

# **AGAINST IMPERIALIST WAR**

## **The Struggle for a Mass Antiwar Movement**

### **The Greek-Turkey capitalist rivalry**



**Ο.Κ.Δ.Ε.**

Οργάνωση Κομμουνιστών Διεθνιστών Ελλάδας

**Organization of Communists  
Internationalists of Greece**

**Original Title: Η Πάλη ενάντια στον Ιμπεριαλιστικό Πόλεμο · Ο  
Ελληνοτουρκικός Ανταγωνισμός · Για ένα Αντιπολεμικό Κίνημα**

Εκδόσεις Εργατική Πάλη, Απρίλης 2026

The present is translated from greek and printed in May 2026, Ergatiki Pali  
Publications

Address: Athens, Agiou Konstantinou 57, Tel. 2105247227

Thessaloniki, Mpaltadorou 11, Tel. 2310 237938

## PROPAGANDA AND LIES OF WESTERN IMPERIALISTS

One would have to be immeasurably naïve to believe that Trump’s camp —having recently abolished abortion rights for American women and aiming to push women back into the household— is launching a military attack on Iran in order to liberate Iranian women. And one would have to be criminally naïve to believe that the subjugation of Iran and its historical regression into a semi-colony would improve the standard of living and expand the range of political, social, economic, democratic and other rights of the country’s workers and people, both women and men.

We also cannot believe that the intervention in Iran is taking place because the United States is being dragged along by Netanyahu or is yielding to the powerful Israeli lobby within the US, or because it wants to escape the Epstein scandal. All this contains a grain of truth — but we should not forget, for example, that the Israeli lobby in the US was strengthened in the late 1990s and early 21st century, when the US had already decided to “reshape” the Middle East through military interventions (as it did, for example, with the second Iraq war in 2003) and by upgrading its local policeman, Israel. Nor should we be naïve enough to think that Zionist billionaires in the US do not participate in and belong to the hegemonic American imperialism, based on their class interests, but merely attach themselves (out of patriotism or religious zeal?) to the plans of the fanatical Zionists of Israel in order to seize yet another piece of land, regardless of the major risks this entails for the broader plans, alliances etc. of the United States itself.

Equally misleading are the various arguments about Israel’s “just defense” and “right to self-defense,” or about issues of US “national security.” In general, every bourgeois class—even one that is attacking— always seeks to present “its” nation (that is: itself) as defending, precisely in order to convince the popular strata of the just cause of the war it is waging. In the case of the US–Israel attack on Iran, this is now blatant. Another example, which was not so clear (at least initially and on a mass scale), is the war in Ukraine. US incorporated one Eastern European country after another into NATO, bringing it to Russia’s “doorstep”, violating all the promises and assurances it had given to Russia after the collapse of the USSR (1991). It then declared that Ukraine and Georgia would also be incorporated (the latter would encircle Russia from Caucasus), planned and carried out the Maidan coup in Ukraine in 2014 (using fascist methods and groups, which it brought to power under its direct guidance), attempted so-called “color revolutions”<sup>1</sup> in Belarus just six months before Russia’s intervention in Ukraine and later in Kazakhstan (a final provocation and test of Russia’s limits), moved NATO troops, bases, and especially nuclear-capable missiles to Poland, Romania etc., trained, armed and massified fascists in Ukraine, and pushed the Kyiv regime to permanently eliminate Russian-speaking populations in Eastern Ukraine... In the end, it rejected Russia’s proposals for a “security architecture” in Europe, waiting for Russia to react by invading Ukraine, so it could denounce it and direct the Ukrainians into war, supporting them together with the European imperialists, aiming to bring Russia to its knees through war and sanctions, with the goal of fragmenting it or forcing it to facilitate the northern encirclement of China.

Verbose theoretical discursiveness are also the views, in our country [Greece], of various liberal adherents of the so-called “school of realism,” as well as of their corresponding followers—generally “left-wing”—, who additionally support the necessity of a so-called “multi-dimensional Greek foreign policy”. It is not that certain of their observations are not correct — especially those indicating the limits and contradictions of the aggressiveness of American imperialism, which are due either to its economic weakening, or to the interstate correlation of

<sup>1</sup> *This term refers to the staging and use of controlled, supposedly “democratic movements” which, through propaganda for the change of an “authoritarian regime,” create internal destabilization within a country, aiming to bring to power the preferred candidate of the United States (more generally, of Western imperialism).*

forces (that is, the strong competitors it now confronts), or to the class correlation of forces at a global level (that is, the numerical/social strengthening and the capacities for resistance, struggles, and organization of the proletariat).

