

**The Shifting Balance of Imperialist Powers
and the Recomposition of the World Order:
The Necessity of Independent
Proletarian Organisation**



Internationalist Voice

For the Reader's Attention:

The pieces portrayed on the cover are not intended to represent the political reality or particular circumstances of any specific country; rather, the image stands as a metaphor for the turbulence, disorder, and complex power relations that shape the global chessboard of contemporary capitalism.

Addresses of the Internationalist Voice

Homepage:

www.internationalistvoice.org

Email:

contact@internationalistvoice.org

X (ex-Twitter):

https://x.com/int_voice

Telegram:

<https://t.me/intvoice>

COMMUNIST REVOLUTION

OR

THE DESTRUCTION OF HUMANITY!

Support Internationalist Voice!

A fundamental pillar of revolutionary work is to systematically intervene and provide a perspective for the development of the struggle of the working class. The existence of a revolutionary tendency, though very weak, is a manifestation of the antagonism between the social classes and is a barometer of the class struggle.

A revolutionary tendency is only supported against the enormous resources of the bourgeoisie propaganda machine by those who are against the capitalist society, exploitation, wage slavery etc. Internationalist Voice is truly internationalist without any illusions about nationalism, democracy, and the left of capital, and defends the Communist Left tradition. Internationalist Voice is fighting for the Communist Revolution and needs your support in its struggle, in its defence of proletarian values and principles. Support Internationalist Voice.

Table of Contents

Introduction	6
The Emergence of the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation	9
Tianjin Declaration	12
The Alaska Summit	15
Media War for Russia's Return to the Global Stage.....	18
India: A Western Tool of Influence or an Independent Imperialist Actor?	21
The Expansion of Chinese and Russian Influence: A Challenge to the Western Bourgeoisie.....	24
Demonstration of Power in Beijing	32
China's Imperialist Ambitions.....	37
The Escalating Chaos in the Middle East	39
The decline of Europe's standing?.....	47
The US' Response to China's Challenge	58
Arms Race	68
The Global Situation and the Necessity of the Independent Organisation of the Working Class	78
Basic Positions:	99

Introduction

Following the Alaska meeting between the United States and Russia—a meeting that was said to be intended to bring an end to the imperialist war between Russia and Ukraine (NATO)—the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation held its summit. This summit was the largest gathering of the organisation since its establishment, with leaders from over 20 countries in attendance. During the meeting, 25 cooperation agreements were signed, and a joint statement was issued at its conclusion.

Immediately following this summit, China held its Victory Day parade—an event widely regarded as a demonstration of the country’s growing power. The ceremony echoed the Victory Day parade (9 May) in the Soviet Union, which had become a symbol of Soviet military might, with leaders reviewing the troops from atop Lenin’s Mausoleum. In Beijing, in a similar display, Xi Jinping, dressed in a Mao suit, together with other domestic leaders and foreign guests, reviewed China’s military forces from the platform above Tiananmen Gate.

With the collapse of the bipolar order and the decline of Russia’s global standing, the United States became the sole dominant world power and launched multiple wars to maintain its hegemony. Today, however, this imperialist balance is shifting: an emerging power such as China has risen, and, in other words, the world order is being rewritten.

The question now arises: does this shift in the balance of power signify the formation of new global blocs? Has the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation moved beyond the framework of security, political, and economic cooperation, and is it moving towards some kind of military-security alliance similar to NATO?

In other words, is the world on the verge of a new bloc formation, in which an Eastern bloc centred on China, accompanied by countries

such as Russia, North Korea, Iran, and others, aligns against a Western bloc led by the United States? Or is the new world order following a multipolar path, with poles such as the US, Europe, and China, each holding a share of global power and influence?

If we consider the period following the end of the Cold War, the major imperialist powers did not directly engage in military confrontations with one another; rather, they pursued their rivalries and tensions through proxy wars. Meanwhile, powers such as the United States also launched direct attacks on smaller countries in pursuit of their imperialist objectives — such as the invasions of Afghanistan, Iraq, and other nations.

However, a distinguishing feature of the current situation is that the major imperialist powers are now directly involved in military tensions and rivalries, and are affected by their consequences. In a world where each power seeks to advance its own imperialist interests, and where rivalries occur not only through proxy wars but also directly and militarily between the major powers, and where alliances and convergences remain stable only as long as imperialist interests dictate, a fundamental question arises:

What kind of order are we facing? Are we, in fact, confronted with a system that could be described as one of all against all?

It is an undeniable fact that military tensions and imperialist wars are not the result of the policies of foolish leaders or dictators, but an inevitable part of capitalist existence in its period of decay. However, the fundamental difference between war in the era of imperialism and wars of earlier periods is that today, warfare is highly technological, and killing takes place on a large-scale, industrialised level.

Nevertheless, it should be noted that imperialist tensions and the balance of power represent only one side of the equation; the other side is the global working class. These global developments will undoubtedly have a profound impact on the position of this class. As economic and

military competition intensifies, it is the working class that bears the heaviest burden of such conflicts—whether through poverty, unemployment, forced migration, or death on battlefields that bring it no benefit. In such circumstances, the decisive question is whether the working class will be able to overcome its current fragmentation, transcend national borders, and once again assert itself as a global historical force and as a social class in opposition to the capitalist system.

Most importantly, the fundamental question before us is: what is the role of communists at this critical historical juncture? Communists must be able to chart the path of political independence for the working class amid imperialist crises, linking the struggle against war and class oppression, and opening up an internationalist and socialist perspective to the working masses—workers who are weary of the existing system and seeking a path to liberation.

In this booklet, we will endeavour to examine these issues in light of current conditions and from an internationalist perspective. It is hoped that this work will serve as a step towards clarifying the political milieu.

The Emergence of the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation

With the collapse of the Soviet Union, the United States briefly achieved an almost uncontested hegemony. During this period, NATO extended its influence into Eastern Europe and strengthened its political presence, security initiatives, and cooperative programmes in the Caucasus and Central Asia. These measures included military cooperation, the training of armed forces, and the establishment of temporary logistical bases. NATO's expansion in these regions created a new competition in the heart of Asia and highlighted the necessity of regional convergence for Russia and China.

China's imperialist ambitions, aimed at becoming a global power, on the one hand required energy resources and secure trade routes in Central Asia, and on the other were concerned with the potential encirclement by the United States in East Asia. Russia, after a decade of decline in the 1990s, sought to rebuild its influence in the "near abroad" in order to reassert itself as a global power.

Against this backdrop, in 1996, China, Russia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, and Tajikistan, in defence of their imperialist interests, established an organisation aimed at countering the expansion of US and NATO influence, initially called the "Shanghai Five." At that time, China was not yet considered a serious competitor to the United States and its allies, and therefore did not provoke significant concern. Shortly afterwards, with the accession of Uzbekistan, this organisation was renamed the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation. In the following years, with the membership of countries such as India, Pakistan, and Iran, it developed into a broad platform encompassing economic, political, and security dimensions.

In general, the formation of the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation can be seen as an example of imperialist organisation during

a period of redrawing the global balance of power—a tool serving capital in the competition for, and division of, the world. Despite its broad scope, the organisation’s central focus remains the coordination of regional powers against global rivals, particularly the West, led by the United States and NATO. In reality, the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation is nothing more than a reproduction of the same imperialist logic, presented in an ostensibly alternative form to counter other imperialist competitors—a tool serving the great powers in the redivision of spheres of influence.

The internal contradictions of this organisation stem from the imperialist rivalries among its members. For instance, the ongoing tensions between China and India, or Russia’s sensitivity to China’s influence in the Central Asian republics, are not exceptions but inherent features of any imperialist alliance, since none of these states think beyond their imperialist, power-driven interests and their desire to expand their influence.

Even the closeness between Russia and China is based not on “strategic objectives”, but on the pressure of global circumstances and the necessity of countering American hegemony. As soon as conditions change or new imperatives emerge, these contradictions become evident. A clear example of this is the recent disagreement over Azerbaijan’s membership in the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation: China, taking into account its geopolitical and economic interests, supported the application, whereas India, owing to its close relations with Armenia and its long-standing rivalry with Pakistan — Azerbaijan’s main ally — opposed it. According to Ilham Aliyev, it was precisely this opposition from India that prevented Azerbaijan from attaining full membership in the organisation.¹

Nevertheless, the return of Narendra Modi, the Prime Minister of India, to the summit in China after seven years (since June 2018), and his

¹ [The Times of India](#).

participation in the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation meeting — particularly in its final communiqué — at a time when India had recently clashed with Pakistan and its relations with China were also strained, temporarily created an opportunity to ease imperialist tensions and even made possible a trilateral meeting with Putin and Xi.

A fundamental condition for membership in the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation is the absence of United Nations Security Council sanctions², since under the organisation's charter, any country subject to such sanctions cannot become a member. Iran's accession became possible only after the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA) agreement and the suspension of the Security Council's sanction resolutions through the adoption of Resolution 2231.

The question now arises as to whether Iran's continued membership in the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation will be called into question³ with the activation of the 'snapback' mechanism⁴. In any case, these sanctions have always hung over Iran like the Sword of Damocles. This issue will be considered in the final communiqué of the Tianjin meeting.

² United Nations Security Council sanctions are entirely distinct from those imposed by Western countries. For example, despite the heavy sanctions imposed on Russia by Western countries and their allies, no Security Council sanctions have been applied to Russia, nor is this practically possible, since Russia, as a permanent member of the Council, has the right to veto and can reject any resolution in this regard.

³ [Eghtesadd24](#).

⁴ The snapback mechanism (Snapback) is a tool within the framework of the JCPOA that allows the Den of Thieves (United Nations) sanctions against Iran to be automatically reinstated if Iran violates its commitments under the agreement. This process takes place without the need for a new vote in the Security Council. Since the United States had withdrawn from the JCPOA, only the remaining countries — the United Kingdom, France, Germany, Russia, and China — could have activated it by the end of August. The three European countries — the United Kingdom, France, and Germany — activated it before the end of August, and from September, according to the view of Western countries and their allies, UN Security Council sanctions against Iran have been in effect. However, Russia and China do not recognise the activation, nor does the United Nations itself, which will be examined in the following pages.

Tianjin Declaration

The politicians attending the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation summit signed 25 cooperation agreements, as well as the final statement of the meeting, known as the ‘Tianjin Declaration’. This summit can be seen as a stage for China to demonstrate its power in the face of the West, where Beijing, despite the conflicting interests and imperialist ambitions among the members, was able to temporarily align them all behind itself.

In parts of this statement, the member states of the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation (SCO) expressed their deep concern over the humanitarian crisis in Gaza and strongly condemned the actions that have led to “widespread civilian casualties and a catastrophic humanitarian situation in the Gaza Strip”. However, this condemnation of large-scale civilian losses can only be understood within the framework of imperialist rivalries and in line with the political and geopolitical interests of these countries vis-à-vis the West. In fact, the SCO member states, like the Western countries, share responsibility for the genocide in Gaza, and the entire capitalist system is accountable for it.⁵

Another position in the Tianjin Declaration, signed by all members, was the strong condemnation of the attacks by the United States and Israel on Iran. This condemnation revealed that imperialist competition among global powers is often disguised under a veneer of humanitarian concern, with warmongers presenting themselves as peacemakers:

“The member states strongly condemn the military aggression launched by Israel and the United States against Iran in June 2025. Such acts of aggression, targeting civilian facilities including

⁵ For further information, see the “*Gaza Genocide: A Product of Global Capitalism’s Organized Barbarism*”.

critical nuclear infrastructure, have caused civilian casualties, severely violate international legal norms and the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter, infringe upon Iran's sovereignty and territorial integrity, undermine regional and international security, and have serious consequences for global peace and stability.”⁶

India has held a special position for the United States and other Western countries for several reasons. Given the imperialist conflict of interests between China and India, and the fact that the two countries share a border, the West and its allies have used India as a lever to apply pressure on China, creating a form of balance in line with their imperialist interests. At the same time, although India purchased cheap oil from Russia, it generally pursued a policy aligned with the West.

India's recent alignment with other members of the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation (SCO) in condemning the attacks by the United States and Israel on Iran is significant, given that just two months earlier India had refused to join the organisation's members in a similar condemnation of Israel's actions against Iran — a move that exposed internal divisions within the SCO. A similar pattern is evident regarding the issue of Palestine and Gaza; despite being known for its close ties with Israel and openly pro-Israel positions, in June 2025 India abstained from voting on a ceasefire resolution for Gaza in the United Nations General Assembly.⁷

Nevertheless, India's recent alignment can be analysed within the framework of its specific imperialist interests, since every capitalist state ultimately seeks to preserve and expand its own imperialist objectives. Amid global imperialist tensions, India attempts to play a balancing role

⁶ [The Tianjin Final Declaration.](#)

⁷ [The Economic Times.](#)

in its imperialist policy, particularly following the imposition of trade tariffs by the United States. Concurrently, India and Israel signed an investment agreement covering areas such as financial technology, infrastructure, financial regulation, and the integration of digital payment systems. Furthermore, India is regarded as one of the largest purchasers of arms from Israel.

Another notable point in the final statement was the challenge posed to Western powers in line with the imperialist interests of the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation members, particularly regarding the activation of the ‘snapback’ mechanism. The future will show to what extent the member states of this organisation are serious about defending their imperialist interests, or whether this challenge to Western policies will remain merely rhetorical and on paper.

Under these circumstances, the member states of the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation are indirectly opposing the activation of the ‘snapback’ mechanism and the reinstatement of Security Council sanctions, viewing its implementation as conditional on full compliance with the provisions of the relevant resolution. They have warned that any attempt to interpret this resolution arbitrarily would undermine the authority of the Security Council.

“The member states reiterated the importance and binding nature of United Nations Security Council Resolution 2231 (2015) and affirmed that it should be fully implemented in accordance with its provisions. Any attempt to interpret this resolution arbitrarily would undermine the authority of the Security Council.”⁸

⁸ [The Tianjin Final Declaration.](#)

The Alaska Summit

Following the outbreak of the imperialist war between Russia and Ukraine (NATO), Western countries, pursuing their own imperialist interests, imposed heavy sanctions on Russia and sought to isolate it on the global stage—not only to prevent the expansion of its influence but also to significantly weaken it.

However, in recent months, this approach has faced a serious challenge, particularly as the two major world powers, the United States and China, through their official reception of Putin, have demonstrated that Russia is once again seeking to consolidate its position as a global power. For Russia, Putin's meeting with Trump on American soil—in Alaska, a territory that once belonged to Russia—represents a symbolic victory and, at the same time, could be seen as a sign of Europe's waning political influence.

This situation arises while the International Criminal Court, operating within the framework of the imperialist objectives of Western countries—particularly European governments—and as part of tensions stemming from imperialist rivalries, has issued an arrest warrant for Vladimir Putin. Under this ruling, he has effectively lost the ability to travel to more than 120 countries, including almost all European states, most South American countries, nearly half of the African nations, and several Asian member states of the Court.

Putin's visit to Alaska marked his first presence on the soil of a Western country since the outbreak of the imperialist war between Russia and Ukraine (NATO)—a conflict during which Western imperialist powers, utilising the International Criminal Court as an institution serving their own imperialist interests, turned it into a tool to achieve their

objectives and employed it through propaganda, media campaigns, and sanctions pressure against the so-called “Russian war criminals”. As a result, the arrest warrant issued by the Court has effectively and severely restricted Putin’s diplomatic mobility and ability to travel abroad.

Putin and Trump shook hands on the airport runway; meanwhile, the B-2, America’s most formidable strategic bomber, flew overhead as they passed between lines of F-22 fighter jets. On one hand, the scene symbolised a display of the United States’ military power and superiority over Putin, while on the other, it served as an attempt to present a respectful and friendly image of American hospitality.

However, behind these diplomatic displays, deep imperialist rivalries were clearly evident. The warmongering leaders then walked across the red carpet and boarded the US presidential limousine to proceed to the meeting—a scene hardly imaginable for a country in a state of international isolation. This image sent a clear message to the world: Russia is once again seeking to consolidate its position as a global power.⁹

In the meeting hall, the warmongers appeared in the guise of peacemakers, positioning themselves before a blue backdrop bearing the slogan “In Search of Peace”. The scene served as a reminder of the longstanding deceit of imperialist powers—those who themselves instigate and fuel wars, yet now appear on stage wearing the mask of peace.

