

# Platform

September 2026 No.40

The World Anti-imperialist Platform





# Contents

---

|         |                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
|---------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Work    | <b>Economics And Politics In The Era Of The Dictatorship Of The Proletariat</b> .....2<br>V.I. Lenin                                                                                                              |
| Article | <b>Thinking positively is revolutionary. Organize for the counterattack</b> .....7<br>Party of the Committees to Support Resistance—for Communism (CARC Party, Italy)                                             |
|         | <b>On the Occasion of Yet Another Commemoration of the Imperialist Coup in Chile:<br/>Salvador Allende Remains an Example of Revolutionary Struggle</b> .....10<br>Reinaldo Troncoso Cruz   Labour Party of Chile |
|         | <b>The Vanguard Is Not a Matter of Opinion</b> .....14<br>Booker Ngesa Omole   Communist Party Marxist Kenya                                                                                                      |
|         | <b>Eritrea, liberated from colonialism, stands upright</b> .....24<br>Jozef Bossuyt   Communist Party of Belgium                                                                                                  |
|         | <b>Support Venezuela after earthquake, free Maduro and Cilia,<br/>stop US war attack</b> .....26<br>Jozef Bossuyt   Communist Party of Belgium                                                                    |
|         | <b>The Road Is Broad and Deep, and We Are Moving Toward It:<br/>The Socialist Revolution</b> .....28<br>Néstor Guadaño   Unión Proletaria (Spain)                                                                 |
|         | <b>The ongoing Pakistan-Afghanistan war</b> .....31<br>Communist Party of Great Britain (Marxist-Leninist)                                                                                                        |
|         | <b>The example of dignity and struggle set by the people of Iran</b> .....34<br>Dimitrios Patelis   Founding Member of the Revolutionary Theory Group (Greece)                                                    |
|         | <b>The Full-Scale Intensification of World War 3 Through the Expansion of Wars<br/>and the Convergence of Battlefronts</b> .....36<br>Stephen Cho   Coordinator of the Korean International Forum                 |

# Economics And Politics In The Era Of The Dictatorship Of The Proletariat

V.I. Lenin

30 October, 1919

I had intended to write a short pamphlet on the subject indicated in the title on the occasion of the second anniversary of Soviet power. But owing to the rush of everyday work I have so far been unable to get beyond preliminary preparations for some of the sections. I have therefore decided to essay a brief, summarised exposition of what, in my opinion, are the most essential ideas on the subject. A summarised exposition, of course, possesses many disadvantages and shortcomings. Nevertheless, a short magazine article may perhaps achieve the modest aim in view, which is to present the problem and the groundwork for its discussion by the Communists of various countries.

## 1

Theoretically, there can be no doubt that between capitalism and communism there lies a definite transition period which must combine the features and properties of both these forms of social economy. This transition period has to be a period of struggle between dying capitalism and nascent communism—or, in other words, between capitalism which has been defeated but not destroyed and communism which has been born but is still very feeble.

The necessity for a whole historical era distinguished by these transitional features should be obvious not only to Marxists, but to any educated person who is in any degree acquainted with the theory of development. Yet all the talk on the subject of the transition to socialism which we hear from present-day petty-bourgeois democrats (and such, in spite of their spurious socialist label, are all the leaders of the Second International, including such individuals as MacDonald, Jean Longuet, Kautsky and Friedrich Adler) is marked by complete disregard of this obvious truth. Petty-bourgeois democrats are distinguished by an aversion to class struggle, by their dreams of avoiding it, by their efforts to smooth over, to reconcile, to remove sharp corners. Such democrats, therefore, either avoid recognising any

necessity for a whole historical period of transition from capitalism to communism or regard it as their duty to concoct schemes for reconciling the two contending forces instead of leading the struggle of one of these forces.

## 2

In Russia, the dictatorship of the proletariat must inevitably differ in certain particulars from what it would be in the advanced countries, owing to the very great backwardness and petty-bourgeois character of our country. But the basic forces—and the basic forms of social economy—are the same in Russia as in any capitalist country, so that the peculiarities can apply only to what is of lesser importance.

The basic forms of social economy are capitalism, petty commodity production, and communism. The basic forces are the bourgeoisie, the petty bourgeoisie (the peasantry in particular) and the proletariat.

The economic system of Russia in the era of the dictatorship of the proletariat represents the struggle of labour, united on communist principles on the scale of a vast state and making its first steps—the struggle against petty commodity production and against the capitalism which still persists and against that which is newly arising on the basis of petty commodity production.

In Russia, labour is united communistically insofar as, first, private ownership of the means of production has been abolished, and, secondly, the proletarian state power is organising large-scale production on state-owned land and in state-owned enterprises on a national scale, is distributing labour-power among the various branches of production and the various enterprises, and is distributing among the working people large quantities of articles of consumption belonging to the state.

We speak of “the first steps” of communism in Russia (it is also put that way in our Party Programme adopted in March 1919), because all these things have been only partially effected in our country, or, to

put it differently, their achievement is only in its early stages. We accomplished instantly, at one revolutionary blow, all that can, in general, be accomplished instantly; on the first day of the dictatorship of the proletariat, for instance, on October 26 (November 8), 1917, the private ownership of land was abolished without compensation for the big landowners—the big landowners were expropriated. Within the space of a few months practically all the big capitalists, owners of factories, joint-stock companies, banks, railways, and so forth, were also expropriated without compensation. The state organisation of large-scale production in industry and the transition from “workers’ control” to “workers’ management” of factories and railways—this has, by and large, already been accomplished; but in relation to agriculture it has only just begun (“state farms”, i.e., large farms organised by the workers’ state on state owned land). Similarly, we have only just begun the organisation of various forms of co-operative societies of small farmers as a transition from petty commodity agriculture to communist agriculture.[1] The same must be said of the state-organised distribution of products in place of private trade, i.e., the state procurement and delivery of grain to the cities and of industrial products to the countryside. Available statistical data on this subject will be given below.

Peasant farming continues to be petty commodity production. Here we have an extremely broad and very sound, deep-rooted basis for capitalism, a basis on which capitalism persists or arises anew in a bitter struggle against communism. The forms of this struggle are private speculation and profiteering versus state procurement of grain (and other products) and state distribution of products in general.

### 3

To illustrate these abstract theoretical propositions, let us quote actual figures.

According to the figures of the People’s Com-

missariat of Food, state procurements of grain in Russia between August 1, 1917, and August 1, 1918, amounted to about 30,000,000 poods, and in the following year to about 110,000,000 poods. During the first three months of the next campaign (1919-20) procurements will presumably total about 45,000,000 poods, as against 37,000,000 poods for the same period (August-October) in 1918.

These figures speak clearly of a slow but steady improvement in the state of affairs from the point of view of the victory of communism over capitalism. This improvement is being achieved in spite of difficulties without world parallel, difficulties due to the Civil War organised by Russian and foreign capitalists who are harnessing all the forces of the world’s strongest powers.

Therefore, in spite of the lies and slanders of the bourgeoisie of all countries and of their open or masked henchmen (the “socialists” of the Second International), one thing remains beyond dispute—as far as the basic economic problem of the dictatorship of the proletariat is concerned, the victory of communism over capitalism in our country is assured. Throughout the world the bourgeoisie is raging and fuming against Bolshevism and is organising military expeditions, plots, etc., against the Bolsheviks, because it realises full well that our success in reconstructing the social economy is inevitable, provided we are not crushed by military force. And its attempts to crush us in this way are not succeeding.

The extent to which we have already vanquished capitalism in the short time we have had at our disposal, and despite the incredible difficulties under which we have had to work, will be seen from the following summarised figures. The Central Statistical Board has just prepared for the press data on the production and consumption of grain—not for the whole of Soviet Russia, but only for twenty-six gubernias.

The results are as follows:

| 26 gubernias of Soviet Russia | Population in millions | Production of grain (excluding seed and fodder) millions poods | Grain delivered, millions DOODS |            | Total amount of grain at disposal of population millions poods | Grain consumption. Doods per capita |
|-------------------------------|------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------|----------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
|                               |                        |                                                                | Commisariat of food             | Profiteers |                                                                |                                     |
| Producing gubernias           | <i>Urban</i> 4.4       | —                                                              | 20.9                            | 20.6       | 41.5                                                           | 9.5                                 |
| Consuming gubernias           | <i>Rural</i> 28.6      | 625.4                                                          | —                               | —          | 481.8                                                          | 16.9                                |
|                               | <i>Urban</i> 5.9       | —                                                              | 20.012.1                        | 20.027.8   | 40.0                                                           | 6.8                                 |
|                               | <i>Rural</i> 13.8      | 114.0                                                          |                                 |            | 151.4                                                          | 11.0                                |
| Total (26 gubernias)          | 52.7                   | 739.4                                                          | 53.0                            | 68.4       | 714.7                                                          | 13.6                                |

Thus, approximately half the amount of grain supplied to the cities is provided by the Commissariat of Food and the other half by profiteers. This same proportion is revealed by a careful survey, made in 1918, of the food consumed by city workers. It should be borne in mind that for bread supplied by the state the worker pays one-ninth of what he pays the profiteer. The profiteering price for bread is ten times greater than the state price; this is revealed by a detailed study of workers' budgets.

4

A careful study of the figures quoted shows that they present an exact picture of the fundamental features of Russia's present-day economy.

The working people have been emancipated from their age-old oppressors and exploiters, the landowners and capitalists. This step in the direction of real freedom and real equality, a step which for its extent, dimensions and rapidity is without parallel in the world, is ignored by the supporters of the bourgeoisie (including the petty-bourgeois democrats), who, when they talk of freedom and equality, mean parliamentary bourgeois democracy, which they falsely declare to be "democracy" in general, or "pure democracy" (Kautsky).

But the working people are concerned only with real equality and real freedom (freedom from the landowners and capitalists), and that is why they give the Soviet government such solid support.

In this peasant country it was the peasantry as a whole who were the first to gain, who gained most, and gained immediately from the dictatorship of the proletariat. The peasant in Russia starved under the landowners and capitalists. Throughout the long centuries of our history, the peasant never had an opportunity to work for himself: he starved while handing over hundreds of millions of poods of grain to the capitalists, for the cities and for export. Under the dictatorship of the proletariat the peasant for the first time has been working for himself and feeding better than the city dweller. For the first time the peasant has seen real freedom—freedom to eat his bread, freedom from starvation. In the distribution of the land, as we know, the maximum equality has been established; in the vast majority of cases the peasants are dividing the land according to the number of "mouths to feed".

Socialism means the abolition of classes.

In order to abolish classes it is necessary, first, to overthrow the landowners and capitalists. This part of our task has been accomplished, but it is only a part, and moreover, not the most difficult part. In order to abolish classes it is necessary, secondly, to abolish the difference between factory worker and peasant, to make workers of all of them. This cannot be done all at once. This task is incomparably more difficult and will of necessity take a long time. It is not a problem that can be solved by overthrowing a class. It can be solved only by the organisational reconstruction of the whole social economy, by a transition from individual, disunited, petty commodity production to large-scale social production. This transition must of necessity be extremely protracted. It may only be delayed and complicated by hasty and incautious administrative and legislative measures. It can be accelerated only by affording such assistance to the peasant as will enable him to effect an immense improvement in his whole farming technique to reform it radically.

In order to solve the second and most difficult part of the problem, the proletariat, after having defeated the bourgeoisie, must unswervingly conduct its policy towards the peasantry along the following fundamental lines. The proletariat must separate, demarcate the working peasant from the peasant owner, the peasant worker from the peasant huckster, the peasant who labours from the peasant who profiteers.

In this demarcation lies the whole essence of socialism.

And it is not surprising that the socialists who are socialists in word but petty-bourgeois democrats in deed (the Martovs, the Chernovs, the Kautskys and others) do not understand this essence of socialism.

The demarcation we here refer to is an extremely difficult one, because in real life all the features of the "peasant", however diverse they may be, however contradictory they may be, are fused into one whole. Nevertheless, demarcation is possible; and not only is it possible, it inevitably follows from the conditions of peasant farming and peasant life. The working peasant has for ages been oppressed by the landowners, the capitalists, the hucksters and profiteers and by their state, including even the most democratic bourgeois republics. Throughout the ages the working peasant has trained himself to hate and loathe these oppressors and exploiters, and this "training", engendered by the conditions of life, compels the

peasant to seek an alliance with the worker against the capitalist and against the profiteer and huckster. Yet at the same time, economic conditions, the conditions of commodity production, inevitably turn the peasant (not always, but in the vast majority of cases) into a huckster and profiteer.

The statistics quoted above reveal a striking difference between the working peasant and the peasant profiteer. That peasant who during 1918-19 delivered to the hungry workers of the cities 40,000,000 poods of grain at fixed state prices, who delivered this grain to the state agencies despite all the shortcomings of the latter, shortcomings fully realised by the workers' government, but which were unavoidable in the first period of the transition to socialism—that peasant is a working peasant, the comrade and equal of the socialist worker, his most faithfully, his blood brother in the fight against the yoke of capital. Whereas that peasant who clandestinely sold 40,000,000 poods of grain at ten times the state price, taking advantage of the need and hunger of the city worker, deceiving the state, and everywhere increasing and creating deceit, robbery and fraud—that peasant is a profiteer, an ally of the capitalist, a class enemy of the worker, an exploiter. For whoever possesses surplus grain gathered from land belonging to the whole state with the help of implements in which in one way or another is embodied the labour not only of the peasant but also of the worker and so on—whoever possesses a surplus of grain and profiteers in that grain is an exploiter of the hungry worker.