But all these “realists,” as well as every kind of “specialist” in geostrategic, geopolitical, geoeconomic, military, diplomatic etc. analysis, fail to grasp a simple, concrete political conclusion — one imposed by the competitive, class structure, logic and functioning of the capitalist and imperialist system. That is, that crises in capitalism/imperialism, when they intensify, lead to inter-imperialist conflicts, that is, to war — and that for the capitalist system and for the bourgeois classes there exists no other way out, even if in this way they are driven to choices that are contradictory or that appear “irrational” as “absurd” and “self-destructive.”

There exists no other way out, especially since various economic-technical and balancing “solutions” (on the basis of the competitive and exploitative logic of the capitalist system) are not socially and politically feasible, such as e.g. the United States reindustrializing or turning towards its own internal economic and social development, and more generally all Western imperialists devoting themselves to such aims within an ideal of the best possible world.

## **THE CRISIS OF CAPITALISM – RIVALRIES AND WAR**

### **The crisis of the global capitalist economy**

The global capitalist system continues today to be in a long downturn, that is, in a deep and insurmountable structural crisis — which has in fact become the longest in its history<sup>2</sup>. This is evident, among other things, from the massive expansion of all debts (public and private, of enterprises and households etc.) in all countries, from excess productive capacity<sup>3</sup> and from the intense competition prevailing in almost all sectors among multinational corporations of various countries (and not only from the side of China), which leads to a restriction of markets, profits, or their dominance, and consequently also of their investments.

The crisis is also manifested in the enormous volume of parasitic/fictitious capital, that is, capital which cannot be profitably invested in production — and which seeks to extract profit by being placed in debt (lending to states, enterprises, households), in extremely complex and unregulated “financial products” (shares, derivatives<sup>4</sup>... “cryptocurrencies” etc.). Indeed, the largest share of this capital circulates on a global scale without control and, of course, without being taxed. This takes place through a “black” and unofficial network of irregular and illegal banks, tax and wealth concealment “heavens” — the so-called shadow banking system.

An irrefutable witness to this pathological situation is also the following:

1. The fact that the continuation of these policies requires a total class war against the working class. So that these “bubbles” of fictitious capital and these parasitic profits can be continuously sustained through the reduction of wages and the standard of living of workers and the popular masses, through privatizations, through the seizure and plunder of all public property, all collective and individual wealth (for example, from the channeling of pension funds into the stock market to the auctions of the homes of working-class families).

2. Despite the claims or propaganda about the so-called “4th technological revolution” (advanced robots, artificial intelligence, quantum computers etc.), in reality its results and its application remain limited — and above all are not accompanied by a strong upward wave of

---

<sup>2</sup> *It has lasted for over 50 years now, starting from the late 1960s – early 1970s.*

<sup>3</sup> *That is, the machinery/equipment of the productive sectors (industry, agriculture) does not operate at full capacity but only at a portion of it (e.g. today around 80%).*

<sup>4</sup> *Put simply, derivatives constitute a formal “bet” between two capitalist “investors”. Whoever comes closer to predicting the future price of a commodity on the global market, a stock exchange share etc., wins and gets paid.*

productive investment. The reason is not technical but economic and social. Such a development would mean that a very large part of production becomes fully automated. But then we reach the “internal limit” of the capitalist system, that is, who will buy the products at satisfactory prices, and on which living workers will capitalist exploitation rely (that is, the production of surplus value).

3. For the same reason, despite the experiments that have been carried out or the various forms of empty theorizing that are recycled, there is today no satisfactory new model of the organization of labor from the side of capital (such as, for example, the assembly-line model in its time). That is, a model in which the working class can be “integrated” to a satisfactory degree, covering its basic needs, so that it can constitute, in a more permanent and stable way, the object of exploitation. On the contrary, there prevail conditions of a working class crisis of reproduction crisis. That is, the intensification of exploitation, the absence of trade union organization and collective agreements, layoffs, “black” and flexible labor, the privatization of all social goods and services (health, education, social security, welfare etc.), the inability to cover basic needs due to high costs, the lack of housing etc. — all of which make it increasingly difficult for the working class to continue to exist at the same educational and technical level. Today, the crisis of the system and the attacks of the bourgeoisie push workers and societies decades backward, imposing a deep regression and destruction.

4. The pharaonic social inequalities, where a thin elite of billionaires and multi-billionaires, amounting to 1% or even 0.001% of the global active population, appropriates the largest share of global wealth at the expense of the overwhelming majority of humanity, the workers who produce everything and sustain the entire economy.