The negotiations among war criminals, and the complete sidelining of Europe and Ukraine from the decision-making process, are reminiscent of the historic Yalta Conference on the Crimean Peninsula in 1945, where, following the end of the Second World War, the Soviet Union, the United States, and Britain effectively drew up a new map for the division of power in Europe.

⁹ In the following sections, we will revisit how the European leaders were humiliated by the United States’ ruling class during their official visit to the White House.

After nearly three hours of negotiations in Alaska, Trump and Putin failed to reach an agreement. Putin remained determined to defend his imperialist interests, although Trump described the meeting as ‘ten out of ten’ and called it ‘very good’. Both spoke in the presence of reporters but did not answer any questions. In a brief press conference, Putin implicitly emphasised that restoring the security balance in Europe and addressing Russia’s concerns are prerequisites for achieving peace.

Russia has repeatedly expressed its opposition to NATO’s eastward expansion, particularly the potential membership of Ukraine, viewing it as a direct threat to its national security. Moscow’s primary demand is a reduction of NATO forces and a return to conditions similar to the arms-limiting agreements of the Cold War, allowing it to expand its influence with greater freedom of action.

The Alaska Summit, overall, was a sign of Europe’s declining standing and its growing isolation in relations with the United States. The red carpet rolled out for Putin—while the International Criminal Court, an institution primarily representing European bourgeois interests, had issued an arrest warrant against him—constituted a clear snub to Europe and a temporary victory for Russia; a victory within the framework of imperialist competition between Moscow and the European powers.

Media War for Russia's Return to the Global Stage

Economy and military strength are two fundamental factors in emerging as a regional or even global power, playing a decisive role in expanding a sphere of influence. However, although these factors are necessary, they are not sufficient on their own. Every imperialist power, in order to consolidate and extend its influence, inevitably needs to secure legitimacy and social acceptance at the ideological and cultural level as well.

For this reason, propaganda, media, and artistic apparatuses are employed so that imperialist influence may be accepted by the masses with minimal internal resistance. Hollywood and the American film industry are clear examples of this function: the rise of the United States in the twentieth century was achieved not merely through bombs and dollars, but also through imagery and favourable representations of the “cradle of freedom” and the “land of the Statue of Liberty”.

Today, Russia too is striving to counter the Western bourgeoisie and to reclaim and consolidate its position in imperialist rivalries by maintaining an active presence in the media sphere. In other words, Moscow seeks to project a favourable image of itself in the minds of its target countries as a counterweight to the Western propaganda machine — not as a predatory imperialist, but as a “defender of the Global South” and a power that “gives voice to the oppressed against Western domination.” At times, it even resorts to Soviet-era rhetoric to reinforce this narrative. Nonetheless, in reality, this media policy is nothing more than a façade for expanding Russia's economic and political influence and, ultimately, for realising its imperialist ambitions.

The expansion of RT and Sputnik networks across Africa, the Balkans, the Middle East, Latin America, and South-East Asia demonstrates that Russia has filled the gap left by the relative retreat of

Western media. By producing content in local languages, opening new offices, and training journalists, the country is paving the way for the expansion of its imperialist influence. For instance, the closure of BBC Arabic coincided with Sputnik's growing presence in Lebanon and Ethiopia.

This media influence is particularly striking in Africa, where Russia, alongside its propaganda activities, has increased both its military presence and its support for governments, thereby consolidating its position on the continent. In contrast, the United States and European countries are generally losing some of their influence in the region.

In Latin America, the free broadcasting of RT Español in ten countries, along with the widespread redistribution of its content even under YouTube restrictions, provides a further example of this trend, which has served to strengthen Russia's imperialist influence. Ultimately, it is an undeniable fact that prevailing ideas reflect those of the ruling class, and this principle is only overturned under revolutionary conditions—a truth that Marx articulated with absolute clarity.

*“The ideas of the ruling class are in every epoch the ruling ideas, i.e. the class which is the ruling material force of society, is at the same time its ruling intellectual force. The class which has the means of material production at its disposal, has control at the same time over the means of mental production, so that thereby, generally speaking, the ideas of those who lack the means of mental production are subject to it. The ruling ideas are nothing more than the ideal expression of the dominant material relationships, the dominant material relationships grasped as ideas; hence of the relationships which make the one class the ruling one, therefore, the ideas of its dominance.”*¹⁰

¹⁰ *The German Ideology* – Marx&Engels

In all spheres, imperialists—whether weak or powerful—are constantly striving to construct a narrative that justifies and facilitates the expansion of their influence. Through rhetoric such as “democracy,” “freedom,” and “support for the oppressed,” they in fact present their brutality and domination in a guise that appears both legitimate and humane.

It is the duty of communists to resist these narratives and bourgeois propaganda, regardless of their deceptive appearance, and to demonstrate that the true outcome of this system is nothing but exploitation, war, and devastation for the world’s workers. Communists must emphasise the necessity of an independent class struggle against the entirety of the global capitalist system and pave the way for the liberation of the working class from imperialist domination.

India: A Western Tool of Influence or an Independent Imperialist Actor?

India is the most populous country in the world and one of the ten largest economies. Its importance to the Western bourgeoisie is not limited to its economic standing or trade relations with Western countries and their allies; above all, it lies in its geopolitical position vis-à-vis China. For Western powers, India is of particular significance due to its historical and border disputes with China and Pakistan, as supporting India serves as an effective means of containing China's imperialist ambitions.

Some bourgeois critics of the Trump administration's policies argue that his irresponsible and confrontational approaches have pushed India closer to China than ever before.¹¹ Relations between New Delhi and Beijing deteriorated sharply following the deadly clash between the two countries' forces along the Himalayan border in June 2020. Nevertheless, in recent years, India has taken steps economically towards greater cooperation with China, while simultaneously expanding its relations with Russia—developments that have caused deep concern among Western governments, particularly European powers.

Following rising imperialist tensions, the Trump administration initially imposed 25 per cent tariffs on imports from India. Subsequently, due to New Delhi's continued purchase of oil and weapons from Russia despite Western sanctions, a new package of punitive tariffs was introduced, bringing total tariffs on Indian exports to the United States to

¹¹The *New York Times* reported that in June, Trump, during a phone call with Modi, claimed that he had acted as a peace mediator between India and Pakistan and even deserved the Nobel Peace Prize; according to him, India should also acknowledge this. Modi angrily responded that the ceasefire had nothing to do with Trump's intervention. A few weeks later, in response, Trump imposed a 50 per cent tariff on imports from India. ([Source](#))

around 50 per cent. In defence of these policies and economic penalties against India, Trump argued:

“What few people understand is that we do very little business with India, but they do a tremendous amount of business with us. In other words, they sell us massive amounts of goods, their biggest “client,” but we sell them very little - Until now a totally one sided relationship, and it has been for many decades. The reason is that India has charged us, until now, such high Tariffs, the most of any country, that our businesses are unable to sell into India. It has been a totally one sided disaster! Also, India buys most of its oil and military products from Russia, very little from the U.S.”¹²

The imposition of 50 per cent tariffs by the United States dealt a heavy blow to India’s economy, with the country’s textile sector suffering the most. India’s textile industry, the second-largest employer after agriculture, has been among the most vulnerable economic sectors. As a result of these policies, thousands of textile workers in major industrial centres such as Tiruppur, Surat, Panipat, and Ludhiana either lost their jobs or faced severe reductions in working hours. The decline in textile exports has not only threatened India’s economic growth but has also weakened the country’s position in the global textile market.

This shift is unwelcome for the European bourgeoisie and even the United States, as it signifies a reduction in their influence over India. A decline in influence over India, in turn, weakens pressure on China. Reduced pressure on China could strengthen Beijing’s confidence and resolve in pursuing its imperialist ambitions, thereby creating the material conditions for the intensification of global tensions.

¹² [TruthSocial](#).

Consequently, a segment of the Western bourgeoisie—particularly in Europe—believes that part of the American bourgeoisie, especially the faction represented by Donald Trump, played a significant role in shaping India’s inclination to move closer to China and Russia. It was in this tense atmosphere that, following the attendance of Narendra Modi and Vladimir Putin at the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation summit in Tianjin alongside Xi Jinping, Donald Trump wrote in a message:

*“Looks like we've lost India and Russia to deepest, darkest, China. May they have a long and prosperous future together!”*¹³

¹³Reuters.

The Expansion of Chinese and Russian Influence: A Challenge to the Western Bourgeoisie

Russia possesses vast reserves of oil, gas, energy, raw materials, and military power, while China enjoys considerable industrial and technological capabilities. In other words, do these two countries not complement each other as a united bloc? Furthermore, the policies of the Western bourgeoisie are increasingly driving them towards convergence. So, can we not expect them to move towards a genuine alignment?

These questions are reasonable, but the main issue is that both countries pursue their own imperialist interests—interests that sometimes conflict, thereby undermining the foundation of any lasting convergence. China is on the path to becoming a global power and has little desire for Russia to become overly strong; for China, the ideal is for Russia to be powerful enough to resist the West, yet still remain within China's sphere of influence. The same logic can also be observed in China and Russia's relations with Iran.

Following the outbreak of the war between Russia and Ukraine (and, more broadly, Russia's confrontation with NATO) and the imposition of extensive Western sanctions against Moscow, Russia effectively joined the ranks of sanctioned oil exporters such as Iran and Venezuela. However, since the start of the war, China has increased its oil imports from Russia, Iran, and Venezuela, raising the share of these three countries to around 33 per cent of its total oil imports.¹⁴ The largest increase has been in imports from Iran, as Tehran has strengthened its position in the Chinese oil market by offering substantial discounts.

The convergence of China, Russia, and other countries within the framework of the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation is occurring while each of these nations pursues its own specific imperialist interests—

¹⁴ [Khatenergy](#).

interests that sometimes conflict with one another. Nevertheless, their shared objective is to counter Western influence, particularly that of the United States. In reality, all the powers within this organisation, including Russia, are becoming increasingly dependent on China's economy.

In addition to the "Power of Siberia 1" gas pipeline, negotiations between Russia and China on the construction of the "Power of Siberia 2" pipeline, which will pass through Mongolian territory, have been concluded. More importantly, China is particularly interested in the "Northeast Passage"¹⁵—a route aligned with Beijing's long-term imperialist objectives and defined within the framework of the New Silk Road initiative. This passage is of special economic significance to China, as transporting a container from China to Europe via the northern route is approximately 14 days faster than using traditional routes.

At the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation summit on 1 September 2025, Xi Jinping, pursuing China's imperialist interests, once again challenged the Western bourgeoisie and demonstrated that Beijing has become increasingly determined in advancing its imperialist ambitions. In his remarks, he condemned "bullying behaviour" in the global order and called on countries to distance themselves from the "Cold War mentality" and hegemonic policies. Although these statements were made indirectly, their primary audience was the United States and its Western allies. In other words, Xi Jinping urged member states to

¹⁵ The Northeast Passage is a maritime route that runs along the northern coasts of Eurasia, stretching from the Barents Sea to the Bering Strait, connecting the Atlantic Ocean to the Pacific Ocean. This route is not ice-free throughout the year and is currently navigable only during certain seasons. Using the Northeast Passage can, in many cases, reduce travel distances by 20 to 40 per cent compared with the traditional route via the Suez Canal. For example, on the Yoshihama ↔ Rotterdam route, this reduction is around 37 per cent. Such savings translate into lower fuel consumption, shorter voyage times, and consequently reduced costs; however, the route still faces challenges, including the presence of ice, high insurance costs, limited infrastructure, and seasonal access restrictions.

distance themselves from the coercive policies of Washington and its allies.¹⁶

China and Russia have announced that they do not recognise the “snapback” mechanism—an action that can be seen as a serious challenge to the Western bourgeoisie and even to bourgeois international institutions, including the den of thieves (the United Nations). But the fundamental question is: why have China and Russia undertaken such a challenge under the current circumstances? From an economic perspective, explaining this behaviour is not straightforward. China’s trade volume with Iran is estimated at around 15 to 25 billion dollars, while trade with the United States reaches approximately 700 billion dollars.¹⁷ Therefore, Iran’s special discounts on oil sales and the supply of cheap oil alone cannot fully explain China’s motivation to confront the West.

A similar situation can be observed with Russia. The trade volume between Iran and Russia in 2023 was around 4 billion dollars¹⁸, while, despite severe US and European sanctions, trade between Russia and the United States in the same year reached approximately 5.1 billion dollars. Given the increasing strategic cooperation between Iran, Russia, and China, it can be expected that in the coming years the volume of trade between Iran and Russia, as well as between China and Iran, will follow an upward trend. However, these collaborations are driven more by geopolitical objectives and imperialist interests aimed at countering Western influence than by purely economic considerations.

This is despite the fact that both China and Russia voted in favour of all the sanctions against Iran prior to the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA). At that time, it would have been sufficient for either of

¹⁶ [Independent](#).

¹⁷ Due to the circumvention of sanctions, a portion of trade is conducted informally; therefore, providing accurate and official statistics in this area is difficult.

¹⁸ [Tass](#).

these two countries to exercise their veto power to render the sanctions ineffective, or at least to prevent the snapback mechanism from being included in the agreement.

Beyond all these matters, in 2023 and 2024, both China and Russia, in line with the expansion of their imperialist influence in the Arab countries of the Gulf, supported the positions of the Gulf Cooperation Council regarding the three Iranian islands—Greater Tunb, Lesser Tunb, and Abu Musa—thereby effectively challenging Iran’s territorial integrity. In response, Iran summoned the Russian ambassador in Tehran and lodged a formal protest.¹⁹ Similarly, the Chinese ambassador was also summoned, and Iran’s official objection was conveyed to him.²⁰

In Syria, too, before Bashar al-Assad consolidated his power, while Israel repeatedly bombed Iranian positions, Russia did not take any supportive action on behalf of Iran—even though, on the surface, both countries appeared to share an interest in preserving the Syrian government.

Due to crippling Western sanctions, one of Iran’s greatest weaknesses lies in its air defence and air force, which have not been modernised for years and possess limited effectiveness. Despite this, China, and especially Russia, provided no assistance to compensate for these deficiencies. The consequences of these shortcomings became evident during the recent 12-day war, in which Israel achieved absolute air superiority, resulting in heavy losses for Iran. In political milieu, it was even sarcastically remarked that Israel had built an “air highway” over Iran.

The recent support provided by China and Russia to Iran is not based solely on economic interests, but rather aligns with their strategic

¹⁹ [Al Jazeera](#).

²⁰ [Al Jazeera](#).

and imperialist objectives, aiming to shift the balance of power in the global system and advance their own imperialist ambitions. The approach of these two countries is such that Iran must remain weak enough to require their support, but not so weak that it becomes vulnerable and unable to resist the West. Russia and China do not wish for Iran to become powerful and independent of them; rather, they want Iran to remain on the threshold of dependency, so that it stays within their sphere of influence while retaining the capacity to resist the West.

Finally, Russia concluded that it would supply some of the equipment required by Iran within the framework of military cooperation.²¹ What persuaded Russia to take this step was the escalation of imperialist military tensions and the arming of proxy forces in pursuit of its own imperial ambitions. In the following section, we shall first examine how the Russian Foreign Minister explains the provision of Iran's requirements.

“Regarding our military-technical cooperation with Iran: following the lifting of the United Nations Security Council sanctions, we are no longer subject to any restrictions. In full accordance with international law, we are supplying the equipment required by the Islamic Republic of Iran. I would like to emphasise once again that all of this is being carried out strictly within the framework of international law.”²²

²¹ For a considerable time, Iran had sought to purchase advanced Sukhoi-35 fighter jets from Russia. This aircraft, classified as a 4++ generation model, is among the most sophisticated in Russia's arsenal and, under certain conditions, can offer a degree of resistance against fifth-generation fighters such as the F-35. Following the twelve-day conflict between Iran and Israel, Russia, as a short-term measure, delivered several MiG-29 fighter jets to Iran to meet the immediate needs of the Iranian Air Force until the official delivery of the Sukhoi-35s takes place in the future.

²² [Tass](#).

In the above quotation, we saw that the Russian Foreign Minister stated that, following the lifting of United Nations Security Council sanctions, there are no longer any restrictions on Russia's military and technical cooperation with Iran. He also claimed that all such actions are being carried out within the framework of international law.

