a military perspective, the United States is itself engaged in conflict and is therefore unable to provide effective military assistance to Ukraine. Economically, Western countries—particularly in Europe—had imposed severe sanctions on Russia; however, in order to prevent excessive rises in oil prices, the United States granted a 30-day waiver to India, allowing it to purchase Russian oil already loaded on tankers.⁷

We previously observed that Europe supports the war in the Middle East, even though, not long ago, the United States had intended to take over Greenland, which is considered part of Europe. Despite Europe's support for the US-led war, the United States' announcement of a 30-day waiver for Russia has not been well received in Europe.

The cost of the European Union's sanctions is borne by Europe's working class through bourgeois austerity policies and a decline in living standards. Nevertheless, in practice, the United States is reducing the impact of sanctions against Russia in order to advance its own war aims. In other words, US war objectives are being pursued at the expense of Europe's working class, while each imperialist power pursues its own interests.

⁶ [Finnish President.](#)

⁷ [US gives India 30-day waiver.](#)

António Costa, President of the European Council, has stated that this decision by the United States is “very concerning”, as it affects Europe’s security. Friedrich Merz, Chancellor of Germany, has also stated that the easing of Russian oil sanctions by the United States is a mistake.

Apparently, General Dan Caine, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the United States, had informed American warmongers prior to the outbreak of the war that a US attack might compel Iran to close the Strait of Hormuz. Donald Trump also stated that Tehran would likely surrender before closing the Strait of Hormuz, and that even if it were to take such action, the US military would be capable of managing the situation.⁸

American warmongers, like brigands, had demanded the unconditional surrender of Iran’s rulers; they appear to have forgotten that the Iranian rulers are of the same kind, the only difference being that their power is more limited. In response, the Iranian authorities have declared that the war will continue until the complete defeat of the aggressors and that reparations must be paid.

It seems that American warmongers have now abandoned the demand for unconditional surrender and have turned to others in an attempt to take control of the Strait of Hormuz. They have suggested that countries receiving oil through the Strait should be responsible for its protection and have stated that the United States will assist:

“The Countries of the World that receive Oil through the Hormuz Strait must take care of that passage, and we will help — A LOT!”⁹

France has refused to deploy its warships to the Strait of Hormuz. The United Kingdom has also announced that it is considering a range of options to ensure the security of shipping in the region. However, the most humiliating

⁸ [The Wall Street Journal](#).

⁹ [Reuters](#).

comment was made by Boris Pistorius, Germany's Defence Minister, who stated:

*“Donald Trump expect a handful or two handfuls of European frigates to do in the Strait of Hormuz that the powerful U.S. Navy cannot do? This is not our war, we have not started it.”*¹⁰

Apparently, Britain, France, Germany, Japan, Italy and the Netherlands have finally issued a joint statement, announcing that they are ready to participate in appropriate efforts to ensure the safe passage of shipping through the Strait of Hormuz. In other words, barbarity and war are spreading. At present, several thousand ships are trapped on both sides of the Strait, and according to the Maritime Organisation, more than 20,000 seafarers aboard these vessels are caught in the area.

There had been speculation that the United States and Israel would be unable to sustain a long-term war due to a shortage of crucial defensive and strategic weapons; however, this assertion becomes meaningless in light of changes in military tactics. The reality is that, within a matter of days, the United States and Israel rapidly expended their precision ammunition, expensive defensive missiles, and other advanced weaponry in the Middle Eastern conflict, and have since faced a reduction in their stockpiles of precision munitions.¹¹ Systems such as Patriot and THAAD are technologically advanced, but extremely costly and limited in number. Israel has also warned the United States that it is dangerously facing a shortage of interceptor missiles.¹²

The rapid expenditure of such strategic munitions presents the Pentagon with a dual challenge: on the one hand, meeting the immediate demands of the battlefield, and on the other, preserving strategic reserves for other fronts—

¹⁰ [Boris Pistorius](#).