We must also briefly note the following: this structural crisis of the global capitalist system began in the late 1960s – early 1970s. Since then, the bourgeois classes have employed unimaginable means in order to overcome it. Initially, from the 1990s onward, they exploited the enormous, historically unprecedented expansion of the global market with the restoration of capitalism in China, the USSR, and the other countries of the so-called “actually existing socialism”. Massive attacks have been carried out against the working class on a global scale, primarily through extreme neoliberal policies of privatizations, the reduction of wages and the standard of living, the intensification of exploitation, high prices, and a tax counter-revolution in favor of capital and against workers — as well as through the closure of factories and the reduction/devaluation of productive capital, so that it can more freely shift toward the so-called “services” sector and toward speculation for higher immediate profits. Astronomical sums of money have been granted to capital, and especially to big capital, in the form of cheap or free loans, subsidies, and support of every kind. For nearly three to four decades, capital has also been granted every freedom and facilitation to relocate a large part of production to other countries (for example, from the US and Europe towards Asia), in search of cheap labor power and cheap raw materials — and also the freedom to circulate its commodities on the global market. All this constituted neoliberal “Globalization”. Finally, in order to secure these interests and these plans, US and NATO, American and European imperialists have carried out countless deadly and destructive coups, interventions and wars across the world (former united Yugoslavia, two wars in Iraq / Persian Gulf, Afghanistan, Somalia, countries in Latin America, Africa, Asia etc.), what was initially called the “New World Order” and later the “Permanent War on Terror.” And of course —as both the culmination and the precondition of all the above— the democratic, political and trade union rights and freedoms of workers and youth have been severely struck, while state repression and all forms of anti-democratic measures, including political, parliamentary, institutional, and semi-dictatorial coups, have been intensified and deepened.

Today, despite the extremely harsh and painful blows inflicted on the working class, and despite the destruction accumulated for humanity, it is evident that these means and policies

have failed to bring the system out of crisis. Their exhaustion and the absence of any alternative strategy constitute a key factor that opens the “door of the madhouse,” that is, they drive the explosion of the contradictions of capitalism and imperialism toward military competition and war.

Finally, in the face of the crisis and the intensification of rivalries, the bourgeois classes resort to “war economy.” This provides an outlet for capitalist profits, since state orders (based on the reduction of social spending and the squeezing of the working class and the popular strata) guarantee a privileged market for the production of the arms industry. However, this can only temporarily revive profits; it cannot provide a way out of the crisis. The reason is simple: military equipment cannot be used for broader economic and social reproduction (for example, through new investments in production and infrastructure or through an increase in the level of popular consumption). This arms production can only either be left to become obsolete or be used as a force of destruction — that is, in war. In this way, the “war economy” constitutes yet another “admission” and confirmation of the crisis of the capitalist system.

### **Changes in the global correlations of forces**

Certainly —and this has occurred in every long downturn wave— some capitalist economies perform better or even experience growth, while others perform worse or are downgraded. Thus, on the basis of the long downturn, additional contradictions are added to the global capitalist economy, even more explosive ones:

- a) The growing ecological destruction, which requires immediate intervention.
- b) The restructuring of the global population. Western imperialists previously constituted 1/4 of the world population, whereas today they constitute 1/10 . At the same time, there is a significant increase in the proletarianization and urbanization of the global population, that is, a much larger share of wage laborers, who moreover live in urban centers.
- c) The industrial development of a number of countries, and particularly of China, exceeds that of the entire G7<sup>5</sup>, a development accompanied by the long-term deindustrialization of Western imperialists.
- d) The approach of capitalism toward its historical limit, that is, automation. This, of course, does not mean an imminent “collapse” in the immediate sense. Nor does it mean that, in the medium term, the remaining countries can develop smoothly simply by freeing themselves from Western imperialists (this is today a purely theoretical discussion). It signifies a further intensification of the contradictions of the system.

In order to form an overall picture of the global situation on the basis of the general crisis of the global capitalist system, we must note the following regarding the US: On the one hand, it possesses multinational corporations that are based on production chains spread across the entire world — and over which it seeks to maintain control, as well as to keep the rest of the world subordinated. Even if this means restricting or even crippling the development of all other countries (including its allies), in order to prevent the emergence of competitors. On the other hand, it controls the global financial system and its institutions (IMF, World Bank etc.) and seeks not only to maintain its profits from the plunder of other countries but also to increase them (through the full opening of markets and the financial sector of all countries to the absolute dominance of American corporations). For this reason, US not only refuses to consider a reform of the global financial system and the role of the dollar, so as to take into account other bourgeois classes or imperialisms, but also uses them in a “warlike” manner (sanctions, freezing or seizure of foreign exchange reserves, partial or total exclusion from the international banking system SWIFT etc.) in order to suppress reactions or divergences. This constitutes the

---

<sup>5</sup> *The seven richest countries, belonging to the “old” imperialist powers.*

obscurantist project of American imperialism, which Trump —and not only he— is striving to implement with ferocity and determination.