The main challenge here is that Russia and China believe the Security Council sanctions have been lifted and do not recognise the activation of the snapback mechanism by the three European countries — the United Kingdom, France, and Germany. Furthermore, Vasily Nebenzya, Russia's representative to the United Nations, stated at a press conference marking the start of Russia's presidency of the Security Council in October:

*“Our Western colleagues, who initiated the so-called ‘snapback’ – the legitimacy of which we do not recognize – they keep saying that they are open for a diplomatic solution, although they forfeited a diplomatic solution already. [Russia] does not recognize the ‘snapback’ as coming into force. So, we’ll be living in two parallel realities – because, for some, ‘snapback’ happened; for us, it didn’t. That creates a problem; how we will get out of it, let’s see.”*²³

China has also explicitly opposed the use of the snapback mechanism against Iran, stating that the activation of this mechanism is both legally and procedurally flawed. According to China, employing such an instrument without fully completing the necessary legal and diplomatic processes lacks legitimacy.

Meanwhile, the United States has recently imposed sanctions on nearly one hundred individuals, entities, companies, and oil tankers for

²³ [Press Conference](#).

facilitating Iran's oil and petrochemical trade. Among those sanctioned are a refinery and an oil terminal owned by China. In this regard, Guo Jiakun, the spokesperson for China's Ministry of Foreign Affairs, stated:

*"China has always firmly opposed illegal unilateral sanctions that lack a basis in international law and are not authorized by the UN Security Council. We urged the US to abandon the erroneous practice of resorting to sanctions at will. It is legitimate and reasonable for countries to conduct normal cooperation with Iran within the framework of international law. China will take necessary measures to safeguard its own energy security and the legitimate rights and interests of Chinese enterprises and citizens."*²⁴

During the Russia–Ukraine (NATO) war, Israel initially sought to play a balancing role. In particular, in the early days, when Russia maintained an active presence in Syria, Israel repeatedly carried out operations against Iran, Syria, and their allied forces. Over time, Israel was compelled to follow the Western line of policy in its dealings with Russia. However, following the fall of Assad in Syria, and given the significant Russian-speaking population, Israel was able to pursue its imperial ambitions with greater freedom, even vis-à-vis Russia. Although Russia still maintains an airbase in Syria, its direct military presence is no longer as substantial as it once was. As a result, Israel began covertly equipping and supporting Ukraine.

Michael Brodsky, Israel's ambassador to Ukraine, stated in an interview with Ukrainian journalist Marichka Dobenko that Israel had delivered a Patriot missile system to Ukraine.²⁵ The reasons for the ambassador's disclosure of this information are not yet entirely clear, but

²⁴ [Global Times](#).

²⁵ [Kyiv Post](#).

the report provoked anger in Russia, which subsequently requested an explanation from Israel. Israel, in turn, categorically and deceptively denied the claim. The country's Ministry of Foreign Affairs, while rejecting the ambassador's statements, declared that no Patriot missile system had been delivered to Kyiv. In response to a question from the Ynet website, the Israeli Ministry of Foreign Affairs stated:

*"Israel has not transferred such systems to Ukraine."*²⁶

Following Israel's denial, Zelenskyy officially stated that Israel had provided Ukraine with a US-made Patriot missile defence system. This move was likely intended to put pressure on Russia and to demonstrate that the Western countries, with Israel as their proxy, continue to arm Ukraine. He went on to tell reporters:

*"The Israeli [Patriot] system is operating in Ukraine. It has been operating for a month. We will receive two Patriot systems in the fall."*²⁷

It was previously mentioned that Iran is seeking to purchase 48 advanced Sukhoi-35 fighter jets from Russia. Recently, in a "tense" phone conversation with Putin, Netanyahu "pleaded" with him not to arm Iran with these Russian jets. He urged Putin to reconsider the secret arms deal with Iran and stated that, should Russia go ahead with it, Israel could increase its military assistance to Ukraine.²⁸

These events illustrate which imperialist interests are driving Russia to fulfil part of Iran's military needs, as well as how rapidly military tensions in the region are escalating, given that the material foundations of imperialist conflicts are increasing swiftly.

²⁶ [Ynet Global](#).

²⁷ [The Guardian](#).

²⁸ [The Times Of India](#).

Demonstration of Power in Beijing

To mark the 80th anniversary of the end of the Second World War, China held a grand military parade in Tiananmen Square, Beijing, on 2 September. The main purpose of the ceremony was stated to be the demonstration of China's military strength, advanced defensive capabilities, and technological achievements.

In the run-up to the event, Japan publicly urged other countries not to attend — a move that prompted a sharp response and an official protest from Beijing²⁹. Many Western nations, along with some of their Arab allies, declined to participate in the ceremony. Western media outlets interpreted this widespread absence as a form of “political boycott”, seeing it as a sign of growing tension and geopolitical rivalry between China and the West.

Among European countries, Slovakia was the only European Union member to take part in the military parade. Robert Fico, the Prime Minister of Slovakia, attended the ceremony in person, attracting considerable media attention. His presence was particularly notable in light of his recent statements emphasising the need to strengthen Bratislava's relations with Russia and China. Fico's participation in the event can be seen as reflecting internal tensions among EU member states regarding how to respond to the imperialist policies of China and Russia.

The composition of participants at the ceremony, which included more than twenty world leaders, was itself a symbol of the emergence of a new orientation in the global order—one clearly marked by the imperialist competition among major powers. The leaders of China, Russia, and North Korea, each pursuing distinct imperial ambitions and geopolitical objectives, watched the military parade together in a

²⁹ [Reuters](#).

symbolic display of unity; their presence conveyed the impression of a clear message of political and military alignment against the West.

For Kim Jong-un, this attendance was particularly significant, as it was the first time since 1959 that the North Korean leader had taken part in a military parade in China. The move represented an effort to project an image of warming relations between Beijing and Pyongyang, while also providing an opportunity for Kim to present himself alongside Xi Jinping and Vladimir Putin as one of the powerful leaders on the global stage. At the same time, the President of Iran was also present at the ceremony, though not in the position of the principal leaders of China, Russia, and North Korea. This symbolic arrangement clearly indicated that Tehran is not yet part of the central circle of this power.

China's military parade featured a comprehensive display of the country's latest technological and military achievements. The ceremony showcased long-range ballistic missiles, fifth-generation fighter jets, advanced stealth drones, modern air-defence systems, hypersonic missiles, intercontinental missiles carrying nuclear warheads, laser weapons, and even "dog-like" robots—many of which were being publicly unveiled for the first time—providing a clear illustration of the Chinese military's expanding capabilities. In addition, newly established units such as the "Information Support Force" and cyber warfare divisions were also introduced, signalling Beijing's focus on the emerging dimensions of technological and informational warfare.

In his speech, Xi Jinping addressed the global arms race and framed China's significant military advancements within the context of this competition. He emphasised that the world today remains at a critical juncture, caught between "peace and war." Speaking with a resolute tone, Xi declared that "China is unstoppable" and that no power in the world can halt the country's progress, development, or the restoration of its historical greatness.

The significance of the event, however, went beyond the display of military hardware. The meetings and behind-the-scenes discussions among the leaders of the participating countries highlighted China's position as a rising power seeking to consolidate its global standing. The ceremony once again demonstrated that Beijing is determined to pursue its geopolitical and imperial ambitions and will not yield to pressures or strategies aimed at containing its rivals. In his speech, Xi Jinping encapsulated the essence of his message as follows:

“China is unstoppable and will never be intimidated by pressure or coercion.”³⁰

Global capitalism has now reached a stage where its crises and contradictions are no longer purely economic, but have acquired a structural and historical character. Signs of this situation can be observed in the expansion of militarism, rising tensions, and the increasing generation of crises, not only among Western imperialist powers but across all bourgeois states worldwide. A defining feature of the current situation is that Western powers, and particularly the major European powers, no longer possess the capacity to reproduce their former dominance or maintain the previous global order.

Attempts to attribute this situation to the “irrational policies” of individuals, such as Donald Trump, are in fact an effort to conceal the true nature of the current global capitalist system. It is not Trump who enacts these irrational policies; rather, it is the decaying capitalist system itself that displays its internal chaos and structural contradictions through figures like Trump.

What is happening today on the international stage reflects a stage of historical decline in the global capitalist system—a stage in which the rise of new economic and military imperial powers is intertwined with

³⁰ [BBC](#).

the gradual decline of traditional Western imperial powers. In other words, China's ascent to the status of a global power is the flip side of the gradual weakening of Western powers; **a process which, through the interplay and competition of imperialist ambitions, provides the main backdrop for the formation and intensification of current imperialist tensions and, in particular, those likely to arise in the future global order.**

China's rivals, led by the United States, are well aware of this development. They understand that China's Victory Day parade was not merely a grand military display, but a clear message of Beijing's determination to redefine the global order—an order that has hitherto been dominated by the United States. Today, China is employing every available tool—from economic and technological power to diplomacy and military force—to consolidate its position within this transforming order. In this context, *The New York Times* wrote in an analytical report:

*“The summit of more than 20 leaders, mostly from Central Asia, followed by a military parade in Beijing showcasing China’s newest missiles and warplanes, is not just pageantry. It shows how Mr. Xi is trying to turn history, diplomacy and military might into tools for reshaping a global order that has been dominated by the United States.”*³¹

It was in this context that Victor Gao—a lawyer, university Chair Professor, prominent figure in China's intellectual circles, and, most notably, Vice President of the Beijing-based Centre for China and Globalization (CCG)—delivered a sharply worded speech defending China's imperial ambitions at a joint session of diplomats and government officials during the 14th Manila Forum. Referring to the Victory Day parade, he described the event as a symbol of China's

³¹[The New York Times](#).

authority and emphasised that China's military power today is comparable only to that of the United States. In defending China's imperial interests, Gao issued a warning to Washington, stating that Beijing is undaunted by American threats and is prepared to respond if confronted. He asserted that if the United States seeks war, it will have war; and if it intends to impose a nuclear conflict on China, it should know that it will perish in that same conflict. He expressed the hope that American leaders have learned from history and said:

“China will not fire the first shot, but China will not allow you to fire the second shot. China will never allow the United States to launch a war against China—conventional or nuclear—without suffering devastating consequences. If you have not watched the Victory Day Parade in Beijing on September 3rd, one of the weapons China demonstrated—we call it the “61”—can carry 60 nuclear warheads plus one hydrogen bomb. Now, in the world of today, let me ask: which country has a hydrogen bomb? China is the only country with a hydrogen bomb, and that ICBM can reach every corner of the world in less than 20 minutes and destroy any target anywhere without any possibility of being intercepted. I hope Washington has learned the lesson. If you want war, you will get war. If you want to destroy China, you will be destroyed. If you want to impose nuclear war on China, you will be wiped out by nuclear war.”³²

³² On 17 September 2025, a meeting titled the “14th Manila Forum on Philippines–China Relations” was held, with the aim of expanding bilateral cooperation in the economic, cultural, and security spheres between the two countries. At the forum, government officials, diplomats, and international relations experts discussed ways to strengthen mutual trust and promote sustainable regional development. Victor Gao was one of the main speakers at the event, and the topic he addressed arose approximately one hour and seven minutes after the start of the proceedings.

China's Imperialist Ambitions

China is advancing its imperialist ambitions step by step, aiming to become a leading global power. These ambitions include major initiatives such as the “New Silk Road” (the Belt and Road Initiative), which form a central part of this strategy. This project is not only an economic tool for expanding China's influence across Asia, Africa, Latin America, and Europe, but its geopolitical and strategic dimensions also demonstrate that Beijing seeks to reshape the global power map in line with its imperialist interests.

Although economic power plays a fundamental role in the global capitalist system, it is evident to all that achieving such an objective would not be possible without the backing of military strength. China is well aware that its imperialist ambitions cannot be secured by a strong economy alone; military power serves as the complementary element and the ultimate guarantor of these goals. Becoming a leading global power without attaining reliable military superiority would remain an unfulfilled dream.

The reality is that, in today's world, military power continues to hold a decisive role. Recent experience shows that military capability remains the ultimate measure of state authority within the global capitalist order. For example, although Germany is the world's third-largest economy and Russia ranks eleventh³³, it is Russia's military strength that enables it to defend its imperial interests against Western imperialist powers and even to challenge them.

The United States remains the most powerful military force in the world and, compared with other countries—particularly China—it has maintained its superiority in several key areas. These include a large and stable defence budget, an extensive nuclear arsenal, a fleet of aircraft

³³[Forbes](#).

carriers and long-range bombers, a vast network of bases, and the ability to deploy forces across the globe. In other words, its global mobility and capacity for power projection make the United States an unrivalled actor in the military arena.

However, China is closing this gap at a remarkable pace. The country's rapid economic growth has enabled Beijing to make extensive investments in its military and security sectors, strengthening its capacity to play a more influential role in the global balance of power. In this context, Xi Jinping emphasises the importance of recalling history as a means of legitimising China's imperial ambitions. He has repeatedly stated that his country must "atone for the bitter memories of foreign invasions" and consolidate its position as a major and influential power within the international order.

As a result, the combination of China's economic growth and military development has made the country one of the United States' principal rivals in the decades ahead, and the global balance of power is gradually shifting.

The Escalating Chaos in the Middle East

In recent decades, the Middle East has been recognised as one of the most volatile regions in the world in terms of military conflict. The material and geopolitical conditions of the region have created fertile ground for the emergence and escalation of military tensions in line with the interests of global capitalism. Simultaneously, as a new round of ceasefires begins in the Gaza Strip, a fresh wave of military clashes has erupted between Afghanistan and Pakistan. The roots of these tensions can be traced to imperial ambitions and the rivalry between the two sides to expand their spheres of influence. The Taliban accuse the Pakistani government of seeking to destabilise Afghanistan by supporting the “ISIS-Khorasan” faction; in turn, Islamabad claims that the Afghan Taliban provide shelter and the necessary support to members of the “Tehrik-i-Taliban Pakistan”.

The recent clashes have not only further strained relations between the two countries but have also led to direct military confrontations. The latest phase of these tensions began with an airstrike by the Pakistani military on targets in Kabul, an action that provoked a sharp reaction from the Taliban. Subsequently, heavy fighting broke out at no fewer than eight points along the border between the two countries, resulting in hundreds of casualties. Eventually, through mediation by Qatar and Turkey in Doha, Pakistan and the Taliban-led government in Afghanistan agreed to a ceasefire; however, the underlying material and structural causes of these tensions remain.

Within the framework of managing imperialist rivalries, Qatar has become one of the main centres for organising and exerting leverage amid the power struggles of imperialist forces and the ambitions of Western bourgeoisies and their regional allies. However, part of the mechanism that makes this situation capitalist in nature by no means implies

complete alignment between Western bourgeoisies and their regional allies in all respects. Over the past two decades, Qatar has emerged as one of the most important bases for the presence and activities of opposition political and military movements in the Middle East. The country has hosted groups and movements such as Hamas, the Taliban, the Syrian opposition, opponents of Muammar Gaddafi, the Muslim Brotherhood, Libyan rebels, and other similar forces.

The Qatari government claims that hosting these groups—particularly the political bureau of Hamas—was carried out at the request of the United States, playing a role similar to that previously undertaken when hosting the political bureau of the Taliban, in order to provide a basis for peace negotiations and diplomatic mediation with the US. According to Qatari officials, American authorities considered the presence of Hamas’s political bureau in Doha essential to maintain “indirect lines of communication” between Washington and the movement, ensuring the possibility of engagement when necessary. Qatar, citing the same reasoning, has justified the presence of Hamas’s political bureau on its soil, regarding it as a measure to facilitate dialogue and preserve channels of communication between the parties involved.

“Qatar has hosted Hamas’s political office since 2012, after what Qatari officials say were requests from the United States. Qatari officials have repeatedly said that the decision to host the Hamas leadership came after a request from the United States. In a 2023 opinion piece for The Wall Street Journal (WSJ), the Qatari ambassador to the US, Sheikh Meshal bin Hamad Al Thani, said that Washington wanted the office “to establish indirect lines of communication with Hamas... Qatar hosted the Taliban’s political office from 2013 onwards as it fought against the US and the former Afghan government. The Taliban political office was also

opened at the request of the US to provide a venue for peace talks.”³⁴

With this context, it is now possible to return to the subject of the bombing of Doha. Although Israel’s attack on Doha was a sign of the intensifying chaos and instability in the Middle East, the event itself makes the underlying causes of this disorder clearer to the public, since its roots are more structural and political than military. Following Iran’s missile strikes on the Al-Udeid US base in Qatar—carried out in response to the United States’ bombing of Iran’s nuclear facilities—four air defence systems were activated to protect the base. As a result, only one missile hit its target, damaging or completely destroying the geodesic dome associated with the base’s advanced communications and telecommunications systems.³⁵ Nevertheless, this strike caused no casualties, a fact largely attributable to the simultaneous operation of the four advanced defence systems:

“Four main systems, all made by American manufacturers, were highlighted as part of the Qatari armed forces’ military response: F-15 fighter jets, Apache helicopters, Patriot air defense systems, and National Advanced Surface-to-Air Missile systems.”³⁶

General Dan Caine, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the United States, described this defensive action as a “historic event” and stated that during Iran’s missile attack on the Al-Udeid base in Qatar, “the largest single-event launch of Patriot interceptors in U.S. military history” took place. He emphasised that the coordination among the defensive systems deployed at the base was an exceptional example of a

³⁴ [Al Jazeera](#).