You are violators of freedom, equality, and democracy—they shout at us on all sides, pointing to the inequality of the worker and the peasant under our Constitution, to the dissolution of the Constituent Assembly, to the forcible confiscation of surplus grain, and so forth. We reply—never in the world has there been a state which has done so much to remove the actual inequality, the actual lack of freedom from which the working peasant has been suffering for centuries. But we shall never recognise equality with the peasant profiteer, just as we do not recognise “equality” between the exploiter and the exploited, between the sated and the hungry, nor the “freedom” for the former to rob the latter. And those educated people who refuse to recognise this difference we shall treat as whiteguards, even though they may call themselves democrats, socialists, internationalists, Kautskys, Chernovs, or Martovs.

Socialism means the abolition of classes. The dictatorship of the proletariat has done all it could to abolish classes. But classes cannot be abolished at one stroke.

And classes still remain and will remain in the era of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The dictatorship will become unnecessary when classes disappear. Without the dictatorship of the proletariat they will not disappear.

Classes have remained, but in the era of the dictatorship of the proletariat every class has undergone a change, and the relations between the classes have also changed. The class struggle does not disappear under the dictatorship of the proletariat; it merely assumes different forms.

Under capitalism the proletariat was an oppressed class, a class which had been deprived of the means of production, the only class which stood directly and completely opposed to the bourgeoisie, and therefore the only one capable of being revolutionary to the very end. Having overthrown the bourgeoisie and conquered political power, the proletariat has become the ruling class; it wields state power, it exercises control over means of production already socialised; it guides the wavering and intermediary elements and classes; it crushes the increasingly stubborn resistance of the exploiters. All these are specific tasks of the class struggle, tasks which the proletariat formerly did not and could not have set itself.

The class of exploiters, the landowners and capitalists, has not disappeared and cannot disappear all at once under the dictatorship of the proletariat. The exploiters have been smashed, but not destroyed. They still have an international base in the form of international capital, of which they are a branch. They still retain certain means of production in part, they still have money, they still have vast social connections. Because they have been defeated, the energy of their resistance has increased a hundred and a thousandfold. The “art” of state, military and economic administration gives them a superiority, and a very great superiority, so that their importance is incomparably greater than their numerical proportion of the population. The class struggle waged by the overthrown exploiters against the victorious vanguard of the exploited, i.e., the proletariat, has become incomparably more bitter. And it cannot

be otherwise in the case of a revolution, unless this concept is replaced (as it is by all the heroes of the Second International) by reformist illusions.

Lastly, the peasants, like the petty bourgeoisie in general, occupy a half-way, intermediate position even under the dictatorship of the proletariat: on the one hand, they are a fairly large (and in backward Russia, a vast) mass of working people, united by the common interest of all working people to emancipate themselves from the landowner and the capitalist; on the other hand, they are disunited small proprietors, property-owners and traders. Such an economic position inevitably causes them to vacillate between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. In view of the acute form which the struggle between these two classes has assumed, in view of the incredibly severe break up of all social relations, and in view of the great attachment of the peasants and the petty bourgeoisie generally to the old, the routine, and the unchanging, it is only natural that we should inevitably find them swinging from one side to the other, that we should find them wavering, changeable, uncertain, and so on.

In relation to this class—or to these social elements—the proletariat must strive to establish its influence over it, to guide it. To give leadership to the vacillating and unstable—such is the task of the proletariat.

If we compare all the basic forces or classes and their interrelations, as modified by the dictatorship of the proletariat, we shall realise how unutterably nonsensical and theoretically stupid is the common petty-bourgeois idea shared by all representatives of the Second International, that the transition to socialism is possible “by means of democracy” in general. The fundamental source of this error lies in the prejudice inherited from the bourgeoisie that “democracy” is something absolute and above classes. As a matter of fact, democracy itself passes into an entirely new phase under the dictatorship of the proletariat, and the class struggle rises to a higher level, dominating over each and every form.

General talk about freedom, equality and democracy is in fact but a blind repetition of concepts shaped by the relations of commodity production. To attempt to solve the concrete problems of the dictatorship of the proletariat by such generalities is tantamount to accepting the theories and principles of the bourgeoisie in their entirety. From the point of view of the proletariat, the question can be put

only in the following way: freedom from oppression by which class? equality of which class with which? democracy based on private property, or on a struggle for the abolition of private property?—and so forth.

Long ago Engels in his *Anti-Dühring* explained that the concept “equality” is moulded from the relations of commodity production; equality becomes a prejudice if it is not understood to mean the abolition of classes. This elementary truth regarding the distinction between the bourgeois-democratic and the socialist conception of equality is constantly being forgotten. But if it is not forgotten it becomes obvious that by overthrowing the bourgeoisie the proletariat takes the most decisive step towards the abolition of classes, and that in order to complete the process the proletariat must continue its class struggle, making use of the apparatus of state power and employing various methods of combating, influencing and bringing pressure to bear on the overthrown bourgeoisie and the vacillating petty bourgeoisie.

(To be continued)



# Thinking positively is revolutionary. Organize for the counterattack

Party of the Committees to Support Resistance—for Communism (CARC Party, Italy)

The Third World War is spreading. Not only in Ukraine, Iran, and Palestine: the African continent is in turmoil, Venezuela has been attacked and is under siege, Cuba is under threat, and South America is being shaken by attempts to impose US puppet governments. In the background are the maneuvers of the US, Zionist, and EU imperialists against the People's Republic of China.

The world is not facing the danger of a Third World War; the world is already immersed in the Third World War.

The entire economic and financial activity of the imperialist countries revolves around the demands of war and projections for its development.

Enormous amounts of money are already being diverted into military engineering, logistics, and war production, taken away from healthcare, education, measures to address the climate and environmental emergency, and social policies.

The effects are visible, are out in the open, and continue to worsen.

And the more forcefully the alarms that periodically erupt in public debate over one emergency or another gain momentum, and the more desperate the appeals to “do something” become, the more clearly it emerges that the current ruling class does not want to and cannot change course. War is an objective necessity of capitalism in crisis.

And although the particular consequences of this course differ to some extent from country to country, this is the track on which all imperialist countries are proceeding.

In this sense, all imperialist countries have a common destiny, assigned to them by history: they are the frontline—the cause, the driving force, and the promoters—of the Third World War and, precisely for this reason, they are also the decisive context for the rebirth of a conscious and organized communist movement, the only alternative to the chaos produced by the general crisis of capitalism.

Only the socialist revolution and the establishment of socialism in at least one imperialist country can

interrupt the destructive vortex of the Third World War.

Before giving in to skepticism and distrust, and throwing this thesis into the bin of “beautiful hopes that are impossible to realize,” give yourselves the opportunity to explore it more deeply.

Inevitably, we speak of our own country, because it is precisely here that we must and can carry out the socialist revolution. This is the concrete and decisive contribution that the Italian workers and popular masses can make to the popular masses of the other imperialist countries and to the peoples of the oppressed countries, by emancipating themselves from the system of power of the ruling class (see the article “Anatomy of the Papal Republic” on page 10).

## What Was Silent Is Now Shouting

One consequence of the overall worsening of living and working conditions, the increase in precariousness, and the decay of the social institutions that in some way guaranteed social cohesion is the proliferation of protests, expressions of discontent with the course of events, and, in parallel, the search for “solutions.”

This is not a phenomenon that emerged suddenly; it has grown in parallel with the worsening of the general crisis—economic, environmental, and social. The fact is that today everyone is shouting about the ills of society.

The media are shouting, stringing together one real or invented emergency after another.

Pundits and influencers at the service of the ruling class are shouting about social decay and fomenting the hunt for poor immigrants.

Politicians of every color are shouting improvised solutions, invented solutions, solutions pulled out of thin air.

Confusion reigns because all analyses and solutions that evade the real causes of the situation, that evade the general crisis of capitalism and deny the connection between the chaos we are experiencing here in Italy and the development of the Third World

War, are merely chaotic chatter that feeds confusion, obstructs the analysis of reality, and prevents the elaboration of effective solutions.

Shortcuts are increasingly prevalent. From the “remigration” promoted by the reactionary right and nostalgists of the Twenty Years of Fascism, to the wealth tax promoted by the bourgeois left. Empty talk that poisons consciousness and feeds powerlessness and defeatism.

### **What Was Motionless Has Begun to Move**

The worse the situation becomes—and it is visibly getting worse—the more the popular masses are pushed to mobilize, to take some kind of initiative.

And indeed, mobilizations and protests are multiplying. But so are backward, antisocial, destructive, and self-destructive forms of resistance.

Anyone who insists on saying that “nothing is moving in Italy” is simply disconnected from reality.

The healthy and advanced part of the popular masses has been mobilizing continuously for years against the genocide in Palestine and against the Third World War. Protests against those responsible for the climate and environmental crisis have continued for years. The country is dotted with large and small episodes of workers’ resistance to the dismantling of the productive apparatus. There are widespread mobilizations against environmental devastation and against large-scale speculative projects that are useless and harmful. Students and teachers in secondary schools and universities are in motion, as are the parents of elementary school students.

By contrast, even the most brutalized part of the population, under the sway of reactionary propaganda, is beginning in some way to mobilize.

It does so at the command of this or that racist or fascist strongman, driven by backward and antisocial conceptions, but it is beginning to do so in an increasingly collective manner.

This means that the struggle between the revolutionary mobilization and the reactionary mobilization of the popular masses is intensifying and becoming increasingly concrete.

This means that the organization and mobilization of the popular masses—in one direction or the other—has assumed, is assuming, and will progressively assume an increasingly important, decisive role.

### **Thinking Positively Is a Revolutionary Act**

In the context we have necessarily described only in broad outline here, fear is also spreading.

It is spreading because the authorities and institutions of the ruling class cannot and do not want to provide a positive response to the problems of the overwhelming majority of the population; they are unable to defend and preserve social cohesion. On the contrary, they operate and act **ONLY** in accordance with the demands of financial and speculative capital.

It is spreading because the forms and instruments through which the ruling class governed society and the country have increasingly become openly instruments of oppression and persecution of the popular masses.

It is spreading because the propaganda of the ruling class remains deeply rooted in the prevailing common sense of an important part of the popular masses. The ruling class presents the decline of its system as the decline of human society, of humanity itself, just as it presents its particular interests as common interests, as the common good.

However, the decline of capitalist society is **NOT** the end of the world, nor does it correspond in any way to the decline of human society. On the contrary, the extinction of capitalism will be—is—an epochal evolutionary leap for human society.

A leap through which humankind frees itself from the causes of war, the climate and environmental crisis, racism, male chauvinism and gender oppression, and **ALL** the consequences of the division of society into classes.

That revolutionary leap is possible. It will be traumatic and it will not be linear, but it is possible, as well as necessary. That leap is the socialist revolution, which, with the establishment of socialism, opens the way to a new phase of human civilization.

Everything that feeds skepticism or distrust regarding the possibility of making that leap is a manifestation of how much influence the ruling class still has over the popular masses at the cultural, intellectual, and practical levels.

The skepticism and distrust that fill the thoughts and feelings of workers and the popular masses are the last chain binding workers and the popular masses to the ruling class.

But the principal problem, the decisive question, is the extent to which skepticism and distrust condition the communists, the revolutionaries, those who

want to change the world, the political vanguards, and the vanguards of struggle: are they themselves still convinced that “the conditions for revolution do not exist,” that “the enemy is too strong,” that “it would be beautiful and just, but...”

Comrades, thinking positively is not idealism. It is not unjustified optimism. It is the manifestation of having reached the understanding that the collapse of the old world of the capitalists is the prerequisite for the birth of the new world of the organized popular masses. Thinking positively is revolutionary.

### **Move Everything to the Counterattack**

The Third World War is spreading; the governments, institutions, and authorities of the ruling class are fueling it; the effects of the general crisis and the world war are pushing the popular masses to mobilize and take the initiative.

It is precisely here that the role of communists becomes decisive.

It is the communists who must promote the political, ideological, and organizational strengthening of workers’ and popular organizations, and of the political and trade-union organizations that, in general terms, resist the disastrous course of events. With the objective of moving them to the counterattack.

To overthrow the governments, institutions, and authorities of the ruling class and replace them with a government of popular emergency, with institutions that are accountable to workers’ and popular organizations, and with new public authorities.

The existing workers’ and popular organizations must become what the soviets were in Russia: this is the substance of our work, our objective.

There are a thousand reasons why so many comrades, workers, and elements of the popular masses are still inclined to throw this thesis into the bin of “beautiful hopes that are impossible to realize.”

But ultimately, however solid and reasonable each of these reasons may appear, they are merely manifestations of skepticism and distrust.

Skepticism and distrust in what we say—in the line, the methods, the instruments of struggle, and the objectives—but also, and perhaps above all, skepticism and distrust in the fact that organized workers and popular masses are capable of imposing the epochal leap that is needed. Which, upon closer examination, is also a lack of faith in themselves.

This is why thinking positively is a revolutionary act. It breaks first and foremost with the conviction

that oppressed classes must remain oppressed, as if by “divine will.”

But divine will does not exist, just as human nature does not exist, and there are no spells that condemn the popular masses to be cannon fodder or slaughtered like cattle for the ruling class. Therefore, the question is not metaphysical, but very concrete.

Every initiative that does not project itself toward the offensive, toward the counterattack, leaves ground to the enemy. It leaves ground to the governments, institutions, and authorities of the ruling class, or even to those who, on behalf of the ruling class, promote the reactionary mobilization of the popular masses.

In times of war—which are also times of socialist revolution—either positions are won or ground is lost: equilibrium is always and only a temporary phase. And now there is a need to organize for the counterattack, not for balancing acts and postponements.