This plan must, of course, take into account the threat of nuclear war; for this reason, US seeks to isolate China from the rest of the world rather than to attack it directly. This means exhausting a potential ally such as Russia (which it failed to do), or uprooting Chinese investments and trade relations from all countries, or cutting China off from sources of energy, from infrastructure (ports, railways etc.), and from maritime routes. Whether it can succeed is debatable — most likely the answer is “No.” But this is the US imperialism attempt. Otherwise, American multinational corporations would have to return and confine themselves within the domestic economy of the US (that is, to self-mutilate), to risk enormous capital in an attempt at reindustrialization within the U.S. with an entirely uncertain outcome (the correlations of forces in this regard are against them, vis-à-vis China as well as many other powerful “emerging” countries), to dismantle the global financial system which constitutes for them a source of parasitic profits and “rents”... and so on.

It is enough to outline this alternative to understand how unimaginably difficult it is — and therefore why the American imperialist bourgeoisie will continue along the path of war and not along the path of any “peace-maker”. All the more so, since it more or less possesses the military capabilities for such a course, or at least to attempt it — while, of course, spreading devastation on a global scale.

### **The contemporary inter-imperialist rivalry: its character and specificities**

Are we not faced today, for example, with a parallel or even interdependent race between the Western imperialists and the BRICS+ or the Russo-Chinese bloc? Categorically: NO.

The global capitalist system and global imperialism cannot today (after so many changes compared to the past and in the midst of a particularly fluid and transitional situation) be said to constitute a single unified system with a strictly hierarchical structure (a structure that arises from the inherent nature of the uneven and combined development of capitalism). This is one of the causes —if not the principal one— of the periodic disruption of its previous equilibrium (in the present case: the equilibrium established at the end of World War II, whose first major shock was the collapse of USSR and the other countries of so-called “actually existing socialism”).

It is true that today it is not only the hegemon that is being challenged, as was the case in the past, but the entire “old” upper layer, that is, the Western imperialists, who risk being downgraded to a lower or at least an “intermediate” level. In this sense, it is correct to attribute war to the intensification of capitalist contradictions and to the structure of imperialism. *Mutatis mutandis*, this is a repetition of previous inter-imperialist wars. However, history does not repeat itself in an identical manner — and today we must also note certain significant differences, which require adjustments in the analyses and tactics of the workers’ movement and of Revolutionary Marxists.

It is true that the Western imperialists participate in unequal exchange and in the exploitation of other capitalist formations (through the payment of interest on debt, intellectual property rights etc.), with the exception of certain strong ones, and above all China. However, this makes them economic imperialists and does not exhaust the content or the significance of imperialism. The concept of imperialism, in all the classical Marxist theorists, does not refer only to economic exploitation or to the “empire” of the imperialists, but to their capacity to stand militarily within competition.

An example: Tsarist Russia, for both Lenin and Trotsky, was economically a semi-colonial country (dependent primarily on French capital), backward but with significant specificities — yet its brutal domination and oppression over various nationalities, and above all its participation

in the imperialist World War I, rendered it an imperialist country. Taking the above into account, it would be somewhat difficult today to characterize as imperialist, in the full sense of the term, British capitalism and even more so German or French capitalism — not to mention Spanish or Italian capitalism. This is because they are unable to participate with their own independent forces in an inter-imperialist rivalry, as in the past, but can act only in a complementary manner to American imperialism. Without underestimating their economic strength, it is sufficient to consider the expulsion of French imperialism from West Africa, or their diminished political weight at the international level, or to ask in which countries they can still impose themselves as before (in countries the size of Malta, Cyprus...? when “giants” such as China, India —or even Turkey— are emerging?). This is also evident in the case of Ukraine as well as Greenland. It would be a different discussion if they were unified as the EU — but this now appears to have been definitively foreclosed.