³⁵ [Al Arabiya](#).

³⁶ [Defense News](#).

multi-layered advanced defence operation, which was able to neutralise a widespread threat with minimal damage, and he remarked:

*“We believe that this is the largest single Patriot engagement in U.S. military history.”*³⁷

He described the American forces who, alongside their Qatari brothers and sisters, stood against the Iranian missiles and safeguarded the security of Al-Udeid base as the “unsung heroes of the United States Army in the twenty-first century”—forces who, through exemplary dedication, discipline, and coordination, defended one of the United States’ most important military bases in the region:

*“Those troops, are awesome humans [who] along with their Qatari brothers and sisters in arms, stood between a salvo of Iranian missiles and the safety of Al Udeid. They are the unsung heroes of the 21st-century United States Army.”*³⁸

Qatar is home to the largest United States military base in the Middle East, Al-Udeid Air Base, located only about 30 kilometres from the site of the Israeli attack and situated in an area with very strict security measures. This area lies near Doha’s commercial centre and hosts a number of foreign embassies, residences of diplomats and wealthy individuals, as well as schools and other key urban facilities.

During the bombing of Doha, reports indicate that Israeli fighter jets flew over the Red Sea and launched their missiles from over eastern Saudi Arabia towards Doha. This comes against the backdrop of countries such as Saudi Arabia, Qatar, the United Arab Emirates, and

³⁷ [The War Zone](#).

³⁸ [The War Zone](#).

Bahrain having spent billions of dollars over the past decades on purchasing military equipment from Western countries, all of which are equipped with advanced air defence systems, including the Patriot system. Therefore, when the missiles were fired towards Doha, it was naturally expected that these countries' defence systems would be activated.

But the fundamental question is this: why was not a single missile fired in response to the Israeli missiles, even symbolically? This issue cannot be analysed purely from a military perspective; rather, it must primarily be examined from a political and strategic standpoint.

From a military perspective, the failure to activate the air defence systems cannot be justified, since the Patriot systems and other air defence equipment in these countries effectively operate under the United States' surveillance and control network. Without coordination with US central command, activating these systems against the military aircraft of other countries, including Israel, is virtually impossible. From this standpoint, the silence of the air defence systems could be seen as a deliberate decision, resulting from the absence of authorisation at the US command level to avoid direct confrontation.

Meanwhile, the website *Israel Hayom* has reported that, during the recent conflict between Iran and Israel, Saudi Arabia secretly shot down Iranian drones in its own airspace and surrounding areas, including over Iraq and Jordan.³⁹

Following Israel's attack on Qatar, Marco Rubio first travelled to Israel, where he emphasised the United States' steadfast support for the country. In other words, he stated that Israel's attack on one of America's regional allies would not affect Washington's ongoing support for Tel

³⁹ The website *Israel Hayom*, which generally reports from a perspective close to the Israeli government and focuses particularly on developments in the Middle East, national security, and Israel's relations with regional countries, has published this disclosure.

Aviv. He then travelled to Qatar, where he highlighted the “strong bilateral relationship” between the US and Qatar, and affirmed that security, economic, and diplomatic cooperation between the two countries would continue.

Following these developments, Saudi Arabia, which has invested billions of dollars over past decades in purchasing and equipping its military forces with Western weaponry and continues to do so, made an unexpected decision: Riyadh signed a defence pact not with the United States or other Western powers, but with Pakistan. This move indicates that, in order to strengthen its deterrence and guarantee its security, Saudi Arabia has chosen Pakistan’s military as a key option, rather than relying solely on the might of the US armed forces.

In other words, US security guarantees in Riyadh are no longer taken as seriously as they once were, and traditional trust in Washington is eroding. This reflects the declining reliability of the “US security umbrella” for regional countries and growing doubts about Washington’s genuine commitment to defending its allies.

Under the terms of the defence pact between Pakistan and Saudi Arabia, any hostile action against one party is considered an attack on both countries—a development that could bring the Middle East’s security balance into a new phase and affect regional developments, particularly in terms of deterrence, arms competition, and strategic interactions between regional and extra-regional powers:

“This agreement, which reflects the shared commitment of both nations to enhance their security and to achieving security and peace in the region and the world, aims to develop aspects of defense cooperation between the two countries and strengthen joint deterrence against any aggression. The agreement states that

any aggression against either country shall be considered an aggression against both.”⁴⁰

In pursuit of its imperialist ambitions, and with the backing of Western powers, Israel has turned the Middle East into a theatre of its influence and aggression. Perhaps, as the German Chancellor put it, Israel carries out the hard and dirty work on behalf of the Western bourgeoisie. The Gaza Strip, the West Bank, Iran, Lebanon, Syria, Qatar, Yemen, and Iraq⁴¹ are among the regions directly affected by Israel’s aggressive policies. Benjamin Netanyahu also claims that the outcomes of Israel’s recent wars on seven fronts have fundamentally changed the face of the Middle East and transformed Israel into a global power:

“The outcomes of Israel’s ‘seven-front’ war have succeeded in ‘changing the face of the Middle East’ and transforming Israel into ‘a global power.’”⁴²

It is a fact that, despite being widely reviled⁴³ for the genocide in Gaza, Israel has significantly strengthened its military position, at least at the regional level. However, this military advance has been achieved

⁴⁰ [MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS](#).

⁴¹ In Iraq, too, and with the aim of turning the country into an ‘air corridor’ for attacks on Iran, several air-defence radar systems were mysteriously destroyed by unidentified actors, ensuring that this ‘air corridor’ would experience minimal disruption. The question arises: who both possesses the technical capability to carry out such a complex operation and the motive to attack Iraq’s radar systems while executing it covertly?

⁴² [Radio Farda](#).

⁴³ It has recently been revealed that Israel, in an effort to counter the wave of global hostility resulting from the genocide in Gaza, sought to shape public opinion in the United States by influencing social media and employing American influencers, presenting a more favourable image of itself online. Under this scheme, individuals were paid between \$6,000 and \$7,000 per post to publish pro-Israel content on platforms such as TikTok and Instagram. Reports indicate that, between June and November 2025 alone, approximately \$900,000 was spent on this campaign.

[The full report on this matter can be accessed at this link.](#)

primarily through war and slaughter, and it potentially paves the way for future tensions in the region. In other words, it can be expected that, in the coming years, we will witness an intensification of imperialist tensions in the Middle East.

From Israel's perspective, the confrontation with Iran is far from over, and Tehran, in response, has bolstered Hezbollah in Lebanon to resist efforts by both the Lebanese government and Israel to disarm it, while continuing to consolidate its military position. One of the central principles proposed by Israel in its security agreement plan with Syria is the maintenance of an air corridor; this air route would enable Israel to use Syrian territory for potential operations against Iran whenever necessary.

“The maintenance of an air corridor to Iran through Syria, which would allow Israel to conduct potential future attacks on Iran.”⁴⁴

⁴⁴ [Radio Farda](#).

The decline of Europe's standing?

The transformations of capitalism — particularly over the past decade — together with the profound changes in the global order, have also convinced Europe's ruling class that the imperialist order established after the Second World War, although significantly altered following the fall of the Berlin Wall and having to some extent strengthened the position of the European bourgeoisie, now stands on the threshold of fundamental upheavals. A new imperialist order⁴⁵ is taking shape, and one of the key questions is to what extent the European ruling class possesses the will and the capacity to play its part in defending its imperialist ambitions under the new global conditions.

Kaja Kallas, the European Union's foreign policy chief, in connection with the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation summit, the Beijing parade, and other global developments, has emphasised that Europe must deploy its *geopolitical power* more effectively in defence of its imperialist interests. She stated that, in order to maintain its position, Europe must act more proactively in response to global developments and, while defending its imperialist ambitions, play an effective role in the new world order — not merely to preserve its current standing, but to consolidate and strengthen its strategic position. She expressed this as follows:

⁴⁵ Although the term *order* literally refers to the natural harmony and coherence of elements, and its use in a context where capitalism is moving towards disorder might seem inappropriate, from a conceptual standpoint the new conditions can themselves be regarded as a form of order. The intensification of imperialist tensions on a global scale, the adoption of a war economy — not by the peripheral countries but by the metropolitan countries of capitalism — together with the renewed emphasis on militarism, the escalation of violence, and other similar developments, all amount to a political order in their own right.

“Looking at President Xi standing alongside the leaders of Russia, Iran, North Korea in Beijing today, these aren’t just anti-Western optics, this is a direct challenge to the international system built on rules...It’s not just symbolic. Russia’s war in Ukraine is being sustained by Chinese support. These are realities that Europe needs to confront now...We are experiencing deliberate attempts to change the international order...China and Russia also speak of leading changes together not seen in a hundred years and the revision of the global security order... A new global order is in the making...It will not be shaped without Europe, but it will be shaped by what Europe is willing to do, whether we are willing to recognise the need for Europe to play a geopolitical role.”⁴⁶

After the fall of the Berlin Wall, the United States launched a series of wars to maintain its global hegemony, including the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, which in turn spread a form of disorder not only in the Middle East but across the world. The recent actions of the major European countries can be seen as broadly analogous to the behaviour of the United States after the fall of the Berlin Wall, albeit on a much weaker scale. Although these countries are not capable of initiating wars to consolidate their imperialist positions, they resort to other measures, the outcome of which is not the creation of greater order, but the proliferation of further disorder. In the following, some of these actions will be highlighted.

In pursuit of its strategic objectives to contain China, the United States is seeking to implement a reversal of the “Kissinger policy”: a policy which, in the 1970s, by separating China from the Eastern Bloc, paved the way for the withdrawal of American forces from Vietnam and ultimately enabled China’s gradual integration into the Western-led

⁴⁶ [Radio France Internationale](#).

order. Within the same framework, the Trump administration's policy towards Russia is also a continuation of this overarching goal — namely, to contain China and isolate Russia.

A potential agreement between the United States and Russia over the Ukraine war can be seen as an attempt to implement a reversal of a form of the “Kissinger policy,” with the crucial difference that the imperialist interests and ambitions of the United States and Europe in this regard are not only unaligned, but in some cases directly opposed. The European powers, by providing full-scale support to Ukraine, aim to prolong the war and erode Russia's military and economic capacity. They oppose any territorial concessions to Russia in Ukraine, believing that such a concession would not only fail to weaken Russia, but would also portray it as the victor in the conflict.

During Joe Biden's presidency, there was a certain convergence between the American Democratic faction and European governments regarding the war in Ukraine. However, with the return of Donald Trump and the resurgence of the Republican faction, signs of divergence between Europe and this faction have become increasingly apparent. During his election campaign, Trump stated that, if he were president, the Russia–Ukraine (NATO) war would never have started, and that, if elected, he would end the war within two weeks. These statements are part of Trump's demagoguery, which seeks to portray the war as the product of foolish and criminal leaders, whereas in reality the conflict is a product of the decaying capitalist system and forms part of the natural course of capitalism in its period of decline.

The fact that an individual with a disordered personality, behavioural instability, and shifting positions can ascend to the presidency of the world's largest economy and military power is itself a reflection of a deep crisis within the capitalist system. In reality, it is not Trump who has lost his balance, but **the capitalist system itself**, which has spiralled out of control, with signs of instability evident at every level.

Trump changes his positions almost daily; therefore, it is not possible to speak of a “clear Trump position” unless it is specified exactly at what point in time and on which issue he made a statement. For this reason, before continuing the discussion, we briefly outline his most significant positions regarding the war in Ukraine:

February 2025:

Trump adopted a hardline stance towards Ukraine, holding the country partly responsible for the outbreak of the war. He accused Ukraine of being able to prevent the conflict by ceding part of its territory. Trump stated:

“You should have never started the war, you could have given up land.”⁴⁷

August 2025:

Trump spoke of the idea of a “territorial exchange” or mutual concession. Following meetings and discussions with European politicians, he suggested that both sides might be forced to “cede part of their territories” in order to end the war. He also expressed hope regarding the possibility of security guarantees and referred to “Putin’s willingness to reach an agreement.”

September 2025:

Trump, in a clear reversal, expressed support for Ukraine’s territorial integrity, claiming that Ukraine could reclaim all its territory with NATO’s assistance. He stated:

“I think Ukraine, with the support of the European Union, is in a position to fight and WIN all of Ukraine back in its original form.

⁴⁷ [Trump blames Ukraine.](#)

With time, patience, and the financial support of Europe and, in particular, NATO, the original Borders from where this War started, is very much an option.”⁴⁸

October 2025:

Following a tense meeting with Zelensky, Trump refrained from sending Tomahawk missiles to Ukraine and advised—or pressured—Zelensky to cede eastern regions such as Donbas in their current form. In other words, he suggested that Donbas be handed over to Russia so that the war could be halted immediately. These statements caused confusion and a negative reaction from the Ukrainian delegation.

Following the meeting between Putin and Trump in Alaska, it was decided that Trump would also meet with Zelensky. Given the previous incident in which Trump humiliated Zelensky in front of journalists at the White House, turning the session into a tense encounter, the leaders of the major European countries accompanied Zelensky this time to prevent a repeat of that experience.

Peter Brookes, the cartoonist for *The Times* (UK), has depicted this meeting in the form of a cartoon. His illustration is inspired by Hans Christian Andersen’s classic story *The Emperor’s New Clothes*, and shows Trump wearing a crown and royal robe. While Trump parades like a naked emperor, European politicians such as Macron, Merz, von der Leyen, and Starmer follow behind him, praising his “invisible clothes.”

It appears that the European “criminals,” due to Europe’s declining influence and position, have no choice but to accompany the global “gangster.” In the details of the cartoon, each politician exaggerates their admiration for Trump: Ursula von der Leyen praises him in a theatrical and over-the-top manner, “OOH LA LA!”; Starmer offers unqualified

⁴⁸ [AP News](#).

praise, saying, “Suits You, SIR!”; Macron commends the “SUPERBES VETEMENTS!”; and Merz lauds his “WUNDERSCHÖN NEW CLOTHES!”

The war in Ukraine has, in fact, revealed particular conditions of capitalist life: a situation that has not only driven Europe’s economy towards a war economy—borne at the expense of the working class—but has also spread chaos and insecurity throughout what is supposed to be “secure” Western Europe.

Leaving aside the case of Poland, NATO considered the entry of drones into the country’s airspace a violation and, although unintentional, deemed it a reckless act. Recently, unidentified drones have been spotted in the skies over Western European countries, including Norway, Denmark, Germany, the Netherlands, and Belgium, disrupting airports in Oslo, Copenhagen, and Munich. A clear picture of these incidents is not yet available, but European countries have raised the possibility of Russian involvement in targeting infrastructure and have described it as part of Russia’s “hybrid war.”

Russia has dismissed these allegations as “baseless” and, in turn, condemned the proposed “European drone wall,” describing it as a factor likely to escalate tensions. The key issue is that, with rising geopolitical tensions, serious security challenges are no longer confined to the peripheral capitalist countries; the air transport infrastructure in Western Europe—that is, at the heart of the capitalist metropole—is now also under threat.

This decline in Europe’s position is evident even in the way the United States treats its European allies, although European politicians, despite these humiliations, continue their servile flattery. Emmanuel Macron, the President of France, encountered an unexpected and somewhat humiliating incident during his trip to New York to attend the United Nations General Assembly. After his speech, while returning to the French Consulate, his motorcade was suddenly stopped by the New

York Police near the UN headquarters. The halt was due to Donald Trump’s motorcade passing along the same route, which led the police to close the street completely for a period. After Trump’s motorcade had passed, the street was reopened only to pedestrians, and Macron was forced, together with his security team, to walk for about thirty minutes through the streets of New York to reach the French Consulate⁴⁹.