¹¹ [The Washington Post](#).

¹² [Ynet Global](#).

particularly in Asia and for containing China. This situation forces the Pentagon to prioritise targets for interception, which means accepting the risk that some Iranian missiles and drones may get through its air defence systems.

Iran's calculations in this regard are based on both strategic considerations and the economics of war. In other words, during the first two weeks, Iran used older-generation missiles to deplete the enemy's interceptors, and from the third week onwards, it has relied on modern missiles. This explains why the number of missiles fired has decreased while the number of successful strikes has increased. The interceptors used by Israel and the United States are far more expensive than Iran's disposable missiles and drones.

In response to these conditions, the United States has moved away from the use of long-range "strategic" weapons—expensive, advanced systems such as Tomahawk cruise missiles—and has instead turned to cheaper, "short-range" weapons, such as JDAM bombs, which can be dropped from above the target. The United States can sustain this approach to warfare for an almost indefinite period.

These analyses show that capitalism is driving humanity towards the intensification of military tensions and the spread of chaos. The horizon ahead points not towards a reduction in war and military conflict, but towards an expansion of this barbarism, because this war is not the product of insane warmongering leaders, but the result of the material conditions created by capitalism. In other words, it is capitalism itself that, with speed and intensity, escalates military tensions and spreads disorder.

The consequences of this imperialist war will not be confined to the region. The working class in other parts of the world—even those not directly involved in the conflict—will bear its costs: falling living standards, runaway inflation, rising unemployment, and increased repression and police control.

The right- and left-wing tendencies of capital, each with its own eloquence and style, employ workers as cannon fodder in imperialist wars. Meanwhile,

even those who present themselves as opponents of war, in various ways, steer the masses towards cross-class anti-war movements. Such ambiguities prevent the formation of an independent, conscious, and class-based struggle.

In these circumstances, the role of internationalists is more vital than ever. The task of communist left cannot be limited to issuing statements; it requires taking an active and organised role in defending proletarian internationalism. Communist left has remained loyal to internationalism in all imperialist wars; therefore, today too, communist left must mount an active defence consistent with this historical tradition and take practical and effective steps to uphold an independent, proletarian, and class-based position. Such measures should serve to strengthen class consciousness and contribute to the formation of an independent proletarian struggle.

This is because imperialist war is a war against the identity and class consciousness of workers, and the intervention and defence of the Communist Left do not take place in a vacuum; they acquire meaning only within the real context of social and class struggles.

History shows that the only force capable of halting capitalist wars is the working class; as in the First World War, the threat of a workers' revolution forced the bourgeoisie to retreat. This historical experience demonstrates that war criminals withdraw not out of humanitarian concern or political rationality, but only under the real threat posed by the proletariat—a retreat undertaken with the aim of rebuilding strength and preparing for a class war against the proletariat itself.

Today, although the working class finds itself in a position of weakness, it is only through independent organisation and class struggle that capitalist war and barbarism can be confronted. The global working class alone can turn capitalist wars into a struggle against capitalism itself and, by overthrowing this system worldwide, eliminate the foundations of militarism and war-

related tensions. Therefore, ending war and achieving lasting peace is possible only through a global proletarian revolution.

Workers Have No Country!
Down With the Imperialist War!
Long Live the War Between the Classes!

M.J.
19 March 2026

E-mail:
contact@internationalistvoice.org

Homepage:
www.internationalistvoice.org

X (ex-Twitter):
https://x.com/int_voice

Telegram:
<https://t.me/intvoice>

The Internationalist Voice Already Published!

**Submission or War?
Capitalism and the Tendency
Towards Generalised Imperialist
War, and the Internationalist Response**



Internationalist Voice

**Decisive Choice: It's
Not Democracy or Fascism,
But Socialism or Barbarism**



Internationalist Voice

**All States
Are War Criminals!**



Internationalist Voice

**The War Between Iran and Israel
Highlights the Savagery and
Madness of Capitalism**



Internationalist Voice