Caution is also required in characterizing Chinese or Russian capitalism. Undoubtedly, they possess nuclear weapons; China engages in exploitation through unequal exchange with other countries (including European ones); Russia demonstrates an effort to exercise strict control within its “neighborhood” and possesses military capabilities; while China, within a few years, may even surpass the US economically and militarily. However, it is the United States that —beyond possessing the largest arsenal, some 1,100 military bases worldwide, and an international political apparatus capable of organizing coups, controlling countries, or fomenting “civil wars” etc.— also has the appropriate social infrastructure for all this, forged over more than a century. For the time being, China, among other things, has not projected power beyond its territory, has never waged any war, and only twenty years ago was a backward country (with all the implications this carries for its political and social structure), while Russia is “struggling” in Ukraine just 500 kilometers beyond its borders.

Similarly, in the war in Iran, we cannot speak of an inter-imperialist conflict: because Russia and China, although their vital interests are affected and although they directly or indirectly support Iran, nevertheless cannot be said to have Iran fighting as their proxy — unlike the case of Ukraine, where, broadly speaking, Western imperialists have provided close to \$350 billion and almost directly direct the actions of the Kyiv regime (including militarily, from the Ramstein base).

As for Iran, correspondingly, it is certainly a capitalist formation (see certain elements below) and the Islamists are certainly not “anti-imperialists” — in the sense that, while they do confront an imperialist power (US–Zionists), they neither aim to carry out a socialist revolution nor even to come into conflict with all imperialisms and with the capitalist system as such. On the other hand, they are in conflict with American imperialism, which remains hegemonic and by far the most dangerous. Certainly, the Iranian bourgeoisie and certain wings of the Islamists would prefer to reach some form of accommodation with American imperialism — but this is impossible, because US-Israel do not seek a relatively mild or tolerable compromise, but rather the full underdevelopment, weakening and crushing of Iran, in order to exercise complete control over the region in line with the plans for a “Great Israel” and a “New Great Middle East.”

However, through all these contradictions, there is no doubt that a victory for Iran —or even a non-defeat— would alter global developments, would accelerate the weakening of imperialism, and particularly of American imperialism, at all levels, and would bring about significant changes in the correlation of class forces, in a direction favorable to the working class, the poor popular strata and the youth (perhaps even greater than those brought about by the defeat of the US in Vietnam).

## **THE POSITION OF REVOLUTIONARY MARXISTS**

## The trap of Pacifism

Workers, the popular strata and the youth are worried and anxious about the spread, generalization, and escalation of war. They do not want to suffer its consequences or live through its horror. This justified, genuine popular sentiment constitutes a starting point for a mass struggle against war. However, it must not be identified with the illusions systematically cultivated by Pacifism, that is, with a condemnation of wars and an appeal to peace in general and in the abstract.

In its various forms, the primary function of Pacifism is to detach the question of war from the struggle against the capitalist/imperialist system that generates it, and from the way out represented by Socialist Revolution. This operates through propaganda and the cultivation of illusions, for example regarding “international law.” Or even through the fostering of the illusion that deadly rivalries can be harmonized within an international system of “fair globalization” or within a more or less balanced “multipolar world”.

In this way, Pacifism disorients or passivizes the working class, the poor popular strata and the youth. The struggle against war is transformed into a matter of almost symbolic “protest” or “pressure”. It is exhausted in words and resolutions, or at best in events and limited mobilizations — and is always channeled into the electoral vote.

Even when bourgeois and reformist parties formally or superficially condemn this or that war, this constitutes the basis of their policy.

## Just and Unjust Wars

The nature of wars differs depending on the historical period, the social classes that wage them, their aims and their means. For this reason, we must make the fundamental distinction between just and unjust wars.

Some examples of just wars, which militants of the workers’ movement must support:

a) Wars for historically progressive aims, such as the abolition of slavery and feudalism, and liberation from a historically reactionary regime: the wars of the French Revolution against feudalism and absolutism; the American Revolutionary War against the British Crown; the American Civil War, in which the capitalists of the North defeated the slaveholders of the South; the bourgeois Greek War of Independence (and those of the other Balkan countries) for liberation from the Ottoman Empire.

b) The revolutionary war for the defense and consolidation of a victorious Socialist Revolution. For example, the Russian Civil War of 1918–1921, in which the Bolshevik Party and the Red Army, led by Lenin and Trotsky, defeated the intervention of the domestic Whites and the imperialists against the October Revolution.

c) The war for the defense of a workers’ state, even one that is bureaucratically degenerated or deformed, against imperialist intervention and the restoration of capitalism. For example, the war of the Soviet Union against Nazi German imperialism in 1940–1945.

d) The war of a colonial, semi-colonial, and generally dependent country, or of an oppressed nation, against imperialism. Such a war is just whether it develops into a socialist revolution or remains under a bourgeois leadership. Earlier examples include China, Vietnam, Cuba, Algeria, India, Afghanistan etc.