# On the Occasion of Yet Another Commemoration of the Imperialist Coup in Chile: Salvador Allende Remains an Example of Revolutionary Struggle

Reinaldo Troncoso Cruz | Labour Party of Chile

Since the dictator seized power through the coup d'état of September 11, 1973, the majority of Chileans who have lived through the most combative and heroic decades of our people have been unable to avoid feeling a sense of shame at the successive heads of state who have governed our country. Some, driven by personal ambition, such as Patricio Aylwin; others, through their servile subordination to imperialism, such as Eduardo Frei, Ricardo Lagos, and Michelle Bachelet; another, even worse, through his extreme narcissism, greed, and excessive lust for power, such as Sebastián Piñera; and then Gabriel Boric, a young man who represented what was old and shameful in petty-bourgeois morality—arrogance, conceit, haughty airs, and opportunistic conduct—which seriously compromised the dignity of his office and political standing, including his declaration of support for the Nazi government of Ukraine and his alignment with the most criminal imperialism in history. Finally, there is the current president, José Antonio Kast, a Nazi through and through. Thus, for present-day Chile, we have witnessed the most mediocre figures our country has ever had as presidents and statesmen.

Pablo Neruda once said that José Manuel Balmaceda and Salvador Allende were, up to that point in our political history, the best presidents Chile had ever had. Both were, in the truest sense, dignitaries: distinguished by their political and moral authority, their prestige and legitimacy, and the honorability with which they exercised the highest office in the land. They were capable of offering their lives for Chile and for the project of social justice that they embodied.

We believe that this provides the necessary point of comparison for us, on this occasion, to address the figure of compañero President Salvador Allende Gossens with the responsibility and revolutionary commitment that such a task entails. We know that this is a delicate undertaking, requiring the humility to understand that our pen faces an enormous chal-

lenge: to encompass, within our limitations and our words, the historical stature of his example as the apostle of the people he represented.

Without fear of constructing an opportunistic, idyllic, or ahistorical portrait, we have decided to write about him from the sole political, social, and economic significance that defined his commitment, clear and pristine, from the moment he began his journey of more than thirty years as the candidate of the working class and the people. We say this because throughout his political trajectory, throughout his arduous path toward socialism, there were no compromises of principle, no hesitation, and no betrayal. And it was for this reason that his people elevated him to La Moneda.

## THE 40 MEASURES: THE MOST CONCRETE, THE MOST HISTORIC

Salvador Allende was a student of Chilean and world reality. He rigorously examined, in a scientific manner, the antagonisms and contradictions expressed through the class struggle. But he was not merely an intellectual observer standing at a distance. For many years already, “Chicho” Allende had traveled through the different social fronts, maintaining close contact with the people and learning with empathy about the realities experienced by workers and popular sectors throughout Chile.

His knowledge of the social and economic dramas suffered by the people remained with him as a clear point of reference regarding the problems that had to be resolved in a country marked by enormous inequalities and injustices.

His actions and struggles—as a student leader first, as a physician afterward, as Minister of Health in the government of Pedro Aguirre Cerda, and later as a Senator of the Republic—demonstrate a personality deeply committed to the aspirations and interests of the oppressed and exploited classes.

His presence among the hardships and poverty of the people was not an electoral exercise undertaken because the circumstances required a parliamentarian to appear among them. It was his responsibility and duty as their representative that compelled him to reach workplaces, working-class neighborhoods, universities, and, above all, the tragic and painful centers where the bourgeois power exercised through the repressive institutions of the state unleashed massacres.

He went wherever the blood of workers and ordinary people had been spilled. He questioned and condemned with force and clarity the murderous actions of governments, demanding punishment for those responsible and justice for the victims of these crimes of state. He went to the El Salvador mining district and to Pampa Irigoyen in Puerto Montt, mourning alongside the people in those hours of pain.

These were not minor events in the class consciousness of workers, residents of poor neighborhoods, and peasants. They became part of the foundation and justification for a program of social justice that had become necessary within the national context of class struggle.

The diagnoses made during the first decades of the twentieth century were already established. The crisis of the system and the failure of the economic model were more than evident. At the same time, class consciousness was developing, and the discontent of the masses was expressed through an unstoppable rise in mobilizations for the rights of the people.

Secondary-school and university students, workers, peasants, and residents of working-class settlements moved from mass demonstrations to incorporating direct mass action into their struggles, and land and property occupations—the tomas—began to multiply as an insurgent tendency.

The working class and the people were putting into practice the slogan that “only struggle gives what the law denies.”

Basic necessities such as food, housing, employment, fair wages, education and cultural development, health care, freedom of expression—in short, an entire dimension of the democratization of society—were embodied in the Program of the 40 Measures of the coalition of parties forming the Popular Unity alliance led by Salvador Allende.

Among the program’s most emblematic achievements were the nationalization of copper and Chile’s

basic natural resources, a genuine and effective agrarian reform, and the provision of half a liter of milk to every child in Chile.

## **AN ATMOSPHERE OF POPULAR PARTICIPATION**

The victory of Popular Unity, with Salvador Allende as its undisputed leader, can be unfolded through images that appropriately evoke this leader who had won, in full measure, the minds and hearts of Chile’s poor.

The people poured into the streets to celebrate the victory: in the working-class neighborhoods and camps, in the mining workplaces, in the internal passages of industries and factories, in the coves and landing sites of artisanal fishermen, along rural roads, in secondary schools, on university campuses, along the avenues, and, of course, on the Alameda in central Santiago, where, from the headquarters of the Federation of Students of the University of Chile (FECH), the newly elected President of Chile addressed the people who had chosen him to lead the process of change that our country urgently needed.

The wood- or paraffin-burning stove, the chipped enamel mug, the lack of crockery and dishes, never having known a dining-room set, a living-room suite, or a sideboard. “Homes” made from pieces of wood, cardboard, corrugated metal, and roofs covered with fiber-cement sheets that could withstand the rain for only some time.

Clothing that covered nakedness but did not protect against the cold. Food and other basic products were extremely scarce in popular households, even in those of people who worked and, fortunately, had a regular income.

People were poor—very poor. Patches did not decorate their clothes; they covered tears and extended the usefulness of garments. Pieces of string or worn-out suspenders held up trousers. Poverty was painfully severe, often enough to provoke tears or rage.

Salvador Allende entered and came to know these spaces of misery. He respectfully confronted that reality, a reality that moved him and—which, in the language of liberation theology, one might say—challenged him and converted him to the cause of that heroic people who struggled tirelessly against centuries-old deprivation.

The image of *compañero* President appeared in

newspapers, magazines, and weekly publications. Those who owned televisions could see him on their screens. His face was always serene, always confident; his bearing conveyed certainty, assurance, and control over events.

There was no arrogance in his speech, but intelligence. There was no conceit, but wisdom and an honest and clean spirit.

The people were immensely proud of their president, proud of their historic representative. They trusted his project and trusted his word—"the confidence they placed in a man who was only the interpreter of great aspirations for justice," as he himself expressed it.

And that aspiration for justice gradually took shape as popular participation and protagonism.

The university reform of the 1960s consolidated tripartite representation among the different constituencies within Chile's public universities and promoted unprecedented university extension efforts that brought the academic sphere closer to the world of work and, conversely, brought the world of work into closer contact with the university.

As a result of this conception of the university, "Seasonal Schools," voluntary work programs, and an extraordinary number of initiatives emerged throughout the country. These efforts helped connect intellectual work with manual labor, thereby contributing to the revaluation and redefinition of manual work in the eyes of students, academics, and intellectuals in general.

The transfer of fragments of science and knowledge into working-class and popular spaces created favorable cultural conditions for the mass organization of artistic and cultural activity among workers and the people.

In factories and industries, in sectors of the countryside affected by agrarian reform, in working-class neighborhoods and camps, in hospitals, and in universities, excellent amateur theater groups emerged everywhere. They were organized nationally through the National Association of Amateur Theater of Chile (ANTACH), alongside initiatives arising from the political commitment of the staff of the Catholic University's Department of Extension and Communications.

The University Department for Workers and Peasants (DUOC) was another expression of this atmosphere of consciousness, which also reached private institutions and advocated for a new and

more just society.

In the countryside, peasant unionization multiplied, and demands grew for the expansion of land expropriations to estates exceeding forty basic irrigated hectares. The reform that had already begun was considered insufficient, and peasants with higher levels of political consciousness aspired to the definitive dismantling of the latifundia system in the country.

A similar situation existed within the industrial and factory world. Workers, too, aspired to expanded workers' control over production, distribution, and consumption.

This radicalization of the working class gradually acquired concrete organizational form through the Industrial Cordons, conceived as embryos of popular power. They demanded an expansion of the "Social Area" of the economy and called for the expropriation of industries possessing the greatest capital assets and which, at that time, constituted the most important economic reserve of the industrial bourgeoisie.

The classic "Worker-Student Alliance" of that period was permeated by two antagonistic discourses.

On one side were the weak discourses of the reactionary right and social Christianity, which at that time retained a pronounced anti-communist character, accompanied by the typical accusation that Marxism sought to control people's minds.

On the other side stood the government's project for the National Unified School System, which, in its essential purpose, sought to overcome historically the segregationist and class-based practices embedded in bourgeois methodology and pedagogy.

Students who understood themselves as an auxiliary sector of the working class had opted for a resolutely revolutionary struggle advocating education in the service of the people—free and comprehensive education—while seeking progressively to narrow the gap between manual and intellectual labor.

The inhabitants of working-class neighborhoods and settlement camps developed their levels of consciousness by formulating their own platforms of struggle and rights, pursuing an understanding of social dignity that included the demand for decent housing as a prerequisite for a dignified life.

Their movement incorporated land occupations, popular self-defense, militias, and gradually developed a conception of popular justice through the exercise of forms of popular tribunals.

Their greatest organizational development was expressed through the Supply and Price Control Committees (JAPs), which, despite being placed within a legal framework under Decree with Force of Law No. 2 of the National Directorate of Commerce (DIRINCO), functioned extensively as a genuine organ of popular power.

Within a context of black markets, speculation, hoarding, and shortages caused by the bourgeoisie, the JAPs were able to secure and guarantee food supplies for working-class neighborhoods. They assumed responsibilities for control and distribution and, in extreme cases, requisitioned products from sectors of the bourgeoisie connected to the trade in essential foodstuffs.

We briefly enumerate these events, experienced by an entire people who knew with profound conviction that there, at La Moneda, was a man who had untied important knots in history and restored to the people confidence in their own strength and power, as well as certainty in the justice of their cause.

Despite the employers' offensive, the complicity of a treacherous and cowardly military command intent on carrying out the coup, and an imperialism hostile to humanity, Allende—who had publicly confessed to his comrades that he had no vocation for martyrdom—arrived at La Moneda on September 11, 1973, took his position at the combat post, and amid fire and smoke proclaimed:

*“I will pay with my life for the loyalty of the people... Other men will overcome this gray and bitter moment... Much sooner than later, once again the great avenues will open...”*

Only great historical figures can become a turning point in history.

Allende was such a turning point—perhaps the most important in the history of Chile.

Those already mentioned, and others besides them, are merely minor figures.

# The Vanguard Is Not a Matter of Opinion

Booker Ngesa Omole | Communist Party Marxist Kenya

*A Reply to Godrick Namwaya on the National Democratic Revolution, the Vanguard Party and the Kenyan Revolution*

## Editor's Note

This article is a response to “Cadre Building, Vanguard Claims, and the Kenyan Left” by Godrick Namwaya, published by Countercurrents on 26 July 2026.

Readers who have not seen the original article may read it here:

<https://countercurrents.org/2026/07/cadre-building-vanguard-claims-and-the-kenyan-left/>

The present reply is not intended as a personal polemic. Rather, it addresses the political and ideological questions raised by the article, particularly concerning the Leninist conception of the vanguard party, the National Democratic Revolution, democratic centralism, cadre formation, and the strategic road to socialism in Kenya. These are questions of political line whose significance extends far beyond any single individual or organisation.

Every revolutionary period produces not only revolutionaries but also ideological struggles over the direction of the revolution. These struggles are not distractions from the class struggle. They are themselves expressions of it. Marxism Leninism has never feared ideological contestation. On the contrary, it develops through ruthless criticism of incorrect ideas, through the struggle between political lines, and through the constant testing of theory in the furnace of revolutionary practice.

It is in this spirit that I respond to Godrick Namwaya's recent article, *Cadre Building, Vanguard Claims, and the Kenyan Left*.

At first reading, the article presents itself as a balanced and objective assessment of the socialist movement in Kenya. It speaks the language of neutrality. It invokes democracy, pluralism, inclusivity

and openness. Yet beneath this carefully constructed appearance lies a familiar political project. The article is not principally about the Communist Party Marxist Kenya. It is an attack on the Leninist conception of the revolutionary party. It rejects the National Democratic Revolution. It questions democratic centralism in practice. It dismisses the necessity of a disciplined communist vanguard. In short, it advances a political line fundamentally opposed to Marxism Leninism.

This should surprise no one.

Godrick Namwaya does not write as an observer standing outside the ideological struggles of the Kenyan Left. He writes as an active participant whose own political journey reflects a succession of ideological departures from Marxism Leninism. Having previously been associated with communist organisations and later embracing political tendencies fundamentally at odds with Leninism, his present critique represents not an academic inquiry but the logical outcome of a different ideological trajectory. The issue before us is therefore not the biography of one individual. The issue is the political line that biography has produced.

Political lines matter.

History has never been shaped by good intentions alone. The working class has suffered defeats not because it lacked courage but because incorrect political lines repeatedly diverted its struggles into reformism, economism, spontaneity, sectarianism, liquidationism and opportunism. Lenin devoted an entire lifetime to combating these deviations because he understood that without correct theory there can be no revolutionary movement.