The level of the United States’ relations with Europe can be clearly gauged by comparing Washington’s treatment of two figures: on the one hand, the humiliation of Emmanuel Macron in New York; and on the other, the highly orchestrated escort of Benjamin Netanyahu, who is reportedly under international scrutiny. In the released video, Netanyahu departs New York in a large motorcade to travel to the White House for a meeting with President Trump. Along the route, highway patrol officers have completely cleared the roads, and several counter-assault teams, as well as two ambulances, are positioned within the convoy, providing the highest level of security.⁵⁰

We have previously examined how three European countries — the United Kingdom, France, and Germany — activated the “snapback mechanism.” From their perspective, the sanctions of the Security Council of the den of thieves (the United Nations) against Iran have effectively been reinstated. In contrast, China and Russia have explicitly stated that they do not recognise this action, a stance that can be seen as a direct challenge to the Western bourgeoisie and the international institutions under its influence, including the so-called den of thieves (the United Nations).

In response, Iran declared that the United States was the first party to violate the JCPOA and Resolution 2231, and that the European countries, by continuing and expanding illegal sanctions, have effectively followed Washington’s lead.

⁴⁹ [The Guardian](#).

⁵⁰ [A large motorcade escorting Netanyahu](#).

Subsequently, China, Russia, and Iran issued a joint statement rejecting the three European countries' activation of the "snapback mechanism," describing it as "without any legal basis." In a letter addressed to the Secretary-General of the den of thieves (the United Nations), they emphasised:

"We have the honour to bring to your attention an urgent matter pertaining to the disruption of the implementation of Security Council resolution 2231 (2015), in which the Council endorsed the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA). In particular, we refer to the claims of the Foreign Ministers of France, Germany, and the United Kingdom (the E3), in their letter dated 28 August 2025, on allegedly invoking paragraph 11 and the so-called "snapback" mechanism provided by the above-mentioned resolution for diligent participant Member States.

Therefore, it is by default legally and procedurally flawed. The E3's course abuses the authority and functions of the Security Council while misleading its members as well as the international community concerning the root causes of the breakdown in the implementation of JCPOA and Security Council resolution 2231 (2015). At the inception of JCPOA, when the "snapback" mechanism was established, it could hardly be foreseen that the United States would be the first to break its obligations. The United States decision in May 2018 to unilaterally withdraw from JCPOA and undermine the resolution fundamentally affected the modalities of triggering the "snapback" mechanism, which can no longer be used in relation to Iran without properly addressing and resolving in advance the significant non-performance by the United States...The Security Council cannot proceed on the basis of the communication submitted by the E3 and should consider it null and void. Any step or action taken in disregard or

contravention of Security Council resolution 2231 (2015) cannot result in lawful international obligations for the Member States.”⁵¹

The crux of the matter is that these three European powers, by activating the snapback mechanism, have effectively created the material conditions for escalating future chaos and tensions—something that is entirely consistent with the current crisis and the precarious position of the imperialist powers.

The interesting and, at the same time, significant point is that these countries have not said that Iran must reach an agreement with them for the sanctions to be lifted; rather, they have emphasised that Iran must reach an agreement with the United States. On the one hand, this stance shows that the European gangsters are escalating imperialist tensions, as the Iranian criminals will seek to resist it; on the other hand, it highlights the decline of the European bourgeoisie’s position in global geopolitics.

Although Germany is the leading economic power in Europe and currently the third-largest economic power in the world, it is the French bourgeoisie that pursues its imperialist interests with greater clarity and determination than the other imperialist powers. France consistently advances its imperial ambitions on various occasions, while other European countries are content merely to complain and grumble.

This assertive approach of the French bourgeoisie has repeatedly provoked reactions and sanctions from the United States and the United Kingdom. One prominent example of these tensions was the cancellation of the submarine construction contract between Australia and French companies⁵²—an action that France described as a ‘stab in the back’ and,

⁵¹ [Joint letter from the Foreign Ministers of Iran, Russia, and China to the Secretary-General of the den of thieves \(the United Nations\)](#).

⁵² In 2016, Australia signed a contract with the French company Naval Group for the construction of 12 diesel-electric submarines. However, in September 2021, Australia announced that it had cancelled this contract and, instead, under the AUKUS agreement, would acquire nuclear-powered submarines using technology from the United States and the United Kingdom.

in an unprecedented move, led it to recall its ambassadors from Australia and the United States. This event triggered a serious diplomatic crisis between the countries.

With this in mind, let us examine how France responds to the weakening of Europe's position. France has issued arrest warrants against Bashar al-Assad and six senior officials of his government, accusing them of 'complicity in war crimes and crimes against humanity' in connection with the Syrian army's missile attack on the foreign press centre in Homs in 2011—an attack that resulted in the deaths of two journalists.⁵³

In fact, this judicial action can be seen as part of the imperialist tensions between Europe and Russia. Since Bashar al-Assad, following his ousting in December 2024, has been residing in Moscow under the protection of the Kremlin with his family, the issuance of this warrant by France is, in practice, more than a matter directed solely at him; it constitutes a political message aimed at Russia.

Meanwhile, during the genocide in Gaza, according to independent organisations, more than 230 journalists lost their lives in attacks by the Israeli army⁵⁴—without any similar action being taken by the French judiciary or other Western countries. To put it more clearly, France's civilised barbarians, by issuing an arrest warrant for Assad, are not acting on behalf of the murdered journalists but in defence of their imperialist interests—or, more precisely, the imperialist interests of Europe in its confrontation with Russia—and are seeking to consolidate Europe's position in these tensions.

Within the European Union, there is no complete or uniform agreement regarding support for Ukraine, as each member state pursues its own imperialist interests—interests that sometimes conflict with one

⁵³ [Deutsche Welle](#).

⁵⁴ [Foreign Policy](#).

another, and it is precisely this clash of interests that gives rise to tensions both within and beyond the EU.

For instance, the Hungarian government has repeatedly obstructed efforts to provide comprehensive support to Ukraine and has even refrained from signing joint European Union statements in its support.⁵⁵ Slovakia, too, has at times suspended the delivery of military aid to Ukraine and weakened its stance on military assistance.⁵⁶ Meanwhile, Italy and France—particularly with regard to large-scale military aid packages or their rapid expansion—have acted cautiously, in contrast to some other EU members.⁵⁷

Recently, a demonstration titled the “Peace March” was held in Budapest, the capital of Hungary. In reality, however, this gathering was not a genuine movement for peace — not even in the bourgeois sense — but rather a state-organised march orchestrated by Hungary’s ruling class to advance its own imperial ambitions and interests. This action stands in clear opposition to the dominant policies of the European Union and highlights the internal divisions and tensions within the European Union. The recent statements and positions of Viktor Orbán also clearly reveal the depth of these tensions.

*“The day of the Budapest Peace March has arrived. Today we send a message to the whole world: Hungary says no to war! We will not die for Ukraine. We will not send our children to the slaughterhouse at Brussels’ command.”*⁵⁸

⁵⁵ [Hungary Opposes support for Ukraine.](#)

⁵⁶ [Le Monde.](#)

⁵⁷ [Ukrainska Pravda.](#)

⁵⁸ [Pravda Hungary.](#)

The US' Response to China's Challenge

Under Stalin's leadership, the Comintern, following the policy of the "United Front", supported and equipped the Kuomintang. In this context, in 1926 the Kuomintang was accepted as a "sympathising party" or "affiliate party" of the Comintern; this admission was approved with only one dissenting vote — that of Leon Trotsky. Soviet support for the Kuomintang continued until 1941.

The Second Sino-Japanese War began in 1937 and became intertwined with the Second World War, evolving into part of the global imperialist conflict. During this period, China was governed by the Nationalist Kuomintang under the leadership of Chiang Kai-shek, while the rural areas in the north and west of the country were under the control of forces loyal to Mao. During the war, Mao and Chiang Kai-shek fought side by side within the framework of the "United Front" in the imperialist war against Japan.

During the Second World War, following Germany's invasion of the Soviet Union, Stalin signed a neutrality pact with Japan to prevent the opening of a second front in the East. Under this agreement, the Soviet Union was unable to provide direct military assistance to China. Consequently, for most of the Second World War, the Soviet Union was not directly engaged with Japan, and its support for China declined. Only after Germany's surrender in 1945 did the Soviet Union, in accordance with its agreement with the Allies, declare war on Japan, launch an attack on Manchuria, and provide significant assistance to China.

In 1941, the United States formally entered the war and, alongside the other Allied powers — including Chiang Kai-shek's China — fought against Japan. Within this framework, the United States, in pursuit of its geopolitical and strategic interests in East Asia, provided extensive military, financial, and logistical assistance to the Kuomintang

government. These supplies were mainly transported to China via the overland route known as the “Burma Road” and later through the perilous air route referred to as “the Hump”⁵⁹.

Within the framework of its imperialist ambitions for global hegemony, the United States portrays the deployment of its soldiers to imperialist wars as a form of “sacrifice for China’s liberation from Japanese aggression” — a depiction that implies China should feel indebted to America. In reality, however, US policies were part of Washington’s broader strategy to contain Japanese influence and expand its own dominance in East Asia. Donald Trump, in response to the holding of a victory parade in China, similarly described the deaths of American soldiers in the Second World War — which occurred in pursuit of US imperialist interests — as, in populist rhetoric, a “symbol of the American nation’s sacrifice for China’s freedom from Japanese rule”; the same Japan that today is regarded as the United States’ closest ally in the region:

“The big question to be answered is whether or not President Xi of China will mention the massive amount of support and ‘blood’ that The United States of America gave to China in order to help it to secure its FREEDOM from a very unfriendly foreign invader. Many Americans died in China’s quest for Victory and Glory. I hope that they are rightfully Honored and Remembered for their Bravery and Sacrifice! May President Xi and the wonderful people of China have a great and lasting day of celebration. Please give

⁵⁹ The Hump was a vital Allied air route used to transport military and logistical supplies from India to China over the Himalayan mountain range. After the closure of the “Burma Road” in 1942, it became China’s only link with the Allies. Despite the extremely hazardous flying conditions, the Hump played a crucial role in supporting Chiang Kai-shek’s China against Japan during the Second World War.

*my warmest regards to Vladimir Putin, and Kim Jong-un, as you conspire against The United States of America.”*⁶⁰

Containing China’s imperialist ambitions currently forms the strategic policy of the entire American bourgeoisie. However, the two main factions of the US bourgeoisie — the Republicans and the Democrats — adopt different approaches and tactics in pursuing this strategy. Media outlets such as CNN, which can be regarded as reflecting the policies and viewpoints of the Democratic faction of the US bourgeoisie, within the framework of this global competition, question the performance of the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation and criticise its “neutrality” with regard to international developments — as if, in the imperialist world, there exists a power that does not pursue its own geopolitical interests and acts from a purely “moral” position. CNN asks why the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation has so far not issued a joint statement condemning the war in Ukraine, even though the same organisation strongly condemned the US and Israeli military attacks on Iran last June:

*“Even as the group regularly calls for ‘avoiding bloc, ideological or confrontational approaches’ to addressing security threats, its summits have yet to produce a joint statement mentioning the war in Ukraine...The group did, however, ‘strongly condemn’ the military strikes carried out by the US and Israel on Iran this past June.”*⁶¹

We have previously emphasised that the Democratic-wing bourgeoisie and its affiliated media accuse the Republican faction — and

⁶⁰Trump.

⁶¹CNN.

particularly Donald Trump — of failing to consider America’s long-term interests in the context of global imperialist calculations. According to these media outlets, Trump’s irrational and short-term approach encourages key American friends and allies in the region, who could play a role in achieving Washington’s strategic objectives — particularly the containment of China’s growing influence — to gravitate towards China. This, in turn, makes it more difficult to realise America’s strategic goals. For example, Democratic-leaning media present Xi Jinping’s red-carpet reception for India’s Prime Minister, Narendra Modi, as a sign of this trend — an action that could strengthen India’s economic and political ties with China and place pressure on the United States’ geopolitical position in the region:

“China’s Xi rolls out the red carpet for Putin and Modi as Trump upends global relations.”⁶²

During his second term, Donald Trump’s administration pursued its foreign and military policy with a focus on expanding US influence in strategically important regions of the world. Within this framework, Trump sought to gain or consolidate influence in areas of vital geopolitical significance to the United States’ imperialist and strategic objectives.

The proposal to annex Canada as the 51st US state, or the threat to reclaim the Panama Canal, both fall within the same policy of expanding Washington’s imperialist influence. Alongside these, the plan to purchase Greenland from Denmark also held a prominent place in the Trump administration’s agenda, owing to its geostrategic position in the Arctic region and its significance in military and energy considerations.

⁶² [CNN](#).

However, perhaps the most notable example in this context is Trump's desire to reclaim Bagram Air Base in Afghanistan. He regards the base as a key location geographically, near China's borders, and believes that regaining control of Bagram could reinforce the United States' strategic superiority over China. In his statements, Trump has emphasised that the base is only an hour away from the area where China produces its nuclear weapons — a remark that clearly demonstrates that behind his policies lie the United States' strategic, geopolitical, and imperialist objectives. Trump stated:

*“We’re trying to get it back because they need things from us. We want that base back. But one of the reasons we want the base is, as you know, it’s an hour away from where China makes its nuclear weapons.”*⁶³

It remains unclear whether this decision is solely Trump's personal wish or a determined policy, as capturing and maintaining Bagram Air Base would require tens of thousands of military personnel, substantial repair costs, and significant logistical support to provide necessary equipment. Even if the base were recaptured, its main challenge would be defending against threats from ISIS, al-Qaeda, and even potential missile attacks from Iran. Unsurprisingly, Trump's statements provoked a strong reaction from the Taliban, who stated in a declaration that:

*“Under the Doha Agreement, the United States pledged not to use force or threats against Afghanistan’s territorial integrity and political independence, and not to interfere in its internal affairs. Therefore, it is essential that they adhere to their commitments.”*⁶⁴

⁶³ Why Does Trump Want Afghanistan's Bagram Air Base Returned To US Control?

⁶⁴ [Afghanistan National Radio and Television](#).

Of course, Trump claimed that he would not talk but act; he emphasised that he would reclaim the base and even warned that if it were not handed over, they would discover the fate that awaited them:

*“We are not going to talk about it. We want to take it back, and we will do so immediately. If they do not, you will find out what I intend to do.”*⁶⁵

During his election campaign, Trump entered the arena with peace-oriented slogans and statements to appeal to a large segment of voters who were weary of America’s endless wars and heavy military expenditures abroad. With the utmost populism, he sought to cultivate an image of himself as someone genuinely concerned with the interests of the American people and determined to prevent the waste of the country’s resources and capabilities on fruitless wars.

Trump pretended to oppose the US military presence in the Middle East and intervention in other countries, claiming that he wanted to reduce the intensity of costly conflicts. This portrayal was part of the “America First” slogan — a slogan that, on the surface, appeared to benefit ordinary people and the working class, but in reality was intended to strengthen the United States’ imperialist interests in competition with other global powers.

Even now, months into his presidency, Trump’s actions demonstrate that, contrary to his bourgeois peace-oriented posturing, he is in practice advancing Washington’s strategic objectives — objectives that drive increased military tensions and intensified imperialist competition.

⁶⁵ [RadioFarda](#).

Trump insists that he deserves the Nobel Peace Prize, while simultaneously revealing his bellicose nature. He refers to the so-called “Department of Defense” as what it was originally created to be — and, in practice, indeed is: a Department of War. Of course, this renaming is not merely a correction of a title; it is an affirmation of the true nature and function of this institution — an institution whose very essence is war and its expansion.

Until 1947, the United States had an institution called the “Department of War,” which that same year changed its name to the “Department of Defense.” However, by executive order dated 5 September 2025, Trump authorised the use of the title “Department of War” as a secondary designation for the US Department of Defense (the Pentagon). Under this order, Pete Hegseth may be referred to in official and media communications as the “Secretary of War,” and the Pentagon as the Department of War.

This change does not yet have official status, and the title “Department of Defense” remains the institution’s official name, as a formal name change requires legislative approval from Congress. Nevertheless, in practice, the use of the terms “Department of War” and “Secretary of War” has become increasingly widespread.

Of course, this new name is, in many respects, more meaningful than the previous title, since the institution has never truly been a Department of Defense, but has always been a Department of War. Given the current trajectory of the capitalist system and its aggressive, tension-inducing policies, this new title reveals the institution’s true nature and function better than anything else.

Trump has repeatedly stated that during the era of the “Department of War,” the United States had an “incredible record of victories” in the two World Wars. He and his Secretary of War have emphasised that the institution should once again focus on a “fighting spirit.” Trump has also

said: “I believe this name is far more appropriate given the current state of the world,” adding, “This name conveys a message of victory.”