Especially in the latter case, militants of the workers’ movement are obliged to defend the dependent country or the oppressed nation against imperialism, even “unconditionally”. That is, regardless of the precise characterization of the regime of that country or of who stands at the leadership of the popular movement. For two fundamental reasons:

a) The defeat of imperialism opens a path for the historical progress of that country and of its popular masses. By contrast, a victory of the imperialists threatens regression and barbarism — not only poverty and destitution but also the enslavement of these popular masses, their degradation into a condition of protectorate and colonial subjugation.

b) The defeat of imperialism weakens the principal adversary of the global workers' movement. It creates more favorable conditions for its struggle, for the advance of Socialist Revolution.

This applies even more strictly and without exception to militants within the imperialist countries themselves. Thus, for them in the US and France, it was obligatory to offer wholehearted and practical support to the Cuban, Algerian, and Vietnamese Revolutions etc. Correspondingly, in Britain, support for the independence of India, Egypt and other colonial possessions of British imperialism, and so on.

Otherwise, one ends up as an open or indirect apologist for imperialism. This holds even if one attempts to maintain “equal distances” or condemns imperialists with a “yes, but.” Such a role is played today, in the countries of the US–NATO–EU, by those who say, for example: “Trump’s war on Iran is not right, or it is illegal and irrational — but there is also the oppressive theocratic regime — therefore we do not take a position in favor of Iran”. Another example is those who say: “We do not want the genocide of the Palestinians, but there is also the reactionary or terrorist Hamas — therefore we do not side with the victory of the Palestinian Resistance”, remaining at the level of a vague or humanitarian solidarity with the Palestinians.

There is one more case — usually a more complex one — that creates difficulties for the militants of the workers' movement: when the struggle for a people's national rights, for its right to self-determination, is conducted “under the aegis” of an imperialist power. In this case, in order to determine their position, Revolutionary Marxists combine: first, the general recognition of the right to national self-determination, which constitutes part of their program in favor of democratic rights; second, a political criterion.

This means that, beyond certain general principles, we must assess what concretely serves the interests of the workers' and revolutionary movement, and the overall cause of Socialist Revolution. A current and characteristic example: while we of course generally recognize the right of the Ukrainian people to national self-determination, we cannot and must not, in the present conjuncture, support the “right” of the semi-fascist regime in Kyiv to wage war in its name. This is because this war has been transformed into a spearhead of the Western imperialists (US–NATO–EU) directed first and foremost against the Ukrainian people itself and against Russia — where any success on their part constitutes a heavy defeat, a major regression, and a mortal danger for the peoples and for humanity, and of course a serious blow to the cause of Socialism.

## **DEFEAT US – ZIONISTS – WESTERN IMPERIALISTS**

### **Victory to Iran, Cuba, Venezuela, the Palestinian Resistance**

To make a concrete analysis of the situation and orient ourselves correctly, in order to determine what serves the interests of the forces of the global workers' and revolutionary movement, we must examine not only general principles and strategy, but also tactics.

This means priorities and hierarchies: being able to see which force constitutes the greatest immediate threat, the one which it is a matter of life and death to confront. As Trotsky explained, for example: when you face two enemies, one of whom is pointing a revolver at you while the other is slowly poisoning you, then you must immediately confront the first and then deal the

second. With this basic method, we can determine the fronts of struggle and the slogans of the most urgent priority and highest hierarchy — instead of disorienting discussions about “good” and “bad” imperialists or about the corresponding “camps”.

In today’s conditions, although complex, things are clear from this standpoint. The course toward World War III, the nuclear threat, total class war and a process of fascistization against the working class are being strengthened and driven not only by the crisis and the rivalries in general... but by the **IMMEDIATE** plans of US imperialism and Zionism. Thus, with the destructive capacities they possess, they are **Enemy Number One** of humanity.

At least for those militants who are in the countries of the Western imperialists, this should be childishly simple and crystal clear!

Any other position is irrationally dangerous. Let us imagine, for example, someone who, under the conditions of World War II, in Nazi-occupied Europe, would have said that resistance, the slogan “defeat of the occupation forces,” and armed struggle against them made no sense... because the opposing camp of the imperialist Allies was equally reactionary or even had a longer history of colonial crimes! In the same way: if today the course of US imperialism and Zionism toward catastrophe is not defeated, what remains standing for the struggle of the workers’ movement, for Socialism, for the survival and emancipation of humanity? Certainly not much... and then “resistance” and “struggle” become something entirely abstract and propagandistic, almost outside of time and space.