Godrick's article belongs to this long tradition of revisionist criticism. Its central argument is deceptively simple. Since many organisations engage in socialist education and political activism, no organisation can legitimately claim to be systematically building the nucleus of a revolutionary vanguard. Every organisation, we are told, contributes equally to socialist politics, and therefore any assertion of ideological leadership is dismissed as sectarianism.



This argument is neither new nor scientific.  
It confuses quantity with quality.  
It confuses activism with cadre formation.  
It confuses socialist sympathy with communist organisation.

It confuses political diversity with revolutionary leadership.

Above all, it abandons the central Leninist proposition that the working class requires its own organised, disciplined, theoretically armed vanguard if it is to conquer political power.

This proposition is not an invention of the Communist Party Marxist Kenya. It is one of the foundational principles of Marxism Leninism itself.

Marx and Engels argued that the proletariat must organise itself as a class and consequently as a political party.

Lenin transformed that principle into the theory of the revolutionary vanguard.

Stalin demonstrated its necessity in socialist construction.

Mao developed it further through the Mass Line and the theory of New Democracy.

Ho Chi Minh applied it in Vietnam.

Cabral applied it in Guinea Bissau.

Thomas Sankara embodied it in Burkina Faso.

None of these revolutionaries believed that every socialist tendency occupied an equivalent historical role.

None believed that revolutionary leadership emerged spontaneously from organisational diversity.

None imagined that ideological clarity was a form of sectarianism.

They understood a simple truth.

Without a revolutionary party, there is no revolutionary movement.

Without revolutionary cadres, there is no revolutionary party.

Without scientific socialism, there is no revolutionary leadership.

Everything else follows from this fundamental principle.

The debate before us, therefore, is not whether other socialist organisations exist. They do.

The debate is whether all socialist organisations perform the same historical function.

Marxism Leninism answers that question decisively.

They do not.

## IDEAS HAVE A CLASS CHARACTER

Marxism Leninism has never analysed politics through the lens of personalities. It analyses political lines.

Individuals matter only insofar as they become representatives of definite ideological tendencies. This was the method employed by Marx against Proudhon, by Lenin against the Economists and Mensheviks, and by Mao against both Right and “Left” opportunism. The objective was never to reduce politics to biography. The objective was to expose the class content concealed within political ideas.

It is therefore impossible to understand Godrick Namwaya’s article without recognising that it represents a definite ideological tendency within the Kenyan Left.

His criticism of the Communist Party Marxist Kenya is not merely a disagreement over organisational tactics. It is a rejection of the Leninist conception of the revolutionary party itself.

His criticism of the National Democratic Revolution is not simply a debate over stages of struggle. It is a rejection of one of the central strategic conclusions developed by Marxism Leninism for colonial and semi colonial societies.

His understanding of cadre building is not merely broader than ours. It abandons the Leninist distinction between revolutionary cadres and progressive activists.

These are not isolated disagreements.

They form a coherent political line.

Throughout the history of the international communist movement, ideological departures have rarely occurred through dramatic declarations. More often, they begin with seemingly modest revisions. One concept is softened. One principle is declared outdated. One organisational requirement is dismissed as sectarian. Eventually the revolutionary core of Marxism is hollowed out while its language is retained.

This process has been described by Lenin as opportunism, not because every disagreement constitutes opportunism, but because revisionism frequently advances under the banner of flexibility, inclusivity and realism.

Godrick Namwaya’s article belongs within this historical pattern.

He assures the reader that he opposes capitalism.

He condemns imperialism.

He speaks in the language of socialism.

Yet the organisational conclusions he draws steadily weaken the very instruments through which socialism has historically been achieved.

He questions the necessity of a clearly defined revolutionary vanguard.

He reduces cadre building to a general process of socialist education undertaken by numerous organisations.

He relativises ideological differences by suggesting that competing socialist tendencies are simply alternative contributions to the same struggle.

He replaces scientific distinctions with political equivalence.

This is not Marxism Leninism.

It is organisational relativism.

History demonstrates that revolutions have never succeeded merely because many progressive organisations existed simultaneously. The Russian Revolution did not triumph because every socialist current contributed equally. The Chinese Revolution did not advance because all political tendencies possessed identical strategic value. The Cuban Revolution did not prevail because revolutionary leadership was dispersed among competing ideological centres.

In every successful revolution, one revolutionary party emerged through struggle as the organised leadership of the working class and its allies. That leadership was neither self appointed nor bestowed by commentators. It was consciously built through ideological struggle, organisational discipline, practical engagement among the masses and unwavering commitment to revolutionary objectives.

This is precisely why the question of the vanguard cannot be dismissed as an exercise in organisational vanity.

It is a question of revolutionary necessity.

To reject the necessity of a revolutionary vanguard is ultimately to reject the accumulated historical experience of the international communist movement.

The real issue before the Kenyan Left is therefore not whether multiple socialist organisations exist.

They do.

The decisive question is whether all of them embody the same theory of revolution, the same conception of party organisation, the same understanding of state power, and the same strategic road to socialism.

They do not.

It is precisely because they do not that ideological struggle is unavoidable.

The working class cannot advance by pretending

that all political lines are equally valid.

It advances by distinguishing the correct line from the incorrect line through theory, through practice and through the judgement of history.

## **GODRICK NAMWAYA'S FIRST ERROR: CONFUSING ACTIVISTS WITH CADRES**

The first and perhaps most fundamental error in Godrick Namwaya's article is his treatment of the question of cadre building.

He argues that because trade unions, student organisations, feminist organisations, community movements, historical underground formations and several socialist organisations engage in political education, no single organisation can legitimately claim to be systematically building socialist cadres.

This conclusion appears reasonable only because it rests upon an imprecise definition of what constitutes a cadre.

Marxism Leninism has never understood a cadre simply as a politically conscious activist.

Nor has it ever confused participation in progressive struggles with communist cadre formation.

The distinction is decisive.

A trade union organiser may become a cadre.

A student activist may become a cadre.

A community organiser may become a cadre.

A feminist organiser may become a cadre.

But none becomes a communist cadre merely by participating in struggle.

Cadres are consciously produced.

They are politically trained.

They are ideologically forged.

They are organisationally disciplined.

They are tested repeatedly in practical struggle.

Most importantly, they are developed within the organisational framework of a revolutionary communist party.

This distinction is not semantic.

It is one of the foundations of Leninism.

Lenin repeatedly warned that spontaneous working class struggles, however militant, do not automatically produce revolutionary socialist consciousness. Left to spontaneity, the workers' movement develops trade union consciousness, not revolutionary consciousness. Revolutionary theory must therefore be systematically introduced, assimilated and organised through the communist party.

This is precisely why communist parties establish party schools.

They establish ideological commissions.

They organise study circles.

They develop internal educational programmes.

They assign practical organisational responsibilities.

They evaluate comrades politically and organisationally.

They cultivate discipline.

They combat individualism.

They wage ideological struggle inside their own ranks.

This entire process is what Marxists call cadre development.

It is not equivalent to attending political discussions.

It is not equivalent to supporting socialist causes.

It is not equivalent to participating in demonstrations.

Godrick Namwaya dissolves this distinction completely.

By expanding the concept of cadre building to include virtually every progressive political activity, he empties the concept of all scientific meaning.

If every progressive organisation produces communist cadres, then the communist party loses its unique historical function.

If every activist is already a cadre, there is no need for systematic ideological formation.

If every socialist tendency develops equivalent revolutionary leadership, then Lenin's theory of the vanguard becomes redundant.

This is not an accidental conclusion.

It follows directly from the logic of organisational relativism.

History, however, tells a different story.

The Bolshevik Party did not produce cadres accidentally.

The Communist Party of China did not produce cadres through loose political networks.

The Communist Party of Vietnam did not develop cadres simply by encouraging activism.

The Communist Party of Cuba did not educate revolutionaries through ideological pluralism.

Every successful communist movement consciously built cadres through rigorous political education, organisational discipline, democratic centralism, criticism and self criticism, immersion among the masses and continuous revolutionary practice.

Cadres were not born.

Cadres were made.

The Communist Party Marxist Kenya approaches cadre building in precisely this tradition.

We do not confuse sympathy with commitment.

We do not confuse activism with organisation.

We do not confuse attendance with ideological development.

We understand that every communist cadre must become an organiser, an educator, an investigator, an agitator and a leader among the masses.

The objective is not merely to produce people who understand Marxism.

The objective is to produce revolutionaries capable of applying Marxism to transform society.

This is why cadre building remains one of the decisive questions in every revolution.

Revolutions do not succeed because revolutionary ideas exist.

They succeed because organised cadres carry those ideas into factories, villages, universities, trade unions, communities and every arena of class struggle.

The party without cadres is merely an association.

The movement without cadres is merely a protest.

The revolution without cadres remains only a dream.

Godrick Namwaya's argument obscures this elementary truth of Marxism Leninism.

By confusing political activism with communist cadre formation, he does not broaden the concept of revolutionary organisation.

He abolishes it.

## **THE VANGUARD IS NOT DECLARED. IT IS BUILT**

Having reduced communist cadre formation to general socialist activism, Godrick Namwaya proceeds to his second and more consequential argument. He insists that no organisation becomes the vanguard by declaring itself one. He argues that revolutionary leadership can only be earned through political practice and the confidence of the masses.

Taken in isolation, this statement appears entirely uncontroversial.

Indeed, no Marxist Leninist has ever argued that a communist party becomes the vanguard through proclamation alone.

The problem lies elsewhere.

Godrick constructs a false opposition between conscious organisation and historical validation, as though Marxist Leninists believe that revolutionary leadership is achieved by mere self description. No serious communist has ever held such a position.

The Communist Party Marxist Kenya has never claimed that history can be commanded by declaration.

We claim something entirely different.

A communist party must consciously organise itself as the revolutionary vanguard of the working class while proving that role through theory, organisation, sacrifice and practice.

These are not contradictory propositions.

They are inseparable.

The Bolsheviks did not wait until October 1917 before organising themselves as the party of the proletarian revolution.

For decades they built an organisation distinguished by ideological unity, democratic centralism, revolutionary discipline and relentless work among workers, peasants and soldiers.

When the revolutionary crisis arrived, they possessed what no other political tendency possessed.

They possessed a party capable of leading.

The Chinese Communist Party did not become the leading force because commentators eventually recognised its legitimacy.

It consciously built itself into the revolutionary leadership through years of agrarian struggle, political education, military organisation and the application of the Mass Line.

The Vietnamese Revolution followed the same path. So did the Cuban Revolution.

History does not produce revolutionary leadership spontaneously.

It rewards those organisations that prepare themselves to lead before the decisive moment arrives.

This is precisely why Lenin devoted such attention to the question of organisation.

In *What Is To Be Done?*, Lenin argued that the working class requires a disciplined revolutionary organisation capable of bringing scientific socialist consciousness into the workers' movement.

He did not argue that every socialist tendency should coexist indefinitely until history somehow selected a winner.

Nor did he argue that revolutionary leadership should emerge through ideological pluralism.

He argued for the construction of a single revolutionary party capable of leading the proletariat to state power.

This is the essence of the Leninist conception of the vanguard.

It is not arrogance.

It is responsibility.

The irony of Godrick Namwaya's article is that while criticising any organisation that claims to be building the nucleus of a vanguard, he ultimately advances his own preferred political approach as more convincing than that of the Communist Party Marxist Kenya.

This reveals an unavoidable truth.

Every political tendency believes its strategic line is correct.

Every political organisation seeks to persuade the working class that its programme offers the best path forward.

The difference is not whether one advances a political line.

The difference is whether that political line corresponds to objective reality.

Marxism Leninism has never reduced this question to individual opinion.

A correct political line is not determined by sincerity.

Nor is it determined by popularity.

It is determined by the concrete analysis of concrete conditions.

It is tested in organisation.

It is refined through criticism and self criticism.

It is verified in revolutionary practice.

This is why the Communist Party Marxist Kenya speaks of building the nucleus of the vanguard.

Not because history has already rendered its final verdict.

Not because we claim infallibility.

But because every genuine communist party worthy of the name must consciously prepare itself for the historic responsibilities that revolution demands.

A party that refuses to build itself as the future leadership of the working class has already abandoned its revolutionary mission.

One cannot prepare to lead by refusing to lead.

One cannot construct a vanguard by denying the necessity of becoming one.

The history of the international communist movement confirms a simple lesson.

The vanguard is never created by proclamation.

Neither is it created by accident.  
 It is forged through ideological struggle.  
 It is tempered through organisational discipline.  
 It is tested in the fire of class struggle.  
 It is recognised by the masses because it has first recognised its own historic responsibility.  
 This is the Leninist understanding of the vanguard.  
 It remains as relevant to the Kenyan Revolution today as it was to the Russian, Chinese, Vietnamese and Cuban revolutions in their own time.

## **THE NATIONAL DEMOCRATIC REVOLUTION IS NOT AN OPTION. IT IS A SCIENTIFIC NECESSITY**

Having questioned the Leninist conception of the vanguard, Godrick Namwaya proceeds to attack the strategic foundation of the Communist Party Marxist Kenya, namely the National Democratic Revolution.

He argues that the National Democratic Revolution artificially separates democratic and socialist tasks into successive historical stages. He further suggests that this strategy places excessive confidence in sections of the national bourgeoisie whose interests are deeply intertwined with imperialism. In contrast, he advances the view that democratic and socialist tasks should proceed simultaneously under the exclusive leadership of the working class.

This argument has a long history.