Trump’s executive order also emphasises that the “Department of Defense” focuses solely on defensive capabilities, whereas the “Department of War” conveys a stronger and more decisive message of combat readiness and offensive intent. Furthermore, this new title more accurately reflects the United States’ strategic and imperialist objectives in the current global context:

“The name ‘Department of War’ conveys a stronger message of readiness and resolve compared to ‘Department of Defense,’ which emphasizes only defensive capabilities.”⁶⁶

In September 2025, the United States Secretary of Defense, Pete Hegseth, in an unprecedented move, summoned hundreds of generals and admirals to the Naval Base at Quantico, Virginia, with the aim of strengthening the “fighting spirit,” raising “military standards,” and prioritising “meritocratic and war-enhancing” criteria, among others. This mobilisation is not only a practical measure to increase military readiness for war, but also reflects the United States’ strategic approach in the new global context, particularly its strategy for containing China. At the same time, this action represents an effort to rebuild and consolidate the military apparatus and prepare for decisive future conflicts. At this meeting, Pete Hegseth provided a clearer picture of the performance and lethal capabilities of the world’s deadliest army and its objectives in preparing for future imperialist wars:

“Welcome to the War Department because the era of the Department of Defense is over...From this moment forward, the

⁶⁶ [BBC](#).

*only mission of the newly restored Department of War is this: warfighting, preparing for war and preparing to win, unrelenting and uncompromising in that pursuit...Should our enemies choose foolishly to challenge us, they will be crushed by the violence, precision and ferocity of the War Department...We have the strongest, most powerful, most lethal and most prepared military on the planet. That is true, full stop. Nobody can touch us. It's not even close.”*⁶⁷

Shortly after the statements of the United States Secretary of War, on 18 October 2025, and on the occasion of the 250th anniversary of the Marine Corps, General Eric Smith, Commander of the United States Marine Corps, once again emphasised the need to prepare the Marines for the next war and warned that the next conflict is imminent. Reiterating his point, he said: “Trust me, it’s coming.”

*“The Marines here today are cut from the same cloth as those who seized Tarowa, withstood the cold of Korea, and fought through the streets of Iraq and the mountains of Afghanistan. And the next fight is coming. Trust me, it’s coming. Across battlefields, our character has never wavered. Just as the nature of war, the clash of wills, the test of fortitude, the demand for discipline remains the same.”*⁶⁸

To summarise this section, the actions and policies of the Trump administration, contrary to its bourgeois peace-oriented posturing, demonstrate a sustained effort to maintain the United States’ geopolitical position and imperialist interests as a global hegemonic power. The

⁶⁷ Secretary of War Pete Hegseth.

⁶⁸ The next fight is coming.

renaming of the “Department of Defense” to the “Department of War” is viewed as a signal of readiness to enter a new phase of competition and military tension with rival powers, particularly China. The mobilisation of hundreds of generals and admirals by Pete Hegseth, along with General Smith’s emphasis on the necessity of preparing the Marines for future wars, reflects Washington’s strategic focus on maintaining its military superiority on the global stage. Moreover, the emphasis on the army’s “lethal capabilities” sends a clear message to both allies and international rivals: the United States is prepared to defend its imperialist ambitions and will pursue its strategic objectives decisively through military means.

Arms Race

Arms races and the increase in military budgets in the modern era have their roots in the early twentieth century. One of the most prominent examples was the “Dreadnought race”⁶⁹ between Germany and Britain on the eve of the First World War. Germany, as an emerging power, sought to challenge Britain’s traditional naval supremacy and expanded its maritime strength by building and launching Dreadnought battleships.

With capitalism entering its stage of decline and the onset of the “Age of Communist Revolutions,” or the “Era of Imperialist Wars,” these rivalries and the pursuit of imperialist ambitions intensified. During this period, arms races became instruments for advancing imperialist ambitions and extending the influence of both major and minor powers across the world.

Nevertheless, it was during the Cold War that the growth of military budgets accelerated at an unprecedented rate — not only between the United States and the Soviet Union, but also globally, across many other countries.⁷⁰ Even so, the arms race between the two superpowers — the United States and the Soviet Union — reached its peak. This trend was partially curbed through the signing of arms control agreements, including the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty in 1987; however, following the United States’ withdrawal from the treaty in 2019, the arms race once again intensified.

According to reports from the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, global military spending has increased each year compared with the previous one. In 2024, spending reached \$2.718 trillion, marking a 9.4% rise over 2023 — the largest annual increase

⁶⁹The *Dreadnought* was a type of battleship that, by using steam turbine engines and large, uniform-calibre guns, had greater speed and firepower than earlier vessels.

⁷⁰ Data and statistics on military spending can be viewed on the [Our World in Data](#) website.

since the end of the Cold War. This trend reflects heightened tensions and the expansion of imperialist competition worldwide. The table below⁷¹ shows the trend in military spending over the past ten years. As is evident, spending has grown consistently during this period, with particularly notable increases in 2023 and 2024, and this upward trend shows no sign of slowing.

Year	Global Military Spending (trillion USD)	Per Cent Change from Previous Year
2015	1.917	—
2016	1.924	+0.4%
2017	1.945	+1.1%
2018	1.996	+2.6%
2019	2.068	+3.6%
2020	2.121	+2.6%
2021	2.136	+0.7%
2022	2.214	+3.7%
2023	2.440	+6.8%
2024	2.718	+9.4%

Although the bombing of Iran’s nuclear sites, particularly the Fordow facility, was one factor that compelled Israel and the United States to declare a ceasefire with Iran — which Iran subsequently accepted — another major reason for this decision was the significant depletion of Israel’s and the United States’ defensive weapon stockpiles. During the 12-day war between Iran and Israel, Iran launched hundreds of drones and missiles at various targets within Israeli territory. Despite the deployment of the most advanced technologies — from satellites and modern radar systems to defence systems such as the Patriot, Iron Dome,

⁷¹ The table was compiled using data from the [Stockholm International Peace Research Institute](#) website.

and David's Sling, as well as the involvement of allied countries including Saudi Arabia, Jordan, France, the United Kingdom, and the United States in intercepting drones and missiles — for the first time in Israel's history, cities such as Tel Aviv and Haifa experienced scenes reminiscent of Gaza.

During these attacks, the Weizmann Institute of Science⁷², a key institution in Israel's scientific and military research, suffered heavy damage. In the final days of the war, the number of Iranian missiles that breached defence systems and hit their targets increased steadily. Since interceptor missiles are limited in number and both difficult and costly to produce, the American–Israeli war criminals proposed a ceasefire to the Iranian war criminals to prevent further attrition of their defensive capabilities, giving them an opportunity to rebuild their military strength and readjust their war policies for the continuation of imperialist conflicts. The Jewish Institute for National Security of America⁷³, an organisation closely connected to the United States' military and security circles, explains this matter clearly:

“The United States blew through about a quarter of its supply of high-end THAAD missile interceptors during Israel's 12-day war with Iran in June, according to two sources familiar with the operation, thwarting attacks at a rate that vastly outpaces production. US forces countered Tehran's barrage of ballistic

⁷²Iran attacked the Weizmann Institute of Science in Rehovot, Israel, with ballistic missiles, causing significant damage, particularly to several internal facilities within the complex. Around 45 research laboratories across the institute were affected, and it is estimated that 400 to 500 researchers were impacted by the attack. According to Israeli media reports, the strike was “by no means accidental” and indicates that Iran deliberately targeted an advanced research centre associated with the Israeli military in response to the deaths of its own nuclear scientists.

⁷³The Jewish Institute for National Security of America is a Washington-based think tank — a research institution closely connected to the United States' military and security circles, conducting research and analysis on defence and strategic matters.

missiles by firing more than 100 THAADs (short for Terminal High Altitude Area Defense) – and possibly as many as 150 – a significant portion of America’s stockpile of the advanced air defense system, the sources said. The US has seven THAAD systems, and used two of them in Israel in the conflict.”⁷⁴

Following the Israel–United States–Iran war, the United States changed its policy on arms sales to Europe. When Denmark sought to purchase the Patriot air-defence system, the Pentagon suddenly halted negotiations, stating that available stock was low and needed to be reserved for domestic use. These restrictions are not limited to Denmark; requests from other European countries to acquire certain weapons have also been blocked. The United States possesses only around 25% of the Patriot interceptor missiles it requires, and Europe has no effective alternative, so this decision has heightened security concerns across the continent.

The production of these advanced systems is time-consuming, and rebuilding stockpiles and completing the interceptor missile arsenal at the current rate of production will take between three and eight years — highlighting the significant challenges in maintaining long-term defensive capability in the face of a missile barrage. Ari Cicurel, an analyst at the Jewish Institute for National Security of America, explains this clearly:

“After burning through a large portion of their available interceptors, the United States and Israel both face an urgent need to replenish stockpiles and sharply increase production rates.’ He estimating that it would take three to eight years to replenish at current production rates. According to data compiled by JINSA, interception rates lagged as the war wore on. Only 8% of Iranian

⁷⁴ [The Jewish Institute for National Security of America.](#)

*missiles penetrated defenses in the first week of the war. That doubled to 16% in the second half of the conflict and eventually culminated at 25% on the final day of the war before the ceasefire.”*⁷⁵

The GBU-57 “Massive Ordnance Penetrator” (MOP) bunker-buster bomb is one of the most powerful and destructive penetrator bombs ever developed by the United States and is typically carried by B-2 heavy bombers. Production of these bombs is both costly and time-consuming. According to reports, this weapon was used for the first time in June 2025 during U.S. attacks on Iran’s nuclear facilities⁷⁶, with around 14 bombs deployed in the operation. Given the limited stock and production of these bombs, contracts have been signed with the manufacturers, including Boeing, to replenish them and increase production capacity:

*“Boeing co. will receive a contract valued at as much as \$123 million to replace the 14 massive bunker-busters dropped in June on Iran’s nuclear enrichment and processing facilities... the Massive Ordnance Penetrator is the world’s largest precision-guided weapon and only saw its combat debut in the June strikes, in which the US used 12 to hit the deeply buried Fordow enrichment facility... [The Air Force] has said little publicly about the weapon but acknowledged in 2015 that 20 bombs were placed on contract with Boeing.”*⁷⁷

In recent years, among the United States’ close allies, South Korea has rapidly increased its defence budget and is developing long-range missiles, strengthening its navy (including submarines and warships),

⁷⁵ [The Jewish Institute for National Security of America.](#)

⁷⁶ [The Wall Street Journal.](#)

⁷⁷ [Bloomberg.](#)

equipping its air force, and, more generally, expanding its military-industrial sector. Ostensibly, the main driver of these measures is the threat posed by North Korea; however, in reality, South Korea views North Korea as an immediate threat and China as a long-term one. From this perspective, South Korea's strategy of military power development can be understood within the framework of geopolitical competition with China.

If the sole objective were to counter the threat from North Korea, missiles with a range of a few hundred kilometres would have sufficed. Until a few years ago, South Korea, under an agreement with the United States, was restricted to producing missiles with a maximum range of 800 kilometres. However, in 2021, the Biden administration lifted this restriction as part of its strategic objectives and policy of containing China. Since then, Seoul has focused on the development of long-range missiles.

Recently, South Korea unveiled a missile with a range of over 5,000 kilometres.⁷⁸ This missile enables Seoul to target not only Beijing but also large parts of China, Russia, and even India and Central Asia. This capability provides South Korea with the opportunity to better pursue its long-term objectives and imperial ambitions, while countering Chinese and Russian influence more effectively.

Countries such as Germany, Japan, Canada, the Netherlands, and Brazil are considered “nuclear latency”⁷⁹ states because they possess the technical, scientific, and industrial capabilities necessary to produce nuclear weapons, but have so far chosen not to develop or build them. In contrast, South Korea and Taiwan are typically described as “insecure

⁷⁸ [The Guardian](#).

⁷⁹ The term “nuclear latency” or “nuclear threshold” refers to a situation in which a country possesses the technology, technical knowledge, and infrastructure necessary to produce nuclear weapons but has not yet officially or practically built or tested them. In other words, the country is on the “edge of military nuclear capability” and could become a nuclear power in a short period if it made the political decision to do so.

nuclear-threshold” states. These countries have similar capacities, but owing to their location in tense geopolitical environments and their relatively fragile political stability, the possibility of pursuing or developing nuclear weapons is always present. For this reason, their nuclear-threshold status is regarded as “insecure.”⁸⁰

Among countries with nuclear latency capabilities, Germany and Japan occupy an important position in geopolitical tensions and imperialist competition; therefore, even a brief examination of militarisation trends in these two countries is particularly significant. Historically, China and Japan have been long-standing strategic adversaries, just as Germany and Russia share a similar historical relationship. However, given Germany’s historical enmity with Russia and China’s geopolitical ambitions, China can also be regarded indirectly as a potential rival and threat to Germany.

As noted earlier, Germany and Japan do not possess nuclear weapons and are both parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. However, both countries have a level of technological and industrial capability that places them at the “nuclear threshold,” with the distinction that Japan is much closer than Germany to developing nuclear weapons, both technically and in terms of fissile material stockpiles.

Over the past decade, Germany and Japan, irrespective of their status as “nuclear-threshold” states, have been rapidly strengthening their military capabilities and increasing defence budgets. In Germany, following the announcement of the “Zeitenwende” policy⁸¹, the

⁸⁰ [Nuclear latency](#).

⁸¹ The German term *Zeitenwende* means “turning point” or “historic watershed” and is generally used to refer to major historical, cultural, or political changes. Following the Russia–Ukraine (NATO) war, the German Chancellor spoke of a “historic turning point”; in other words, the world has entered a new phase of imperialist tensions and great-power competition. Within this framework, Germany, in order to preserve and defend its imperial ambitions and in light of these new circumstances, is moving towards extensive rearmament and an increase in its military budget.

government launched a comprehensive programme to modernise the armed forces and equip the military with advanced weaponry. This programme includes the acquisition of long-range missiles, air-defence systems, and modern armoured vehicles. Germany has also set a target of raising its defence budget to around 3.5% of GDP by the end of the decade. Similarly, Japan has increased its defence budget to approximately 2% of GDP and is developing missile systems, warships, and strategic deterrence capabilities.

Germany has drafted a plan titled “Modernisation of Military Service,” which is based on a voluntary model but also allows for the reintroduction of compulsory service in the event of a manpower shortage. Under this plan, all men over the age of 18 would be required to register and undergo an assessment of their skills and military readiness. By implementing this plan within the framework of its so-called New Voluntary Service programme, the German government aims to increase active military personnel from around 183,000 to 260,000 and reserve forces from 49,000 to 200,000 by 2035. The plan is still under review in the German Parliament and must receive final approval to become law; however, surveys indicate that most young people aged 18 to 29 oppose it.

One of the countries that will play a role not only in arms competition but also in military tensions and imperialist relations, both regionally and globally, as it has already done, is Iran. Following the twelve-day war between Iran on one side and Israel and the United States on the other, clear lessons emerged for both parties. For Israel, the United States, and their allies, it became evident that, although weakened, Iran cannot be compared to cases such as Iraq or Syria; even with the support of the United States and its allies, Iran is capable of turning parts of Tel Aviv into situations resembling Gaza. On the other hand, it also became clear to the Iranian criminals that the Western bourgeoisie is sufficiently cunning to gradually weaken Iran, neutralise its proxy forces, and ultimately target Iran itself for bombing. Today, the Western bourgeoisie

is simultaneously increasing economic pressures to destabilise Iran's economy and, by fostering opposition, putting pressure on Iran's leadership to abandon its imperialist ambitions.

The Western bourgeoisie has set three main conditions for improving relations with Iran, which can be summarised as follows:

- **Zero per cent uranium enrichment:**
Under no circumstances should Iran carry out uranium enrichment within its borders. If necessary, it may obtain the fuel required for its peaceful reactors from abroad.
- **Reduction of missile range:**
Iran must limit the range of its missiles to a maximum of 500 kilometres; in other words, Israeli territory must not fall within the reach of Iranian missiles.
- **End of support for proxy forces:**
Iran must cease all political, financial, and military support for its proxy groups and forces in the region.

The rulers of the Islamic Republic regard the three aforementioned conditions as “unconditional surrender” and do not consider any of them feasible. Despite U.S. bombings and pressure, Iran continues to insist on restoring and advancing its nuclear industry. Previously, the Iranian government had deliberately limited the range of its missiles to 2,000 kilometres in order to avoid provoking European sensitivities; however, following the activation of the “Snapback mechanism” by European countries, it not only maintained its missile range but also proceeded to test intercontinental ballistic missiles.⁸²

Intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs) have a specific meaning in the military context: almost all operational ICBMs in the arsenals of the major powers are designed and optimised to carry nuclear

⁸²[Iran threatens deadly response after missile test.](#)

warheads. In other words, nearly all of these missiles are nuclear-armed, as their very existence is founded on the principle of nuclear deterrence.