Various reformists or centrists attempt to reject the slogan “Defeat US–Israel” by confusing it with implausible or anecdotal scenarios. For example, they claim that in such a case it is not clarified who will win, that this would amount to strengthening the imperialisms of China and Russia, and so on<sup>6</sup>.

For Revolutionary Marxists, the defeat of the US–Israel does not, of course, mean aligning politically and ideologically with any emerging imperialism or with any reactionary regional power, nor seeking the strengthening of such bourgeois forces. It means:

1. The blocking of the worst and most immediate plans leading to uncontrolled war escalation, possibly even to the use of nuclear weapons.
2. A serious blow to, and weakening of, the bourgeois classes within the Western imperialist countries, as well as their respective bourgeois governments and political forces.
3. A rise in the confidence of the working class, the popular masses, and the youth — because they will see themselves that the “monster” of Western imperialism can be struck and defeated. This constitutes a decisive factor in the class struggle — indeed on an international scale.
4. The gaining of political time and space for the regroupment, organization, and counter-offensive of the workers’ movement, for the preparation of Socialist Revolution<sup>7</sup>.

---

<sup>6</sup> . *This peculiar position is especially used by the KKE reformists, but is also often invoked by certain far left organizations. It is maximalist and involves a logical leap. In World War II, did the resistance movements against Nazi occupation — which did not even set revolutionary objectives and were “friendly” toward the “democratic and anti-fascist” Allied imperialists (i.e. those mainly led by Stalinism, such as EAM/KKE)— seek to strengthen British, French and American imperialism?*

Finally, we must not overlook the following in the case of a war, for example, against Iran. From the antiwar movement in the “Western” countries, a slogan such as “Victory to Iran / Defeat US–Israel” constitutes practical internationalism and enormous political and ideological assistance to the working and popular masses of Iran, of the Middle East and of the whole world. Because it shows that “we” do not divide workers and peoples along religious lines — and even more that we do not accept the divisions and stereotypes, the arrogant, imperialist and colonial propaganda of the “West,” which seeks to export civilization and freedom to “inferior” peoples. This will constitute a big contribution to the effort of the working and popular masses of Iran to organize themselves, to rise up and to be able, by their own forces and through their own struggles, to liberate themselves from every oppressive regime and determine their own fate. Otherwise, we remain essentially passive spectators or at best well-intended sympathizers, in titanic conflicts in which so much is at stake for the future of humanity.

## How do we defend Iran, Cuba, Venezuela, Palestine

### The importance of correct slogans – Mistakes or opportunisms within the Left

Whatever the precise characterization of regimes and countries such as Iran<sup>8</sup>, Cuba<sup>9</sup>, Venezuela<sup>10</sup> or Palestine may be, their resistance or war against American imperialism and Zionism is just — and we support it. In all these cases, we must put forward the corresponding central slogan, for example: **VICTORY TO IRAN – CUBA**<sup>11</sup>.

In the case of Palestine, matters are even clearer. The Palestinian movement, together with the international solidarity movement, has consistently upheld the right of the Palestinians to their own independent state, as well as the right to armed struggle against Zionist occupation and

---

<sup>7</sup> *Such waves of workers’ and revolutionary struggles in the “West” are very likely to receive little or only opportunist sympathy from the capitalist regimes of China and Russia. This is because they would constitute a powerful, practical class and internationalist signal to the Chinese and Russian proletariat, as well as to that of many dependent or “emerging” countries.*

<sup>8</sup> *Present-day Iran, beyond its so-called “theocratic” regime, is characterized by many specific features, as it emerged from the degeneration of the major Iranian Revolution of 1979 (a degeneration also due to the pressure and attacks of US imperialism). It is not merely a “theocratic” regime —this is not its essence, despite the relentless propaganda of well-paid apologists seeking to justify Western imperialism and intimidate peoples— but rather a highly complex political system of power, which explains its remarkable resilience under sanctions, bombardments and systematic assassinations of its leadership. Over the years it has cooperated with other forces, large or small, seemingly unrelated to its dominant ideology of “red Shiism,” such as Cuba, Venezuela, the BRICS+ etc. Previously, Iran was a dependent semi-colonial country, central to the counterrevolutionary strategy of US imperialism in the region against the USSR and the Arab Revolution. Later, it experienced a certain economic and social development —even under the “Islamic Republic”— contrary to Western propaganda. Over time, as a strategic ally of China and Russia, the Iranian regime has sought to stabilize itself as a significant regional power. However, this has nothing to do with fanciful views suggesting that Iran is itself an imperialism, perhaps as dangerous as US–Israel.*