It is not unique to Kenya.

It is the classical criticism levelled against Marxism Leninism by those who reject the strategy developed by Lenin and further enriched by Stalin, Mao Zedong, Ho Chi Minh, Amílcar Cabral and numerous revolutionary movements in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

The Communist Party Marxist Kenya does not defend the National Democratic Revolution because it is an article of faith.

We defend it because it arises from the concrete analysis of Kenya's concrete conditions.

Marxism teaches that every revolution begins not with abstract formulas but with scientific investigation.

Before deciding the road to revolution one must first answer a fundamental question.

What kind of society is Kenya?

This question cannot be avoided.

Every revolutionary strategy rests upon the answer.

Kenya is not an advanced capitalist society comparable to nineteenth century Britain or twentieth century Germany.

Neither is it a socialist society undergoing internal contradictions.

Kenya remains a neo colonial social formation whose economy is subordinated to international finance capital, multinational corporations and imperialist domination. At the same time, pre capitalist relations persist in the countryside through unequal land ownership, landlordism, usury, patriarchal oppression and uneven development. These realities shape the principal contradictions confronting the Kenyan people.

To ignore these objective conditions is to substitute ideological preference for scientific analysis.

The National Democratic Revolution emerges precisely because these contradictions remain unresolved.

Its immediate historical tasks include the complete destruction of imperialist domination.

The liquidation of neo colonial rule.

The resolution of the land question.

The democratisation of political power.

The development of an independent national economy.

The completion of genuine national sovereignty.

The dismantling of comprador capitalism.

The defeat of feudal remnants.

These are not reforms within capitalism.

They are revolutionary tasks.

Yet they are tasks that create the political, economic and social conditions under which the uninterrupted advance towards socialism becomes possible.

Godrick suggests that this strategy places confidence in the national bourgeoisie.

This is a profound misunderstanding.

The National Democratic Revolution does not subordinate the working class to the bourgeoisie.

It insists that the working class must lead the revolutionary alliance.

Leadership is the decisive question.

The united front is not an alliance of equals.

It is an alliance under proletarian leadership directed against imperialism and all its domestic allies.

Marxism Leninism has never argued that every section of the national bourgeoisie is permanently revolutionary.

On the contrary.

Experience teaches that this class is unstable.  
It vacillates.

At certain moments it may oppose imperialist domination.

At other moments it compromises with imperialism to protect its own interests.

Precisely because of this instability the working class must never surrender political leadership.

It must unite where possible.

It must struggle where necessary.

It must maintain complete ideological independence throughout.

This was Lenin's position.

It was Mao's position.

It was Cabral's position.

It remains the position of the Communist Party Marxist Kenya.

History repeatedly confirms the correctness of this approach.

The Chinese Revolution succeeded not because the Communist Party dissolved itself into a broad democratic movement.

It succeeded because the Communist Party maintained independent leadership while constructing a united front against Japanese imperialism and reaction.

The Vietnamese Revolution followed the same path.

The struggles of Guinea Bissau, Mozambique and Angola all demonstrated that revolutionary alliances require proletarian leadership if they are to advance consistently.

The lesson is unmistakable.

The united front is not a surrender of principle.

It is the method through which the working class isolates the principal enemy while preserving its political independence.

The tragedy of many ultra left deviations throughout history has been their inability to distinguish between compromise and capitulation.

By rejecting every alliance they isolated themselves from the masses.

By demanding immediate socialist transformation regardless of objective conditions they mistook revolutionary impatience for revolutionary science.

Marxism Leninism rejects both opportunism and adventurism.

It advances neither class collaboration nor political isolation.

It advances revolutionary leadership rooted in a concrete analysis of concrete conditions.

The National Democratic Revolution is therefore not a postponement of socialism.

It is the historical bridge through which the oppressed classes dismantle imperialist domination, complete the democratic transformation of society and create the conditions for the uninterrupted transition to socialism.

Those who reject this strategy carry the burden of demonstrating, not merely asserting, that another path corresponds more closely to Kenya's concrete realities.

The Communist Party Marxist Kenya has chosen the road illuminated by scientific socialism.

It is a road tested in revolution.

It is a road shaped by the experience of oppressed nations.

It is a road grounded not in wishful thinking but in the material conditions of our own country.

For Kenya, the National Democratic Revolution is not one strategic option among many.

It is the necessary road to socialism.

## **THE LIBERAL THEORY OF THE LEFT: WHEN ALL POLITICAL LINES ARE TREATED AS EQUAL**

Having questioned the Leninist conception of the vanguard and rejected the National Democratic Revolution, Godrick Namwaya arrives at the logical destination of his political argument. He proposes that the future of socialism in Kenya depends less upon ideological clarity than upon democratic organisation, pluralism and the coexistence of diverse socialist tendencies.

This appears generous.

It appears democratic.

It appears tolerant.

In reality, it abandons one of the most fundamental principles of Marxism.

Marxism does not begin from the proposition that every political line possesses equal historical validity.

Marxism begins from the proposition that every political line expresses definite class interests.

Ideas are never neutral.

Politics is never neutral.

Organisation is never neutral.

Every programme answers a class question.

Every strategy answers a class question.

Every theory of revolution answers a class question.

To suggest that the various tendencies within the Kenyan Left merely represent different but equally legitimate approaches to socialism is to replace scientific socialism with ideological relativism.

History does not advance through the peaceful coexistence of political lines.

History advances through struggle.

Marx and Engels struggled against utopian socialism.

Lenin struggled against Economism, Menshevism and anarchism.

Stalin struggled against both Right opportunism and ultra Left adventurism.

Mao struggled against dogmatism and revisionism.

Cabral struggled against petty bourgeois nationalism.

None believed that the unity of the Left required silence regarding incorrect political lines.

On the contrary.

They understood that the greatest service one can render the working class is to distinguish correct ideas from incorrect ones.

This is precisely why Marxism insists upon ideological struggle.

Not because communists enjoy polemics.

But because the working class pays the price whenever incorrect political lines prevail.

The article repeatedly invokes democracy as though democracy exists above class society.

But Marxism has never understood democracy in this abstract manner.

Every democracy has a class character.

The democracy of the slave owners excluded the slaves.

The democracy of the feudal landlords excluded the peasants.

The democracy of the bourgeois republic protects private property while proclaiming formal equality.

Likewise, every revolutionary organisation possesses its own class character.

The decisive question is therefore not whether an organisation is internally democratic.

The decisive question is which class interests its democratic practice ultimately serves.

Within the communist movement, democracy has never meant the unrestricted coexistence of contradictory political lines.

It has meant democratic centralism.

It has meant vigorous internal debate followed by unity in action.

It has meant criticism and self criticism.

It has meant ideological education.

It has meant collective discipline.

Without these principles, the revolutionary party ceases to function as a unified political instrument and instead becomes a federation of competing opinions.

History has repeatedly demonstrated where such organisational liberalism leads.

It leads to fragmentation.

It leads to factionalism.

It leads to paralysis.

It leads ultimately to liquidation.

Godrick Namwaya warns against sectarianism.

Communists should indeed reject sectarianism.

Sectarianism isolates revolutionaries from the masses.

It substitutes slogans for investigation.

It mistakes organisational isolation for ideological purity.

But there exists another danger.

Liquidationism.

Liquidationism dissolves the communist party into the general Left.

It blurs ideological distinctions.

It dismisses organisational discipline.

It celebrates diversity while abandoning revolutionary coherence.

If sectarianism builds walls where bridges are necessary, liquidationism removes the foundations upon which the bridge itself must stand.

Marxism Leninism rejects both.

The Communist Party Marxist Kenya has never argued that every organisation outside our ranks is an enemy.

Nor have we claimed a monopoly over sacrifice, courage or commitment.

Many organisations have made valuable contributions to anti imperialist struggle.

Many comrades outside our Party have demonstrated remarkable dedication to the cause of social justice.

Recognition of these contributions, however, cannot require the abandonment of scientific distinctions.

To recognise diversity is not to deny hierarchy.

To recognise multiple organisations is not to deny the necessity of revolutionary leadership.

To recognise ideological debate is not to surrender the struggle for the correct political line.

Ultimately, socialism will not triumph because

every organisation feels equally affirmed.

Socialism will triumph only when the working class succeeds in building a revolutionary party capable of uniting the oppressed, defeating imperialism, smashing the neo colonial state and constructing a new political power.

History has never offered another road.

Neither does Kenya.

## **HISTORY IS THE FINAL TRIBUNAL OF REVOLUTIONARY POLITICS**

Throughout his article, Godrick Namwaya repeatedly returns to one proposition.

No organisation, he argues, can claim to be the nucleus of a revolutionary vanguard.

Very well.

Let history decide.

Marxism Leninism has never feared history.

Communists have never asked to be judged by elegant articles, eloquent speeches or academic commentary.

We ask to be judged by revolutionary practice.

The question before the Kenyan people is therefore not whether the Communist Party Marxist Kenya proclaims itself a revolutionary organisation.

The question is whether it conducts itself as one.

Does it investigate the concrete conditions of the Kenyan Revolution?

Does it produce a coherent analysis of Kenya's class structure?

Does it train cadres systematically?

Does it establish organs of political education?

Does it organise workers, peasants, youth, women and students?

Does it develop revolutionary literature rooted in the concrete realities of Kenya?

Does it practise democratic centralism?

Does it participate in the daily struggles of the oppressed?

Does it build durable organisation rather than episodic mobilisation?

These are the questions that matter.

Not slogans.

Not labels.

Not declarations.

Marxism is a science.

Science demands evidence.

The Communist Party Marxist Kenya has never argued that revolutionary leadership can be achieved

through rhetoric.

Leadership must be built patiently.

One cadre at a time.

One branch at a time.

One struggle at a time.

One generation at a time.

Every genuine communist understands this.

The Bolsheviks spent decades preparing before October.

The Chinese Communists marched thousands of kilometres before victory.

The Vietnamese revolutionaries endured generations of war before liberation.

No serious revolutionary expected history to reward impatience.

History rewards organisation.

History rewards discipline.

History rewards political clarity.

Godrick Namwaya invites the Kenyan Left to embrace organisational pluralism as though plurality itself constitutes revolutionary strength.

But Marxism asks a different question.

Can multiple competing political lines simultaneously lead one revolution?

History answers in the negative.

Every successful revolution eventually resolved the struggle over political leadership.

Not through administrative decree.

Not through moral superiority.

But through political practice.

Through ideological struggle.

Through organisational development.

Through the confidence won among the masses.

The question is therefore not whether different socialist organisations should exist.

History itself has produced diverse tendencies within the socialist movement.

The decisive question is whether all political lines equally advance the revolutionary interests of the working class.

Marxism Leninism answers clearly.

They do not.

Some political lines strengthen the revolutionary movement.

Others divert it into reformism.

Some cultivate revolutionary discipline.

Others elevate organisational looseness into principle.

Some prepare the working class to conquer state power.



Others reconcile it to permanent opposition.  
These distinctions are not matters of temperament.  
They are matters of historical consequence.  
For this reason, the Communist Party Marxist Kenya  
neither fears nor avoids ideological struggle.  
We welcome it.  
Every criticism compels us to sharpen our theory.  
Every debate compels us to deepen our investigation.  
Every challenge compels us to test our political line  
against reality.  
This is how Marxism develops.  
Not through silence.  
Not through mutual flattery.  
But through principled struggle over ideas.  
History will not ask who wrote the cleverest article.  
History will not ask who appeared the most moderate.  
History will not ask who accumulated the greatest  
number of social media followers.  
History will ask a different question.  
Which political line organised the working class?  
Which political line united the poor peasantry?  
Which political line defeated imperialism?  
Which political line dismantled neo colonialism?  
Which political line built the revolutionary organisation  
capable of transforming Kenya?  
That is the only verdict that matters.  
The Communist Party Marxist Kenya has chosen  
to place its confidence not in fashionable opinion,  
nor in intellectual approval, but in the organised  
power of the working class, the poor peasantry and  
all oppressed masses under the leadership of a disciplined  
Marxist Leninist Party.  
History will judge every organisation.  
History will judge every political line.  
History has always been the final tribunal.  
And before that tribunal, no one receives special  
pleading.  
Only practice speaks.  
Only struggle decides.  
Only revolution delivers its verdict.  
Forward to the National Democratic Revolution.  
Forward to Socialism.  
Forward to the Revolutionary Unity of the Kenyan  
Working Class.

# Eritrea, liberated from colonialism, stands upright

Jozef Bossuyt | Communist Party of Belgium

“A people who do not know their history and culture are like a tree without roots,” says an Eritrean proverb. Eritrea and its people do have those roots: firmly anchored in a long, complex history.

After the end of Italian colonialism (1941), Eritrea became the object of international deals. First under British rule, then in a federation with Ethiopia (1952–1962) which was eventually abolished. Eritrea lost all constitutional status and was downgraded to the status of a province of the Ethiopian Empire. The rights of the people did not count. The country was treated as geopolitical prey.

When peaceful struggle proved impossible, Hamid Idris Awate started the armed liberation struggle in 1961. The Thirty Years’ War (1961–1991) evolved rapidly thanks to young people who shaped the EPLF: revolutionary, pragmatic and focused on both military liberation and social transformation. In the liberated territories, the Tsegadelti built schools, hospitals, workshops, and even printing plants—an embryonic state that proved that independence was not a dream but a concrete project.

Ethiopia received support from major powers—but despite napalm, cluster bombs and massive repression, the DERG regime never broke Eritrean resistance. Major battles such as Afabet (1988) and Operation Fenkil (1990) eventually led to the liberation of Asmara on May 24, 1991. Menghistu fled; Eritrea was actually free. In 1993, a referendum unanimously confirmed independence.