In the realm of proxy forces, the Islamic Republic is striving, in line with its imperial ambitions, to rebuild and expand this network to the best of its abilities. At the same time, it is seeking to establish a foothold in new regions, such as Sudan. Taken together, these developments indicate that Iran's imperial ambitions are encountering resistance and competition from other powers and, as a result, are likely to exacerbate regional and global tensions.

The Global Situation and the Necessity of the Independent Organisation of the Working Class

So far, we have examined one side of the equation: the transformations of capitalism in recent decades, the conditions in which today's decaying capitalism finds itself, the current position of the imperialist powers, and the influence they exert on the global capitalist system. Now it is time to examine the other side of the equation — **the global working class**: the side that is even more important than the first, for it is only this social class that has the capacity to bring an end to capitalist barbarism and to realise socialism.

Capitalism, while developing the productive forces, simultaneously cultivates the very seed of its own inner contradiction: on the one hand, the productive forces acquire an increasingly collective character, while on the other, the relations of production remain grounded in the private ownership of the means of production. In other words, the expansion of the productive forces within the capitalist system deepens the contradiction between labour and capital, thereby laying the material foundations for the communist revolution.

However, communists are not determinists; revolution does not, and will not, occur of its own accord. Although the existence of the objective conditions for revolution is necessary for its realisation, it is not sufficient in itself. Above all, the revolutionary class — the working class — must become conscious of the necessity of carrying out its historical tasks and attain a level of class consciousness that enables it to overthrow the capitalist system. Yet the working class is transformed from a “class in itself” into a “class for itself” only through the course of class struggle. Marx explained this point with great clarity:

*“Economic conditions had first transformed the mass of the people of the country into workers. The combination of capital has created for this mass a common situation, common interests. This mass is thus already a class as against capital, but not yet for itself. In the struggle, of which we have noted only a few phases, this mass becomes united, and constitutes itself as a class for itself.”*⁸³

If the objective conditions for revolution are present — in other words, if capitalism as a global system has entered its historical period of decline (as it has) — yet the working class does not extend its struggle on a worldwide scale, does not elevate it to a higher level, and does not create the means necessary for the development of class consciousness and the realisation of the communist revolution, namely its global party, the consequences will be catastrophic. In such a situation, the destruction of humanity will become unavoidable; this destruction will not be caused solely by a world war, but may instead manifest through multiple wars, widespread social collapse, or other disastrous forms.

In our analysis, we showed that China is currently the world’s second-largest economy and that, if — and this “if” is very important — it can maintain an average annual economic growth of around five percent, it will become the largest economy in the world by approximately 2035. India, despite being the most populous country in the world, still lags behind China in terms of the size of its working-class population; nevertheless, after China, it has the largest labour force in the world. In other words, more than half of the world’s labour force is concentrated in East and South Asia. From a Marxist perspective, this vast concentration of labour represents a concentration of the potential material force for a working-class social revolution. Therefore, can we not conclude that East and South Asia will gradually become the main

⁸³ [*The Poverty of Philosophy - Karl Marx.*](#)

centre of class struggle and the beating heart of the forthcoming revolution?

Such a view presents a mechanical picture of the working class and of Marxism. **While the size of the working class is important, the real power of the proletariat lies in its class consciousness, revolutionary organisation, tradition of struggle, and class solidarity.** It should be remembered, of course, that a revolutionary organisation, though born from the class itself and an inseparable part of it, does not encompass all members of the class; rather, it unites only the leading, conscious, and militant section — those elements who grasp the historical aims and tasks of the working class before others.

A look at historical memory can help to advance the discussion. In 1917, at the outset of the wave of global revolution, the Russian working class — despite constituting only a small portion of the country's population — became the vanguard of the world revolution thanks to its class consciousness, revolutionary organisation, and tradition of struggle. Proletarian struggles were not confined to cities such as Saint Petersburg, Moscow, and Kyiv; regions such as the Caucasus had also become important centres of the labour movement. On 9 August 1903, *The New York Times* reported:

*“45000 on strike at Baku. Trains Stopped for Ten Days, the Authorities being helpless – 6000 Troops Now in the Town.”*⁸⁴

Unfortunately, the world revolution ended in failure — a failure that in Russia was no less bloody than in Germany. After massacring a generation of communists, the counter-revolution ultimately prevailed. As a result, the Russian working class was unable to transform its labour struggles, class consciousness, and revolutionary organisation into a

⁸⁴ [Azerbaijan-Armenia War: Capitalism Means Savagery!](#)

lasting tradition within society; instead, Russia itself became a bastion of the counter-revolution.

The failure to transform those experiences into a lasting tradition, combined with the resilience of the counter-revolution, meant that even after the collapse of Stalinism, the working class in Russia and Eastern Europe was not only unable to rise again, but sank ever deeper into nationalist illusions — illusions that, in Eastern Europe, became intertwined with the mirage of democracy.

It is in the continuation of these historical defeats that the Ukrainian working class, in the recent war, lined up behind the ruling class and served the imperialist war, while the Russian working class showed no serious or revolutionary response — the same class that, during the First World War, had transformed an imperialist war into a civil war and displayed remarkable acts of heroism.

China is growing ever more powerful and is playing an increasingly significant role in global developments. More importantly, the country is home to the largest working class in the world in terms of numbers — a class that, in the early twentieth century, achieved remarkable victories in the history of labour struggles.

However, the defeat of the Chinese working class in the 1920s reflected the historical defeat of the global working class. After the wave of the world revolution subsided and the Stalinist Comintern emerged, the Comintern’s “united front” policy drove the Chinese working class into the depths of defeat. In reality, Mao’s victory was not a victory of the proletariat, but the triumph of one faction of the bourgeoisie in its internal struggles — a victory that would not have been possible without the working class’s defeat.⁸⁵ This historical setback meant that, from the early 1930s, despite significant growth in its numbers, the Chinese working class was unable to engage in decisive class struggles — a

⁸⁵ For further information on this topic, refer to the booklet *Maoism, the Real Child of Stalinism*.

problem from which the world’s largest working class continues to suffer.

The period in which China was known as a country of cheap labour has come to an end, and capitalism has revealed its harsh and brutal face there as well. In the table below, the annual unemployment rates over the past ten years are compared for China and the United States, the world’s two leading powers. Examination of this data shows that, since 2017 — excluding the COVID-19 period — China’s unemployment rate has been higher than that of the United States in many years. It is worth noting that unemployment statistics in China, particularly in rural areas, are not entirely reliable; in other words, actual unemployment in the country is likely higher than the officially reported figures. This reality indicates that the Chinese working class is highly vulnerable to the crises and pressures of capitalism, even more so than its class brothers and sisters in the United States, and sooner or later, despite the poisonous effects of Maoism and nationalism, it will respond decisively.⁸⁶

Year	United States	China
2015	5.3%	4.65%
2016	4.9%	4.56%
2017	4.4%	4.47%
2018	3.9%	4.31%
2019	3.7%	4.56%
2020	8.1%	5.0%
2021	5.4%	4.55%
2022	3.6%	4.98%
2023	3.6%	4.67%
2024	4.1%	4.57%

⁸⁶ The table is compiled using data from the [YCHARTS](#) website.

The youth unemployment rate in the United States in July 2024 was around 9.8% (July is usually the peak season for youth employment in summer)⁸⁷. However, the youth unemployment rate in China at the same time was significantly higher, reported at over 14%. This situation has given rise to a new phenomenon in China's labour market: companies operating as "fake work enterprises." In this system, rather than remaining unemployed at home, individuals can pay between 30 and 50 yuan to visit mock offices that supposedly belong to a company and artificially pretend they are at work. Such places are now increasingly common in major Chinese cities, including Shenzhen, Shanghai, Nanjing, Wuhan, Chengdu, and Kunming. Against this backdrop, the BBC published a report entitled *"Fake Boss, Fake Office, Real Money: Why Some Chinese Pay to Pretend They're at Work?"* in which it states:

*"Among young people struggling with high unemployment in China, paying to go to an office and pretend to work has become increasingly popular. This phenomenon is taking place against the backdrop of an economic slowdown and a sluggish labour market in China. As access to real jobs becomes more difficult, some individuals prefer to pay to go to an office rather than stay at home."*⁸⁸

India is, by number, the second-largest country in the world in terms of its working-class population. Given India's extensive ties with Western countries, it is gradually becoming a market for their cheap labour. However, today's India cannot be compared to China in the 1990s, nor can we expect it to achieve a position similar to that of present-day China; India will not become the "China of the future."⁸⁹

⁸⁷ Bureau of labor statistics U.S. Department of Labor.

⁸⁸ BBC.

⁸⁹ In the booklet *The New Arrangement of Imperialist Powers in the New Global Conditions*, the factors behind China's rise and its progression towards becoming a global power are analysed and examined.

Although the working class in India, unlike its Russian and Chinese counterparts, has not experienced a comparable historical defeat, it has so far been unable to play a decisive role in the development of proletarian class consciousness and revolutionary organisation, owing to the absence of a sustained tradition of struggle.

We continue the discussion with a specific example. The First World War demonstrated that capitalism, as the dominant form of economic relations, had been established across the world, but its trajectory of growth and development has not been uniform in different regions. For instance, in terms of industrial concentration, Japan is approximately 3.5 times more concentrated than France, and in terms of gross domestic product, it has outpaced France by nearly 2.5 times. It should be noted that France, after Germany and the United Kingdom, ranks as the third-largest industrial economy in Europe and the second within the European Union. Despite this, the French proletariat, in terms of historical struggles and experience in labour battles, has perhaps been a hundred times more active and dynamic than the Japanese proletariat.

If the French proletariat was unable, between 1917 and 1923, to play a role in the wave of the world revolution and class struggles comparable to that of the Russian and German proletariat, it was because it had not yet recovered from the deep wounds and consequences of the massacres following the defeat of the Paris Commune, nor restored its strength.

Based on this analysis, the issue of industrial concentration, and consequently the concentration of the proletariat, should not be approached in a mechanical way. The mere concentration of labour in industrial centres does not, by itself, guarantee the revolutionary power of the proletariat. The true power of this class lies not in the number of its members, but in its awareness of its historical position and in its emergence as an independent and conscious social class — a class that,

through organised political struggle, creates the necessary conditions for fulfilling its historical task, namely the establishment of the communist revolution.

The First World War demonstrated that capitalism had become a global system. However, the globalisation of capitalism does not mean that tensions between the bourgeoisies of different countries have diminished; on the contrary, the decay of capitalism has meant that competition to defend imperialist interests among major and minor powers has become increasingly acute. Each national bourgeoisie seeks to realise the imperialist ambitions of its own country, inevitably placing its interests in conflict with those of other countries' bourgeoisies. It is only at a particular historical moment that the bourgeoisies of all countries place their long-term class interests above national interests — and that is when they perceive the threat posed by the proletariat and the working-class revolution.

Historical experience has shown that bourgeois states, when faced with the threat of a proletarian revolution, set aside all mutual hostilities in order to jointly suppress their class enemy. A striking example of this was the temporary alliance between Versailles and Prussia, which, despite their long-standing enmity, extended a hand of friendship to one another in order to crush their common enemy — the revolutionary proletariat of the Paris Commune — in blood and slaughter. In this context, Bismarck released sixty thousand French prisoners of war so that they could participate in the suppression of the Paris Commune. A similar process occurred in Russia, where a bloc of imperialist countries intervened to crush the Soviet Republics, organising their military assault under the banner of the “Entente.”

Unlike the bourgeoisie, however, the proletariat has no national interests. While the bourgeoisie of each country depends on national frameworks and capitalist states to maintain and expand its economic and

political power, the proletariat is independent of, and even in conflict with, such frameworks. The working class in each country, like workers in other countries, shares the same class interests and destiny. This commonality of interests arises from their shared economic position within the process of capitalist production — a position in which labour power, as a commodity, stands in opposition to capital.

We have previously emphasised that, since the beginning of the twentieth century, capitalism has become a global system, and the expansion of the world market, the international division of labour, and the subjugation of all social relations to the law of value have transformed capital into a unified whole on a global scale. For the same reason, the proletariat has also become a global class — a class whose labour power is commodified worldwide and employed under the domination of capital. This commodification of labour power, or, in other words, the expansion of wage slavery across the world of capital, provides the material basis for proletarian internationalism, rather than moral or utopian considerations.

Therefore, class struggle in the era of imperialism cannot be confined within national borders. No liberation from the domination of capital is possible within the framework of a nation-state. The state, regardless of the colour of its flag or its slogans, is the organised expression of capital's rule. Defending “national interests” or “domestic production” is, in reality, nothing more than defending national capital, and only serves to foster division and disunity among workers.

The proletariat has no country to defend; its struggle is inherently international. To raise this struggle to a more conscious and organised level, the proletariat is compelled to overcome all false and divisive identities, such as nationalism, chauvinism, religious prejudice, and the illusion of bourgeois democracy, and to recognise its true identity — its class identity — and organise itself on that basis.

Every strike, protest, or workers' uprising anywhere in the world resonates with other parts of the global working class, while simultaneously being influenced by them. The crises of capital, austerity policies, environmental destruction, and the erosion of social achievements are not local phenomena; rather, they are different manifestations of the crisis of capital reproduction on a global scale. For this reason, the response of the proletariat must necessarily be global and anti-capitalist in character — a response that often begins with resistance to austerity policies and the defence of living standards, but, as the struggle intensifies, goes beyond the demand for “better wages” and ultimately leads to the revolutionary negation of the entire system of wage labour and private ownership of the means of production.

We have previously emphasised that the advance of the October Revolution, as part of the global proletarian revolution, required the victory of the revolution in Germany — not because of the low level of development of the productive forces in Russia, but because of the inherently global nature of the communist revolution. In other words, even if the revolution had occurred not in Russia, but in a more advanced and industrialised country such as Britain, it would still have depended on the spread and victory of the revolution in other countries for its continuation and ultimate success.

The myth of “Russia's backwardness” as an obstacle to revolution was, even at the time, dismissed as unfounded by revolutionaries such as Rosa Luxemburg. The issue lies not in the level of economic or technological development of any single country, but in the international necessity and shared destiny of the working-class revolution worldwide.

The same principle applies to class struggle. Class struggle cannot be confined within national borders and can only achieve victory when it extends to the global arena. We have previously argued that the Russian working class, despite constituting only a small part of the country's

population, was able, thanks to its class consciousness, revolutionary organisation, and deeply rooted traditions of struggle, to become the vanguard of the world revolution. The same reasoning applies to class struggle more broadly.

It is true that the collapse of Stalinism dealt a deep and debilitating blow to the **global labour movement**, but the working class in Western countries, unlike its counterparts in the East, did not experience a complete breakdown of its traditions of struggle and remains in a comparatively stronger position. In recent years, signs of a renewed awakening of this historic force have begun to emerge. It seems that the “sleeping giant” of the global working class is stirring once more, and the future will show whether this awakening can give fresh momentum to class struggle on a global scale.

The global working class, in the course of advancing its class struggle, faces a variety of challenges, obstacles, and difficulties. These arise from a combination of historical, political, and ideological factors, each of which, in its own way, affects the development and cohesion of the labour movement. Below, some of the most significant of these challenges and inhibiting factors are outlined:

The Poison of Democracy

Dictatorship and democracy are both political and superstructural forms of the capitalist system. Capital, depending on its historical, economic, and social needs and requirements, can adopt and employ either form. In fact, capitalism manifests in one of these forms in response to the necessities of reproducing and maintaining its class domination.

In contemporary history, this reality is clearly observable. In the 1920s, capital in Germany, in order to contain and suppress the working-class revolution and maintain bourgeois order, adopted a democratic superstructure. However, in the late 1930s and early 1940s, with the

intensification of crises, it adopted the form of fascist dictatorship as the most suitable means of preserving the existing system. In later periods, particularly after the end of the Second World War, with changing global conditions and the need for economic reconstruction and political consolidation, capital once again regarded parliamentary democracy as the most appropriate form to ensure its stability and legitimacy.

The same pattern can be observed in other European countries as well: Spain, Portugal, Greece, and several others have, at different historical moments, each transitioned from dictatorship to democracy or vice versa, without the class nature of capitalism in those countries undergoing any fundamental change. In other words, whether under the guise of democracy or dictatorship, capital has a single objective: the preservation of class domination and the continuation of capital accumulation.