However, the peace was short. In 1998, the new Ethiopian leadership unleashed a border war. Despite international rulings, Addis Ababa continued to refuse to apply them, leading to twenty years of “neither war nor peace”, diplomatic isolation and heavy sanctions. Eritrea once again opted for self-reliance: dams, reforestation, water basins, and ecological development constituted an impressive program of endogenous progress.

In 2018, the peace agreement with Abiy Ahmed brought a temporary thaw and the lifting of sanctions. But after the Tigray conflict, Ethiopia returned to hostile politics, partly stimulated by external actors. Nevertheless, Eritrea is once again on the international stage today as a crucial factor of stability in the Horn of Africa, with renewed diplomatic relations and regional security role, including in Somalia and Sudan.

Decades after Aware’s first shots, Eritrea remains upright. The struggle has changed—from liberation to development and diplomacy—but the core remains the same: freedom is not a gift, but the result of self-sacrifice and indestructible unity. Today, it is building a society in which social justice and economic progress prevail despite the permanent threats from Ethiopia.

Eritrea is nevertheless a source of stability in the turbulent region of the Red Sea and the Horn of Africa. Countries that are under heavy pressure from imperialism, such as Sudan, can rely on Eritrea’s support.

Eritrea is not a socialist country. How could that be? The workers represent only 7% of the population, which consists mainly of small farmers. The national bourgeoisie is also limited in number. The EPLF, Eritrea’s unity party, strives for the greatest possible social equality, taking into account the country’s limited degree of development. The people enjoy the beginnings of social welfare, health care and education are virtually free. Eritrea does support the countries that oppose US imperialism. On March 2, 2022, the UN General Assembly voted on the US proposal of sanctions against Russia. 5 countries voted against: the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Eritrea, Syria, Belarus and Russia. Eritrea is sometimes called “the North Korea of Africa”.

Eritrea is hardly known in Belgium. Until a few years ago, there was a huge media campaign against

the country. Completely absurd. The reason was the many refugees from Eritrea, especially well-educated young people who were lured to the West to undermine the country. Young people (especially from the middle class) feared conscription because of the impending war with Ethiopia.

Those young people were quickly disillusioned in the West. But fortunately they were well taken care of mostly by the Eritrean diaspora who live in many countries such as the Netherlands, Germany, Italy, the Scandinavian countries. That diaspora that emerged from the years 1961 to 1991 in a period when Ethiopia was waging a terrible war in Eritrea to prevent its liberation. That diaspora is massively behind Eritrea and its President Afwerki.

# Support Venezuela after earthquake, free Maduro and Cilia, stop US war attack

Jozef Bossuyt | Communist Party of Belgium

The Belgian Committee for Peace in Venezuela, Latin America and the Caribbean, organizing meetings in Brussels to support Venezuela, states:

“The aggression against Venezuela is not new and has not begun with Donald Trump. Earlier there was an attempted coup against President Hugo Chávez in 2002. Barack Obama declared Venezuela in 2015 to be « a brutal and extraordinary threat ». The governments of the United States have imposed more than 1000 unilateral coercive measures (« sanctions »). In 2018, an attempt was made to assassinate President Nicolás Maduro. In 2019, an attempt was made to appoint a puppet president. In the same year, a failed invasion also took place.

The criminal military aggression carried out by Donald Trump’s genocidal administration against Venezuela on January 3, 2026, has claimed more than a hundred lives, including Venezuelan and Cuban civilians and military personnel. During the attack, President Nicolás Maduro and first lady Cilia Flores were scandalously kidnapped, which is a blatant violation of international law and the Charter of the United Nations.

Donald Trump’s administration has encouraged this colonial and mafia expedition to get their hands on the world’s largest oil reserve. Trump has indicated that his administration’s next targets are Cuba, Mexico and Colombia, reviving the Monroe Doctrine, which aims to control the Western Hemisphere, and indeed the entire world.

In Europe, there is a lot of talk about the ‘opposition leader’ Maria Corina Machado. She is in reality a vassal of Trump and a convinced anti-Palestinian one. As a member of the radical right, which can be described as fascist, she demands more sanctions against her own people, she has asked for her own country to be bombed without thinking about the hundreds of people who would die in the process, she is in favor of the privatization of resources such as petroleum, and she has been awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 2025! In 2026, she shamefully handed the Nobel Peace Prize to Donald Trump, leading

to condemnations worldwide. This criminal does not actually enjoy any support in her country, and Donald Trump knows that all too well. He will use all means to achieve his goal. Not only to appropriate Venezuelan oil, but also to destroy the hopeful experiment of the Bolivarian revolution.

Let us support the Venezuelan people in their resistance to this despicable imperialist attack.”

## Venezuela Rodriguez current politics

For her first foreign visit, on April 9, 2026, Venezuela’s acting president, Delcy Rodriguez, visited Grenada to meet Prime Minister Dickon Mitchell and explore with him sectors of cooperation including oil, education, air and sea transport. Rodriguez thus confirms the fundamental orientation of Bolivarian diplomacy, which prioritizes relations with the countries of the Caribbean: “We have set the date for the launch of a comprehensive cooperation program that is likely to integrate other Caribbean countries”

Before taking the plane, the president addressed the Venezuelan people in a public speech. She first took an overview of a decade of economic blockade by the United States and the European Union, and then made the following announcements:

1. Ban on the privatization of hydrocarbons and thus of the state oil company PDVSA. Hydrocarbons remain public property, in accordance with the Constitution.
2. Overall, controlled and sustainable wage increase from May 1, Workers’ Day, linked to the new partially released hydrocarbon revenues.
3. Demand for the “social protection system” and the “pay-as-you-go pension system” as they “coined by Comandante Chávez”.
4. Gradual restoration of the balance of the pay-as-you-go pension system—“pierced” by sanctions—through the reconstruction of the “legal concept” of wages and therefore of workers’ contributions, which are also “pierced” by the blockade.
5. Proposal for the reform of the real estate market to recover about 500,000 unoccupied homes, with

“guarantees from the Venezuelan state” so that they are made available to young people and young families.

6. The eventual recovery of “assets and resources blocked abroad”—through the lifting of certain sanctions—will be invested directly in the productive economy.

7. Launch of a two-week national and international campaign to demand the lifting of all unilateral coercive measures imposed by the US and the EU.

All of these announcements are contingent on the lifting—especially by the United States—of all the horrific sanctions that have burdened the country over the past decade. This is what the government and the Venezuelans themselves are demanding. The new organic law on hydrocarbons was wrongly presented by some people as a privatization of oil, when it is not.

“Yes, the law facilitates certain types of contracts with the private sector that Venezuela was already using to circumvent the blockade, especially with China.

“No, it does not take away the exclusivity of the state over the final decisions and sovereignty over oil resources. Article 40, which recalls that ‘the Republic shall retain ownership of hydrocarbon deposits.’ This also referred to the country’s constitution (which has not been amended) in Articles 302 and 303, which reserve the oil business as well as ‘all the shares of PDVSA’ to the state”.

“Yesterday, the president not only cut off any debate on the privatization of hydrocarbons, which will not take place. And she has repeated it several times since January 3. Because on the other hand, there is the famous ‘Nobel Peace Prize Winner’ that campaigns for a pure and hard privatization of PDVSA and national strategic assets.

“The anti-Delcy campaign led by Washington consisted mainly of symbolically humiliating her, presenting her as submissive and under command. But the constitutional order has not changed one iota since January 3. And saying this does not detract from the observation of the enormous pressure under which the country finds itself...”

Two major earthquakes that rocked Venezuela on 24 June 2026 left thousands of children in need of safe shelter, clean water and urgent care. UNICEF

has scaled up an emergency response, working alongside the Government of Venezuela and other humanitarian partners to reach children and their families with healthcare and nutrition support, water and sanitation, and psychosocial and protection services. The World Food Programme (WFP) is on the ground in Venezuela, providing logistics, food and other assistance. Many countries, from South America and elsewhere have sent donations, materials and teams of engineers, doctors and construction specialists to Venezuela. The US have sent soldiers, with the intention to stay in Venezuela.

# The Road Is Broad and Deep, and We Are Moving Toward It: The Socialist Revolution

Néstor Guadaño | Unión Proletaria (Spain)

After sharing experiences for decades, I consider it appropriate to point out several clear ideas that can help us formulate a more advanced ideological concretization, drawing on historical materialism.

## The Ideological Repression of Khrushchev

This new internal process within the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, following Stalin's death, produced several verified developments in the years that followed:

- A gradual distancing of workers from the defense of socialist society. At first, this manifested itself little by little, in the face of their failure to understand the political and economic measures adopted by the new government, which became one of the principal causes of the decline in support for the Party.

- After the first few years had passed, a manifest distrust developed when people realized that there were profound differences between words and deeds. While Socialism was being spoken of, capitalist norms and directives were being introduced, such as the growth of a legal and illegal market.

- From 1953 onward, the path toward the construction of communism in the USSR was objectively being lost, because the class struggle unleashed against Khrushchev's measures in every sphere of social life consequently drove away the most committed workers, who understood the necessity of proletarian control over production in the factories.

If we consider the fundamental ideological aspects of this destruction, we can see that, in determining how capitalism was restored in the USSR, we must recognize that an essential regression took place, because progress toward communism requires the primacy of politics over economics during the period of transition from capitalism to communism, and not the reverse.

In the present era, the unquestionable power that the great corporations of imperialism exercise over states is based on the consolidation of an economy of plunder and accumulation, independently of the

will of the entire population. The population is compelled to follow these relations of production like a flock following its shepherd, without understanding where they are leading it. Primitive social instincts, reflections of the struggle for material interests, are systematically channeled.

The social conflicts that arose from this, at the dawn of previous centuries, gave rise in the minds of all workers to the basic necessity of using class-against-class violence when the state imposes the power of the oligarchy by using the forces of "public order."

At the same time, there is a crushing of the consciousness of the oppressed through persistent propaganda by the bourgeois state under imperialism, as a form of ideological domination and justification of private property, exploitation, and violence.

As Friedrich Engels correctly noted:

"Why do we struggle for the political dictatorship of the proletariat, if political power is economically impotent? Force (that is, state power) is also an economic power!"

(Letter to K. Schmidt, October 27, 1890).

For all these reasons, Lenin, refuting Trotsky and Bukharin, explained:

"Politics cannot but have primacy over economics. To argue otherwise is to forget the ABC of Marxism."

("Once Again on the Trade Unions, the Current Situation and the Mistakes of Trotsky and Bukharin").

Thus, the principal cause of the restoration of capitalism in the USSR was the loss of the political power of the proletariat, that is, of the dictatorship of the working class over the rise of the capitalist bourgeoisie. In order to achieve this, the revisionists first had to dismantle the instrument of the working class: the Party. Since, during the socialist period of the first stage toward communism, the development or regression of the Party is the principal lever determining its continuation. There can be no other social force capable of governing the state and leading it toward communism.

First, in order to maintain power, the support and organization of the working class are necessary, as is its integration into the governance of the state, promoting socialist measures to consolidate this objective, while also consolidating its integration into its vanguard organization: the Party.

Second, communist society is put into practice through the conclusions of scientific materialism, through the transition from the objectives already achieved toward their fulfillment, and this means that a Marxist-Leninist party is needed to guide society.

Both one and the other are a necessary consequence. A large majority of the Bolshevik vanguard in the time of Comrade Stalin was aware that raising the level of class consciousness of the proletariat was strategically important for the future of socialism. This firm conviction stems from the fact that the Marxist worldview, both before and now, has not become, within the thinking of workers, their principal aspiration in life and for the future.

Consequently, if the Party loses authority, if it loses the capacity to provide guidance on every important political, economic, and cultural question, if it falls into a unilateral practice of coercion, then the system of the dictatorship of the working class is degraded.

After Stalin's death, in the CPSU, militants who warned about the danger of opportunism and about the objective law of revolutionary struggle concerning the irreconcilability of ideologies were removed. In this way, the revisionist leaders who carried out the coup d'état encouraged the idea that factionalism should be regarded as a mere insignificant disagreement in the understanding of Marxism, a peculiar acceptance of points of view. Opportunism within the CPSU itself sank up to its ears into the mire leading to the destruction of the Soviet Union.

### **Anti-Marxist Approaches**

Thus, the erroneous political and economic measures taken by the revisionist majority of the Party in the 1960s caused a considerable loss of the Party's authority among young people and the workers' vanguard. It was the genuine collapse of the dictatorship of the working class.

However, the history of this collapse within the CPSU demonstrated that, in the USSR, the defense of the socialist regime was such a powerful social inertia that even a politician as insignificant as Gorbachev had to make use of that defense in order to

destroy it. The prestige of the CPSU, despite all the flagrant sabotage carried out by Khrushchev and his successors, from Brezhnev and Andropov and their accomplices to Gorbachev, remained; the Soviet people retained their identification with support for socialism even at the beginning of the 1990s.

The activity of the Party as the leading force of the dictatorship of the working class is paramount in relation to politics, strategic objectives, tactics, and day-to-day work. When this social penetration is gradually pushed aside, the understanding of Marxism-Leninism is discredited. Indeed, there is an ideological and theoretical weakening of the authority of materialist ideology and the Party, and of the monolithic scientific coherence between Marxist theory and practice.

Khrushchev and his followers caused a profound social rupture. They introduced anti-socialist reforms, both ideological and economic, that consciously undermined the foundations of the future path toward communism in the USSR. They introduced decrees promoting the market, such as the transfer of machinery from the MTS to collective farms, the autonomous management of state enterprises by their directors without workers' control, the destruction of the 1948 reforestation plan, the reform of all the principles in 1957, etc.

These series of actions stemmed from a single process: the "construction of the cult of personality of I. V. Stalin." By eliminating the practical and ideological foundations of Marxism-Leninism, Khrushchev's sabotage of the path toward communism restructured the social consciousness and ethics of the Party. It completely disrupted an intelligentsia that was already ideologically weak, and undermined the authority of communism and the unity of the communist parties of the world.

But this was insufficient for the restoration of capitalism in the USSR. It was therefore necessary to form a bourgeois class from within the enterprises. Curricula were changed, and slogans of class conciliation were disseminated, such as "social peace with the imperialists and inhibition in the face of any revolutionary process of the peoples." Arguments for a return to the market and intellectual imitation of Western capitalism were recurrent and highly damaging to the class consciousness of the people.

Once this bourgeois ideology had been elevated within the Party leadership, the process led to social demobilization, control of enterprises by the various

mafias of their directors, and the emergence of the exclusive, mediocre bourgeois intellectual elite of the 1970s. These became the trigger for the final coup of 1991, which was inevitable.

**But in This Century, Humanity Has No Other Way Out Than Communism; the Incredible Achievements of Socialist Construction in the USSR Demonstrate This**

The victorious period of this construction demonstrated that the subjective factor of the revolution can be considered mature if, at the head of the Party, there are leaders who master Marxism-Leninism and apply it skillfully in organizational practice directed toward our class and revolutionary thought.

The post-Stalin period of the existence of the CPSU demonstrated that if a Marxist party, under conditions of a capitalist environment, does not work with sufficient intensity on its revolutionary formation through the empowerment of the working class, as was done in the time of Lenin and Stalin, the construction of communism stagnates and, ultimately, the Party is degraded and destroyed.

And this is precisely because alongside Lenin and Stalin worked loyal comrades who shared the same class criteria around them, thereby multiplying their strength. Alongside Lenin, Stalin himself was the most steadfast innovator, enjoying Lenin's complete confidence, together with Sverdlov, Krupskaya, Dzerzhinsky, and many others. Subsequently, from the ideological and political team during Stalin's time, great activists such as Kirov, Zhdanov, Molotov, and Malenkov emerged, despite all the blows directed against the working class and the revolutionary Party.

It must be clearly emphasized that the cause of the restoration of capitalism in the USSR was the incompetence of the members of the CPSU, since they did not develop the torch that illuminates humanity and did not carry the name of the Party toward the practical construction of communism.

Yes! It has been tragic for all of us that the USSR returned to capitalism.

But this has happened before. Along the path traveled by the oppressed, there have also been periods of time in which the march toward their emancipation stopped and even retreated, moving from a new structure back toward an older, destructive one.

Along this path of human history, communism was already something primordial and natural, and existed in primitive form. As consciousness advances

in this century, communism will move to another qualitatively higher level. If progress toward communist society was not developed in the previous stage together with the USSR, with the full development of its productive forces, then with the advancement of new forces added to communism, it will be achieved through the combined abundance of all the highest productive forces and the eradication of capitalism and imperialism.

It cannot be otherwise. These corrupt societies, which are devouring themselves, will be destroyed because at the heart of this social system lies an insoluble contradiction: the private form of ownership and appropriation of socially necessary labor contradicts the social-collective character of production, which is incompatible with the all-powerful imperialist power.

The social-collective character of production under the imperialist system can find a way out only if there is an absolute change in the paradigm of power, only if there is a transition from private property to the collective social ownership of the producers, the innovative creators, and the oppressed, through the socialist revolution.

The road is broad and deep, and there is only one.

**Toward a Communist Society, Through the First Phase of Communism: Socialism!**

We know this. We have tried to describe in detail the stages, the causes, and the solution. The current reactionary imperialist system is a temporary phenomenon.

**Victory Will Belong to the Working Class, Because Communism Is the Future of Humanity!**



# The ongoing Pakistan-Afghanistan war

Communist Party of Great Britain (Marxist-Leninist)

Whilst most western observers have remained focused on the US-Israeli imperialist war on Iran and its increasing consequences for the global economy, little attention has been paid to another ongoing war that broke out at around the same time (ie, towards the end of February this year)—the war between Afghanistan and Pakistan.

This is a war about which virtually nothing is reported in the British media, despite having given rise already to hundreds of civilian deaths and the displacement of thousands from their homes—on both sides of the border. The Pakistani side has the backing of US imperialism, which is still licking its wounds from having been defeated militarily and driven out of Afghanistan by the Taliban. Most other countries, including China and Russia, are calling for a ceasefire and for peace talks to mediate the causes of conflict between the two sides.

## Afghanistan's war-torn half century

Pakistan and Afghanistan have a few things in common: they are both conservative, near-exclusively muslim nations in central/southern Asia. Arguably, they both also share a somewhat uncalled-for highly negative reputation in Britain. In Afghanistan's case this is due to years of chauvinist media propaganda designed to justify the 20-year Anglo-American occupation of Afghanistan, whilst in Pakistan's case the negative portrayal stems from racist propaganda against the large Pakistani ethnic minority that call this country home.

However, despite frequently being lumped together by chauvinists as 'muslim terrorist countries', in reality these two states have very different histories and societies. Afghanistan's history is closely linked to central Asia and it consists of a myriad of different ethnic groups, the largest being the Pashtuns, closely followed by Tajiks.

The region was only briefly formally colonised by the British Empire (1839-42) and successfully fought a number of wars with the British to retain a de-facto independence throughout the 19th century, although its rulers were forced to accept significant British influence over the government until 1919, when the

country secured full independence under a monarchical regime.

The monarchy lasted until 1973, when it was overthrown by an internal coup and a republican system was declared. In 1978, a Marxist-Leninist uprising led by the PDPA-Khalq took over the country and founded a socialist state aligned with the Soviet Union. A massive social upheaval followed and a counter-revolution quickly broke out with the backing of exploiter elements in the countryside who were opposed to socialist land reform aimed at distributing land to the peasants and the outlawing of usury.

The exploiters were able to mobilise the deeply religious rural masses against what was presented to them as the rapid secularisation of the country. At the invitation of the elected Afghan government, the Soviet Union intervened militarily in 1979, replacing the PDPA-Khalq with the PDPA-Parcham (an opposing faction of Afghan communists which was more moderate/revisionist than the Khalq), whilst US imperialism seized the opportunity to turn the rebel 'mujahideen' (islamic religious warriors) into a cause célèbre, funnelling huge amounts of weapons and fighters into the conflict to try to bring down the communist government.

Throughout the ten-year conflict, the staunch Marxist-Leninist principles of the original 1978 revolution were gradually diluted as the government struggled to find a way of ending the civil war through compromise with its enemies. The Soviet army withdrew in 1989, having failed to defeat the rebellion, whilst the government abandoned all remaining references to Marxism in 1990.

Following the dissolution of the USSR at the end of 1991, the socialist government in Kabul finally collapsed and infighting between rival warlords wracked the country until the ultra-conservative muslim 'Taliban' movement took control in 1996.

The Taliban, while initially prepared to make deals with the United States, proved not to be pliant enough for Washington and were overthrown by the US imperialist-led invasion of 2001. They went on to fight a 20-year guerrilla war against the imperialist occupation, in which they ultimately emerged vic-

torious following the final departure of imperialist troops in 2021.

The United States spent at least \$3tn fighting this protracted conflict in pursuit of its geostrategic aims. Afghanistan's importance comes principally from its geographical location. On the one hand it is the lynchpin of the central Asian states, which Zbigniew Brzezinsky referred to as the 'central Asian Balkans' and considered pivotal to the domination of the wider region. Besides this is its proximity to Russia, China, the central Asian republics and the oil-rich Caspian region—a combination that has given the country a significance out of all proportion to the seeming poverty of its people and apparent size of its economy.

Hamid Karzai, the puppet installed as 'president' by the United States from 2002-14, was notorious for his corruption, as the proxy of the US army of occupation. The atrocities of the US and Nato forces were heinous and the only lasting legacy, aside from the astronomic profits of the military-industrial complex and the USA's mounting foreign debt, has been the ever deepening impoverishment of the Afghan people.

Since 2021, Afghanistan has been run effectively as an Islamic theocracy led by the Taliban.

Afghanistan's strategic location, lying across key trade routes at the heart of central Asia, and its rebellious and fiercely patriotic population, make it imperative for imperialism to keep the country in a constant state of disorder and turmoil. Only in this way can the imperialists continue to benefit from untrammelled access to the Afghan people's land and resources.

It is worth noting also that the Afghan-Pakistan border (known as the Durand Line), like so many borders drawn up by the imperialists in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, was deliberately designed to provoke future division and conflict by cutting Pash-tun tribal lands in half, separating people from their families and ancestral lands.

Successive Afghan governments have protested this issue and requested a review of the border, but all attempts have been stonewalled by the international courts, which insist that the lopsided agreements forced upon the 19th-century Afghan rulers by the British empire must remain in force.

This issue remains a further thorn in Afghanistan's relations with its southeastern neighbour.

Pakistan's military theocracy

Pakistan, by contrast, is a very new south Asian country. Its population consists of Muslims from across the former British Raj who were encouraged by imperialism to split off violently from India in 1947 and form their own Muslim-majority country. Despite the near-constant political tension with India, from a cultural, historical and linguistic perspective Pakistanis are much more similar to Indians than to any of their other neighbours.

In contrast to the tumultuous politics of its north-western neighbour, Pakistan has retained the veneer of a relatively stable republican system since its foundation in 1947. In reality, underlying this veneer is a de facto military dictatorship that has ruled the country from the day of its independence to the present, and which dominates every aspect of economic and political life.

Whenever a civilian administration has stepped out of line in Islamabad, the country's apparent 'democracy' has been punctuated by a succession of military coups. When Imran Khan made unacceptably anti-imperialist statements concerning the independence of Pakistan from Anglo-American imperialism, he was unconstitutionally removed from power, his party prevented from standing in elections that it was expected to win, and their leader locked up. He continues to languish behind bars.

The relative stability of Pakistan, aside from its status as a nuclear-armed regional power, is in all likelihood derived from the fact that its elite class has been closely and comfortably intertwined with Washington for most of the country's existence. Pakistan consistently aligned with US imperialism during the cold war, and it was the primary conduit for the weapons and fighters that were sent to the Mujahideen rebellion in Afghanistan during the 1980s.

In essence, Pakistan serves as a regional enforcer for Anglo-American imperialism, similar to the role played by some African countries like Rwanda, Kenya or Nigeria. Indeed, being a country whose very existence was essentially the result of a British imperialist plot to divide and weaken south Asian resistance to imperialism, it was perhaps inevitable that Pakistan would adopt such a role.

### **Pakistan continues to act as a proxy for Anglo-American imperialism**

Understanding this role of Pakistan sheds a new light on the current situation. In February 2026,

Pakistan launched large-scale strikes on supposed ‘militant camps’ in Afghanistan, claiming ‘self-defence’ against an alleged ‘terror threat’ from anti-Pakistan jihadist militants said to be attacking from bases in Afghanistan. Reports from Afghanistan suggested that a number of civilian targets were hit, and the Afghan military responded with tit-for-tat strikes against Pakistani military installations.

Fighting has since escalated, with Pakistan declaring ‘open war’ against the Taliban government. Since then, Pakistan has been launching near-continuous air strikes on Afghan soil, whilst Afghanistan has been hitting back with drone and artillery attacks.

Whilst no western country has openly backed Pakistan in the conflict, it is clear from reading between the lines that Pakistan has imperialism’s blessing in its bid to punish Afghanistan—a sovereign, fully independent nation run by a patriotic government that, whatever one may think of its ideology, successfully inflicted a humiliating defeat on the imperialists in 2021 that the latter are thirsty to avenge.

The European Union issued a statement calling for “de-escalation” from all sides, whilst specifically calling on Kabul to “take effective action against all terrorist groups operating in or from Afghanistan”—in essence repeating Islamabad’s position on the causes of the conflict.

What little western media coverage has been devoted to the war is noticeably slanted in favour of Pakistan. The Afghan side is routinely delegitimised and referred to merely as ‘the Taliban’, as if Kabul were being represented by a mere rebel group rather than a sovereign national government (not unlike the consistent delegitimation of the Yemeni national government in Sanaa as ‘Houthi rebels’).

Little effort is made to search for the truth when Pakistani claims of striking ‘terrorist camps’ collide with Afghan insistence that mosques and civilian homes are being hit, but there is unanimous condemnation of supposed Afghan human rights violations like ‘forced recruitment by the Taliban’—ie, military conscription by a national government when the country is under attack, a policy that dozens of countries practise, including many European ones.

In a chilling resemblance to the Zionists’ actions in Gaza, a Pakistani air strike on 16 March struck a hospital and killed at least 269 people, according to the United Nations. Whilst receiving some limited coverage in the western press owing to the sheer scale of the massacre, there was virtually no western con-

demnation of Pakistan for committing such a savage war crime—a clear signal that this ‘Pakistani’ war is really an imperialist war outsourced to a regional lackey, much like the so-called ‘Saudi’ war on independent Yemen.

Another feature that characterises this war is the presence of non-state actors on both sides, particularly the Afghan side. Being an isolated and sanctioned country, Afghanistan cannot match the conventional firepower of imperialist-backed Pakistan. However, owing to the shared religious and ethnic bonds with devout Muslims in Pakistan, particularly from the Pashtun minority, many militant groups in Pakistan have actively taken up arms against their own country’s military in defence of the Afghan people.