The poison of democracy is one of the serious obstacles to the development of the working-class struggle and its elevation to a higher level on a global scale. However, the destructive impact of this poison differs between the metropolitan capitalist countries and the peripheral countries, as each society has its own specific historical, economic, and political conditions. Below, we will briefly examine the differences in the function and consequences of this phenomenon in both metropolitan and peripheral capitalism.

Democracy in Western countries is a poison that creates the illusion of freedom while simultaneously providing a fabricated legitimacy for the capitalist system — a form of imposed trust in institutions that are, in reality, instruments for maintaining class domination. In these societies, democracy always hangs over citizens like the sword of Damocles: they are led to believe that if they do not support bourgeois democratic institutions, they will face the threat of the return of the “barbarism of dictatorship.”

In such a system, “freedom” is in reality nothing more than the freedom of capital to exploit, and “relative justice” is merely a mask for the continuation of class inequality. Here, dictatorship is not overt, but internal and institutionalised: the dictatorship of capital over labour, which, through voting, law, and the illusion of popular participation, assumes a seemingly legitimate and acceptable form.

In Western countries, the bourgeois mode of production, together with bourgeois culture and values, has evolved over centuries and penetrated deeply into the feelings, thoughts, and social consciousness of the people. In other words, the ideology of democracy in these countries performs a role that is, in many respects, even more poisonous and deadly than the role of religion in Middle Eastern societies, because it substitutes the illusion of freedom and participation for domination and subjugation. Anton Pannekoek addresses this issue with remarkable clarity and theoretical precision in his book *the World Revolution and the Communist Tactics*.⁹⁰

In peripheral countries, under capitalist dictatorships, and even in metropolitan capitalism, “democracy” functions like a mirage that poisons and diverts the working class’s struggle. It first separates workers from their class position and transforms them into “citizens” — citizens who, instead of fighting against capital, are called upon to defend bourgeois democratic institutions. In this situation, the workers’ struggle ceases to be a class struggle and becomes a “citizens’” struggle, conducted within bourgeois frameworks and channels. Even when these

⁹⁰ Anton Pannekoek’s later positions do not diminish the validity of his communist and proletarian stances during the wave of the world revolution from 1917 to 1923, as part of the Dutch Communist Left. In particular, the positions he set out in his book *the World Revolution and the Communist Tactics*, in which he assesses the Russian Revolution as part of the global communist revolution, remain significant. Moreover, contrary to his later anti-party views, he played an important role in the formation of communist parties during the period of the world revolutionary wave.

struggles take violent forms, they never target the fundamental institutions of capital. In pro-democracy movements, workers ultimately become disheartened and frustrated without achieving any real gains. The true function of the pro-democracy movement, whether in dictatorial countries, peripheral capitalism, or metropolitan capitalism, is to serve as a tool for diverting, controlling, and politically disarming the working class.

The only way to overcome the deadly poison of democratic ideology — whether in metropolitan capitalism, peripheral capitalism, or under dictatorial regimes — is to emphasise an **independent workers' struggle grounded in the proletarian class position**. Democratic ideology can only be confronted from the real terrain of class struggle, at the very point where the conflict between labour and capital is clearly revealed. Bourgeois democracy, by deceiving workers with “participation” and “citizens’ rights,” strips them of their historical and revolutionary power, keeping them within the orbit of the existing order. However, through an independent, conscious, and organised struggle, the working class once again recognises its class identity and historical mission, initiating a complete break from bourgeois institutions and ideologies.

Anti-fascism

Another ideology closely linked to democracy and playing a significant role in obscuring the working class is the ideology of “anti-fascism.” Fascism and anti-fascism share a common origin. In other words, anti-fascism has served as a tool for strengthening the institutions of capitalist democracy: this ideology reinforces the “democratic” capitalist state and, in practice, poisons the working class, distancing it from its class position.

The theory of anti-fascism has been one of the most powerful ideological tools for creating confusion within the working class and drawing it into imperialist conflicts. A prominent example is the events of the war in Spain (1936–1939). Unlike the anarchists, Stalinists, and Trotskyists, the position of the Communist Left was non-participation in the “defence of the Republic,” arguing that the Spanish war was not a civil war but an imperialist war in which the working class was the victim. From the perspective of the Communist Left, the Spanish war provided an opportunity for Stalinists, Trotskyists, and anarchists to practise fighting alongside the democrats and to prepare themselves for a “patriotic war” under the imperialist alliance of Britain, Russia, and the United States. The Communist Left held that “anti-fascism” was an ideological formula that led to the dispersal of proletarian positions and ultimately to the serious defeat of the working class, as it channelled workers into bourgeois frameworks and prevented an independent class struggle.

Trade unions

One of the fundamental challenges in the path of the working class’s struggle is the role of trade unions and leftist tendencies, which often operate in connection and overlap with one another. Trade unions, on the surface, appear to defend the interests of the working class, but in practice, they have become instruments for restraining and controlling the labour movement. Leftist tendencies, as the left wing of the bourgeoisie in various forms, also help to consolidate the unions’ dominance over the working masses and, in doing so, steer the class struggle into channels that are controllable, harmless, and manageable for capitalism.

The result of this process is the weakening and diversion of the labour movement — a movement that could potentially develop revolutionary consciousness and organisation from within, but becomes trapped in the grip of the trade unions. Thus, both the trade unions and bourgeois leftist tendencies, despite claiming to defend the working class, in practice serve as an ideological and political shield for capital and prevent the struggle from advancing to a conscious and proletarian level.

In the arena of street protests, far left tendencies often divert workers' anger towards individual, scattered, and non-class-based acts of violence, preventing the development of a conscious and class-oriented direction among them. As a result, the possibility of an independent and organised workers' movement is lost — a movement that could, instead of engaging in individual acts of violence, direct its collective, class-conscious violence into an organised struggle against the capitalist system.

The European bourgeoisie's historical experience in maintaining the dominance of capital

Compared with other bourgeoisies around the world, and even relative to their Western counterparts, the European bourgeoisie possesses long-standing experience, political skill, and sophisticated cunning. Over the centuries, this class has learned to maintain its dominance not only through physical force but also through deception, institutionalisation, and subtle forms of repression. By utilising tools such as trade unions, leftist parties, civil institutions, and liberal media, the European bourgeoisie advances a “soft” and indirect form of control, reducing the need for overt violence. We have previously referred to Pannekoek's valuable analyses of the institutionalisation of bourgeois

values, which shed light on the understanding of these mechanisms of domination.

History has repeatedly shown that these “civilised barbarians,” whenever their class interests are threatened, cast aside the mask of democracy and reveal their true nature. Clear examples of this can be seen in the slaughter of around twenty thousand Parisian workers during the “Bloody Week” that crushed the Paris Commune, and in the massacre of thousands of workers and revolutionaries during the suppression of the German Revolution. Thus, the European working class faces a bourgeoisie that is not only highly experienced but also exceptionally cunning and deceitful — a class that speaks the language of democracy while ensuring its survival through the organised repression of workers.

We have highlighted some of the fundamental challenges facing the working class, challenges that pose serious obstacles to the continuation and deepening of the class struggle. The current historical conditions have made the tasks of communists and revolutionaries considerably more difficult. We do not believe in voluntarism; nevertheless, it must be emphasised that revolutionaries, even in situations of isolation and dispersion, do not live or act in a social and historical vacuum.

The historical defeat of the working class imposed a form of isolation on the revolutionary movement and on communists — an isolation that, in turn, created favourable conditions for the emergence and reproduction of sectarianism within communist left. While sectarianism within communist left reflects the objective conditions of the proletariat’s defeat and isolation, its continuation is not only unjustifiable but also constitutes a shirking of the historical responsibilities of revolutionaries.

Sectarianism is, in fact, a sign of revolutionaries’ rupture from their historical duty — that is, from the role they are meant to play in the

real course of the class struggle. The issue is not the ignoring or suppression of theoretical differences, but that such differences can only be examined and debated dynamically and dialectically within the context of practical cooperation and solidarity in the actual arena of class struggle. Only under these conditions do convergences and divergences arise not artificially or abstractly, but on the basis of the living and evolving reality of the class struggle.

For the class struggle to advance in an offensive and forward-moving manner, a certain level of class consciousness and a combative spirit among workers is vital. However, when protests are channelled into safe paths, or when confusion and ambiguity spread within the ranks of workers, the independent struggle of the proletariat is weakened, and workers are prevented from elevating their movement to higher levels. In China, under such conditions, the task of communist left becomes even more crucial, and the necessity of overcoming sectarianism grows ever more urgent.

However, when protests are channelled into safe paths, or when confusion and ambiguity spread through the ranks of workers, the independent struggle of the proletariat is weakened, and workers are prevented from advancing their movement to higher levels. In such circumstances, the task of communist left becomes all the more crucial, for they must stand against all forms of diversion and weakening, and stress the necessity of **self-organisation and the class independence of workers**.

At moments when capital seeks to confine workers' struggles within safe frameworks, communist left must remain conscious of their historical role and political responsibility. Overcoming sectarianism not only strengthens communist left but also enables them to play a more effective and coherent role in the workers' class movement — a role that serves proletarian organisation and advances the revolutionary

perspective of the working class, a form of organisation and perspective that is vital for the fundamental transformation of society.

The only way to counter the restraining role of the trade unions and the bourgeois left forces — whose task is to contain protests within safe boundaries — is to emphasise the need for **independent workers' struggle**. This means that workers themselves must take the organisation of the struggle into their own hands and, through general assemblies, create the necessary instruments such as workers' committees, strike committees, and other forms of grassroots organisation. Such independent struggle not only enables workers to maintain their own initiative but also serves as a rehearsal for the formation of future workers' councils — councils that will form the real foundations of proletarian power.

When protesting workers succeed in bringing their families, local residents, and other groups of workers into the struggle and onto the streets, the street is transformed from a space of passage into **a public assembly for discussion, decision-making, and the expression of demands**. Such solidarity not only amplifies the voice of protest but also makes repression more difficult and turns the struggle into a powerful social force.

Repression—whether carried out by the police or through the official mechanisms of the trade unions—is effective only when protests are either beyond the control of the workers or remain scattered and limited in scope. However, when workers seize the initiative and build a broad, nationwide movement, the cost of repression for the ruling power rises dramatically, while its effectiveness is greatly diminished.

The ultimate goal is to end the domination of the market, money, and private ownership of the means of production. The historical task of the proletariat is to abolish capitalist relations and establish a communist society — one in which production is organised not for the accumulation

of capital, but for the fulfilment of human needs and the free development of all. In such a system, labour is freed from its alienated and exploitative form and becomes a conscious, creative, and genuinely human activity.

Every genuine step towards the independence of the workers' class struggle — in any country and in any sphere — is simultaneously a step towards rebuilding class identity, advancing proletarian consciousness, and preparing for the world proletarian revolution. For the communist revolution can only be realised through the conscious, organised, and voluntary unity of workers across the world — a revolution that will mark the end of capital's domination and the beginning of humanity's true history.

The historical task of the proletariat is to abolish capitalist relations and establish a communist society — one in which production is organised not for the accumulation of capital, but for the fulfilment of human needs and the free development of all. In such a system, labour is freed from its alienated and exploitative form and becomes a conscious, creative, and truly human activity.

Capitalism reeks of blood, filth, and slime. Every effort must serve the historical mandate of the working class. For if the working class fails to fulfil its historical task — the overthrow of capitalism through a world communist revolution — the continuation of the existing order will ultimately lead to the destruction of humanity. This destruction will not necessarily take the form of a world war; rather, it may manifest in multiple ways: regional wars, the structural brutality of capital, environmental crises, devastating pandemics, and other catastrophic forms. Today, more than ever, the historical choice before us is clear, and the communist alternative appears both more valid and urgently necessary than ever.

Capitalism reeks of blood, filth, and slime. All efforts must serve the historical mandate of the working class. For if the working class fails

to fulfil its historical duty—the overthrow of capitalism through a global communist revolution—the continuation of the existing order will ultimately lead to the destruction of humanity. This destruction need not necessarily take the form of a world war; it can manifest in various ways, including world war or regional wars, the structural barbarism of capital, environmental crises, devastating pandemics, and other catastrophic forms. Today, more than ever, a historical choice lies before us, and the communist alternative appears more valid and necessary than ever:

Communist Revolution or the Destruction of Humanity!

Internationalist Voice

7 November 2025

Basic Positions:

- The First World War was an indication that the capitalism had been a decadent social system. It also proved that there were only two alternatives to this system: communist revolution or the destruction of humanity.
- In our epoch, the working class is the only revolutionary class. Furthermore, only this social class can deliver the communist revolution and end the barbarity of capitalism.
- Once capitalism entered its decadent period, unions all over the world were transformed into organs of the capital system. In turn, the main tasks of unions were to control the working class and mislead them about its class struggle.
- In the epoch of decadent capitalism, participating in the parliamentary circus and elections only strengthens the illusion of democracy. Capitalist democracy and capitalist dictatorship are two sides of the same coin, namely, the barbarity of capitalism.
- All national movements are counterrevolutionary, against the working class and the class struggle. Wars of national liberation are pawns in imperialist conflict.
- The reason for the failure of the October Revolution was the failure of the revolutionary wave, particularly the failure of the German Revolution, which resulted in the isolation of October Revolution and afterwards its degeneration.

- All left parties are reactionary: Stalinists, Maoists, Trotskyists and official anarchists etc. represent the political apparatus of capital.
- The regimes that arose in the USSR, Eastern Europe, China, Cuba etc., while being called “socialist” or “communist”, only offered a particularly brutal and barbaric form of capitalism: state capitalism.
- The revolutionary organization constitutes the avant-garde of the proletariat and is an active factor in the development and generalization of class consciousness. Revolutionary organizations may only take the form of revolutionary minorities, whose task neither is to organize the working class nor take power in its stead, without being a **political leadership**, or a political compass, where revolutionary organizations’ political clarity and influence on the working classes are **the fundamental elements for the implementation of a communist revolution**.

Political belongings:

The current status, positions, views and activities of the proletarian political tendencies are the product of past experiences of the working class and the effectiveness of the lessons that political organizations of the working class have learned during the history of the proletariat. Therefore, Internationalist Voice can trace its own roots and origins back to the Communist League, the First International, the left wing of both the Second International and the Third International, and the fractions that defended proletarian and communist positions against the degenerating Third International, which was represented by Dutch-German fractions, and **particularly Italian Fraction of the Communist Left** and the defence of Communist Left traditions.

The Internationalist Voice Already Published!

In Defence of the Communist Left



РОССИЙСКАЯ КОММУНИСТИЧЕСКАЯ ПАРТИЯ (БОЛШЕВИЗМ)
Газета для рабочих, крестьян

КОММУНИСТ

ЕДИНСТВЕННЫЙ ЖУРНАЛ ЭКОНОМИКИ, КУЛЬТУРЫ И ОБЩЕСТВЕННОСТИ

The Communist
Organ of the Russian Communist Left

Internationalist Voice

The Practical Problems and Obstacles Facing the Working Class in the Class Struggle



Internationalist Voice

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



BILAN
Bulletin théorique mensuel de la Fraction de Gauche du P.C.I.

L'ANTIFASCISME : Formule de confusion

Internationalist Voice

In Defence of the Joint Statement of Groups of the International Communist Left about the War in Ukraine



Joint statement of groups of the International Communist Left about the war in Ukraine

Workers have no country!
Down with all the imperialist powers!
No place for capitalist barbarism socialism!

The war in Ukraine is being fought according to the conflicting interests of all the different imperialist powers, large and small – even in the interests of the working class, which is a class of oppressed slaves. It is a war over strategic positions, the military and economic domination fought secretly and covertly by the superpowers in charge of the US, Russia, the Western European super powers, with the Ukrainian ruling class acting as a key to access national power on the world imperialist class level.

The working class, and the Ukrainian ones, is the real victim of this war, whether in shattered factories women and children, starving refugees in overcrowded camps, hidden in cellars, or in the increasing destruction the effects of the war will bring to workers in all countries.

The capitalist class and these bourgeois media of production against everyone an competitive national divisions that lead to imperialist war. The capitalist classes cannot avoid sinking into greater barbarism.

For its part the world's working class cannot avoid developing its struggle against imperialist wars and fascist conflicts. The latest war, the largest in Europe since 1945, was of imperialist character for the world of the working class struggle alone is based in the overthrow of the bourgeoisie and in replacement by the political power of the working class, the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The war aims and lies of the different imperialist powers.

Internationalist Voice