Complicating the situation further, some of these groups are indeed groups that are historically associated with violent takfiri ideology. One of the most prominent of these appears to be the Tehrik-e-Taliban Pakistan (TTP), a group historically associated with brutal mass-casualty terrorist attacks against civilians such as the infamous 2014 attack on a school in Peshawar—although some sources suggest the group may have moved away from such tactics following years of factional infighting and leadership changes.

On the other hand, Afghanistan’s various rump factions of imperialist-backed ‘freedom fighters’ led by apparatchiks from the former US occupation regime have refused to back the Taliban government in the face of the aggression, blaming Kabul for supposedly ‘provoking’ the conflict. In addition, whilst no longer the major threat that it was a few years ago, the US-backed Isis-K takfiri terrorist group remains in the shadows, ready to be re-activated by its imperialist patrons whenever it is deemed necessary.

It is clear that the war between Afghanistan and Pakistan is incapable of benefiting either country. Pakistan started the war, but financing it will undoubtedly increase its debt bondage to its western lenders, which even before the war was lying heavily and unsustainably on the country’s economy.

Although Afghanistan is better able to minimise its military expenditure, the wealth being squandered would be put to much better use improving the standard of living of its people.

In the circumstances, one cannot but conclude that Pakistan is being used as an instrument for US imperialism to wreak its revenge on an Afghan government that humiliated it.

# The example of dignity and struggle set by the people of Iran

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

The viability of a state that has emerged from an anti-imperialist and/or socialist revolution demonstrates the breadth and depth of the revolutionary process that shaped it, and the popular support that continues to drive its development. The greatest test—even greater than the long-standing economic blockade—is the large-scale offensive by the leading powers of the imperialist axis. This has turned this revolutionary state and its allies into a pivotal theatre of military operations in a world war. The effectiveness of defence and counter-attack strategies hinges heavily on socio-economic, technological and scientific self-sufficiency, but also on the military, cultural, moral, political, organisational and ideological strength of a society and its state, as well as the effective utilisation of international leverage.

The attack by the forces of the ‘United Europe’ under Nazi Germany against the USSR in 1941 demonstrated the then inexhaustible potential of the Great October Socialist Revolution. The triumphant—albeit Pyrrhic—anti-fascist victory in 1945, with the decisive contribution of the Red Army, served to revitalise and enhance the power of the socialist revolution and the influence of early socialism. This victory heralded a series of new anti-imperialist, anti-colonial, national liberation and early socialist revolutions. The organic connection between all these diverse forms of revolutionary processes—particularly in the context of a world war—is law-governed within the logic of the history of the unified global revolutionary process, even if the leading figures of each period and the states that emerge from them sometimes have tense and even hostile relations with one another.

The Islamic Republic of Iran emerged from the Great Anti-Imperialist Revolution of 1979. It has been subjected to long-standing imperialist sanctions and is currently facing its third wave of brutal attacks within a year from the US and the Zionist colonial entity (a proxy instrument of the most aggressive circles of the imperialist financial oligarchy, along with the propped up and/or controlled by the axis

Arab monarchies and other ‘willing’ parties, such as Greece’s servile political establishment). These proxy bodies provide full support and assistance to imperialist aggression through the direct involvement of their armed forces, as well as unreserved support for US and other imperialist powers’ military bases, by providing their energy infrastructure, territory, territorial waters and ‘national’ airspace, over which they are supposed to exercise air traffic control via the FIR.

Iran has exposed the imperialists’ deception. For decades after World War II, they have been peddling ‘protection’ while establishing deadly military bases and occupation forces in dozens of countries. At the same time, they have passed on the cost of these bases, ‘protection’ and exorbitantly expensive weapons systems to the occupied countries. Iran’s epic counter-offensive has demonstrated that in this type of WWII, ‘protection’ literally amounts to a date with death as it makes these countries targets for the forces rightfully striking back at the enemy and its bases.

Iran’s resolute defence and epic, victorious counterattacks have delivered devastating blows of unparalleled strategic importance to the vanguard of the attacking forces of the axis in this theatre of operations, across an ever-widening front. The US and Israel appear to have become embroiled in a conflict that they are struggling to sustain (due to the depletion of their financial, industrial, technological, and other reserves and capabilities), whilst also finding it difficult to withdraw without suffering the stigma of a humiliating defeat.

Ukraine’s Nazi proxy entity’s increasingly more direct involvement in the theatre of operations in West and Central Asia (with 200 unmanned aerial vehicle specialists deployed to defend axis allies among the Gulf monarchies, and most recently an attack on an Iranian merchant ship in the Caspian Sea, with the official pretext being ‘the provision of satellite assistance by Russia to Iran’) signals:

1. The organic link between these theatres of World War III operations AND

2. The escalation of the conflict across all active and potential theatres of operations and fronts.

The funeral of Iran's brutally murdered supreme leader and the members of his family—martyrs of imperialist aggression—turned into the largest mass anti-imperialist demonstration in history. Combined with the Iranians' increasingly resolute and effective counter-offensive against the successive waves of murderous attacks by the Axis, this massive, militant mobilisation and determination of the Iranian people demonstrates not only the sustainability, but also the revival and strengthening of the power of the Iranian anti-imperialist revolution and its influence within the Axis of Resistance and the global anti-imperialist movement.

The Iranian people's resolute and victorious struggle has already taken its place alongside the heroic struggle of the Vietnamese people. It constitutes a source of hope and inspiration, a model of struggle and dignity, for all peoples, for every progressive individual!

# The Full-Scale Intensification of World War 3 Through the Expansion of Wars and the Convergence of Battlefronts

Stephen Cho | Coordinator of the Korean International Forum

August 31, 2026

The flames of World War 3 ignited by imperialism are growing ever fiercer. The situation is moving toward the full-scale intensification of World War 3 through the expansion of wars and the convergence of battlefronts. In Eastern Europe, the war in Ukraine broke out in February 2022, while the West Asian war was shifted in February 2026 from being centered on the war in Palestine that began in October 2023 to being centered on the war in Iran. From the Washington NATO Summit in July 2024 through the collapse of the Assad regime in Syria, imperialism continued its concentrated offensive. The Kursk incursion in August, intensive attacks on Hezbollah in September, the drone attack on the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) in October, the lifting of restrictions on long-range missiles against Russia in November, the military coup attempt in the 'Republic of Korea ('ROK')' in December and the collapse of the Assad regime in December followed one after another. At the time, without the DPRK's war deterrence capabilities and strategic patience, as well as the heroic struggle of the people of the 'ROK,' it would have been difficult to prevent the war in the 'ROK' and the resulting war in East Asia.

Imperialism is once again launching a concentrated offensive in the second half of 2026. In West Asia, the Israeli Zionists continue their attacks on Hamas, occupy southern Lebanon—Hezbollah's principal stronghold—and carry out successive airstrikes on Syria with Türkiye as their target. The battlefield is expanding from the Persian Gulf to the Red Sea, while military tensions surrounding Saudi Arabia are rising, with Ansar Allah forces in Yemen to the south and Shiite militias in Iraq to the north. Even though the blockade of the Strait of Hormuz has been partially eased on the Oman side, the military confrontation between Iran and the USA continues. Iran is responding to the USA's threat to bomb Iran with a threat to occupy Kuwait and Bahrain.

The Ukrainian neo-Nazis are expanding their drone attacks against Russia with the support of Britain and other NATO members. Lithuania and Finland have

shifted their policies toward allowing the deployment of nuclear weapons. The Ukrainian neo-Nazis have attacked Iranian vessels in the Caspian Sea, thereby linking the war in Ukraine with the war in Iran and the broader West Asian war. This is presumed to be one of the items agreed upon in a closed-door agreement at the Ankara NATO Summit. In response, Iran expressed its determination to retaliate by declaring that it would attack NATO bases in Bulgaria in Eastern Europe and Cyprus in Western Europe. The danger of NATO becoming fully involved in the West Asian war, in addition to the involvement of Ukrainian neo-Nazis, is growing.

Previously, the course of World War 3 was expected to proceed from the war in Ukraine through the war in West Asia, becoming full-scale in East Asia, and then moving through the Eastern European war toward the Central American war. However, after this course was blocked in the DPRK and the 'ROK' at the end of 2024, beginning with Israel's two attacks on Iran in 2025, the Iran war ultimately broke out in February 2026, and the West Asian war became full-scale. With the war in Ukraine now converging with it, the course of the war is changing to the order of the war in Ukraine, the West Asian war, the Eastern European war, the war in East Asia, and the war in Central America. The difference is that World War 3 enters its full-scale phase in the war in East Asia in the former scenario, whereas in the latter it does so in the Eastern European war. The imperialist strategy is becoming increasingly clear: if the path to launching a war in the 'ROK' and a war in Taiwan in East Asia is blocked, imperialism is determined, even at the cost of drawing all of Europe into war through the Eastern European war, to bring about the full-scale intensification of World War, expand the war across the entire world, and create a "New Cold War" system.

The decisive reason Russia decided to launch the special military operation in February 2022 was Ukraine's push for NATO membership. This meant that NATO's tactical nuclear intermediate-range

missiles would be deployed in Ukraine and aimed at Moscow from right on its doorstep. The ultimate purpose of NATO's eastward expansion policy was thus confirmed. In July 2026, citing the massive depletion of advanced conventional weapons in the West Asian war, the USA strongly hinted at deploying tactical nuclear intermediate-range missiles to East Asia. This was confirmed through the US Deputy Secretary of Defense's mention of tactical nuclear weapons, media reports regarding redeployment to Japan and the 'ROK,' NCND remarks by a US military commander, and Japan's first test-firing of Tomahawk missiles. Strong responses followed, including the DPRK's statement of condemnation and its test launch of a hypersonic missile over the East Sea, China's warning commentary and test launch of a cruise missile, and Russian President Putin's visit to the Kuril Islands and Russia's missile test launch.

Previously, an East Asian war was limited to DPRK's war in the 'ROK' and China's war in Taiwan, with a war in Japan remaining optional; now, a Japan war involving the DPRK, China, and Russia has become mandatory. Based on current trends, it is highly likely that the wars in the 'ROK' and Taiwan will erupt first, and as Japan intervenes, they will expand into a war with Japan. DPRK remains in a state of belligerence with Japan even today, and like the DPRK, China and Russia also experienced wars with Japan in modern times. The peoples of the DPRK and China can never forget the historical fact that Japanese militarism invaded the DPRK and China, turned them respectively into a colony and a semi-colony, and perpetrated unprecedented massacres and plunder. That very Japan today possesses vast stockpiles of plutonium along with advanced missile and satellite capabilities. The same is true of the 'ROK.' The DPRK, China, and Russia can never tolerate the nuclear arming of neighboring countries: Japan, a subordinate ally of US imperialism, and the 'ROK,' its colonial proxy. Under these circumstances, the USA is pulling the trigger of war by declaring that it will deploy tactical nuclear intermediate-range missiles, just as it did in Eastern Europe.

The rulers, Sanae Takaichi of Japan and Lee Jae-myung of the 'ROK' are both busy accelerating militarization and turning its land into a NATO logistics base, respectively, rather than solving economic and livelihood issues as promised during their election campaigns. It is only natural that the approval ratings of governments that abandon the public's

desire for reform and focus heavily on war preparations are plummeting. As history shows, exploiting military tensions to boost their collapsed approval ratings actually exacerbates internal contradictions. The effects of the well-worn ploy of trying to resolve internal problems through external conflict are temporary, while its consequences are devastating. Their adversaries are the nuclear-missile superpowers armed with hydrogen bombs and hypersonic missiles.

The Iran war is further uniting the anti-imperialist camp and deepening the divisions within the imperialist camp. The US government is presumed to have concluded a secret agreement with Chinese government in Beijing in May 2026, the so-called "Grand Swap." Regarding this meeting, US President Donald Trump praised it as a "historic agreement," while Chinese President Xi Jinping highly evaluated it as "a constructive strategic and stable relationship between China and the USA." Based on a strategic agreement that went beyond the "small deal" of 3T and 5B, and the "big deal" of Chinese intervention in the Iran war and US non-intervention in the Taiwan war, and that included the establishment of a new financial system, the USA concluded an Memorandum of Understanding favorable to Iran and China visited the DPRK. The article that President Xi Jinping contributed to the DPRK's Rodong Sinmun suggests this through its extraordinary and grand ideas such as "the postwar international order," "a new historical starting point," "inclusive economic globalization," and "building of a community with a shared future for humanity." Under conditions in which the anti-Deep-State forces in the USA are still unable to remove the Deep-State forces from the government and military, it appears inevitable that the strategy will be pursued along two tracks, one public and the other covert. Behind all these phenomena lies the essence of the unprecedented political and economic crisis of imperialism, particularly the end of US imperialism's global hegemony. It is reasonable to analyze this as a sober and realistic judgments made out of necessity as US imperialism finds itself on the defensive, much like its strategy of "Fortifying the Western Hemisphere."

Of course, such an analysis cannot deny the fact that the deployment of tactical nuclear intermediate-range missiles is a dangerous provocation that could accelerate a war in East Asia. The imperialist US government is playing a perilous "chicken

game.” Whether it reaches an agreement with China, attempts to reach an agreement with Russia, or says it will reach an agreement with the DPRK, East Asia is currently facing an imminent danger of war. The nightmare of the world war, an unprecedented catastrophe for humanity, is being reproduced through the provocations and aggression of imperialism. In order to prevent war, the anti-imperialist camp is exercising maximum strategic patience and the strongest war deterrence capabilities, but the situation is developing according to the scheme for World War 3 that imperialism is pursuing. Those who play with fire will perish in the flames; imperialism cannot escape its fate of perishing in the flames of the war it has unleashed itself.