<sup>9</sup> *In the case of Cuba, there is an additional factor: the current regime is also a continuation of the workers’ state and revolutionary regime that emerged from the victory of the Cuban Revolution in 1959 — through which the island, previously a US semi-colony and protectorate, broke with imperialism.*

<sup>10</sup> *Venezuela was and remains a deeply dependent country. This condition was strongly challenged by the Bolivarian Revolution from the late 1990s under Hugo Chávez, a major historical figure. Despite its limits and setbacks, the most significant gains of the Venezuelan people are to its credit (including elements resembling a workers’ state), in opposition to coup attempts by the domestic oligarchy and US imperialism.*

<sup>11</sup> *Without crossing into an idealization of the leadership and regime of countries such as Iran.*

brutality. The slogans **VICTORY TO THE PALESTINIAN RESISTANCE – INDEPENDENT PALESTINIAN STATE** are the most fundamental and self-evident.

Reformist forces, such as the KKE [Greek CP, stalinist], or centrist ones, such as certain organizations of the far left, often reject these slogans.

For example, they try to evade the slogan “Victory to Iran” and to disguise it as “Victory to the Iranian people”. This is a problematic position, one that runs counter to Revolutionary Marxism and Leninism — and is also divisive and sectarian. Because it means they express their opposition to an unjust war only under their own conditions: only insofar as the leadership or regime of the given country is to their liking or at least tolerated by them.

This implies: first, a weakening of the significance and of the concrete tasks of the struggle against war. Second, an impermissible concession —or bowing— to the propaganda of “our own” imperialist camp of US–Zionists–NATO.

In this case, verbal tricks, balancing acts and clever evasions lead to major contradictions and usually end up being groundless or even dangerous. Some examples:

a) If US–Israel strike a school, then of course and unequivocally the people of Iran are victims, and the strike must be condemned as criminal and terrorist. But what happens when, for example, they “neutralize” (assassinate) Khamenei, Larijani etc.? When, as their propaganda claims, they are “targeting the regime and its leadership in order to open the way for the liberation of the Iranian people”? Furthermore: what happens when US–Israel strike, for example, an Iranian military camp? Can we distinguish a strike launched or directed from the Souda base [Souda is a port near Hania, in the island of Crete – one of the biggest of US and more crucial in their operations in the area], a military cargo loaded in a Greek port etc., depending on whether it is aimed against the regime or against the Iranian people? Are these not all parts of the same imperialist, unjust US–Israel war? And is not every attempt to separate them into neat, airtight “boxes” schizophrenic — especially when this is done merely to push through one’s own “line” in a general assembly or in a text?

Many who profess a “pure” anti-imperialism often overlook something further. By its own methods and with its own objectives (which Revolutionary Marxists do not share), the Iranian regime conducts its confrontation with American imperialism and Zionism with a certain consistency. Should militants of the workers’ movement approach this fact only through general principles, through a moral identification or rejection? Should such a factor not also be taken into account from a tactical standpoint — that is, as something that shapes concrete conditions for the international workers’ and antiwar movement and for its struggle etc.?

b) In Venezuela, even if we were all to agree, for example, that the Maduro government does not go beyond an attempt at a bourgeois, pro-popular management (the reality is more complex), or that it seeks to maneuver vis-à-vis American imperialism<sup>12</sup> — what does this

---

<sup>12</sup> *Who could seriously deny the right of a poor, isolated or encircled country —especially one suffering under sanctions and embargo— to attempt to survive, secure food, medicine, energy etc., by making certain agreements with stronger countries, even capitalist ones? Not even the most “ultra-revolutionary” would deny this, especially if they at the same time invoke Lenin (who was explicit on this issue). Yet we encounter the absurd claim that Cuba’s leadership “unsuccessfully sought refuge in supposedly ‘more favorable’ dependencies on rival imperialisms (EU–Russia–China)” (a position from KKE(m-l), the main “m-l” organization in Greece). Where, then, should Cuba have obtained the means for its people’s survival, especially when global revolutionary conditions are absent? From vague calls for “people’s struggle” or “resistance fronts” (as launched by this organization)? Such claims are frivolous. Similarly, one could ask these “pure” anti-imperialists: where does the Palestinian Resistance obtain*

imply? Should we not demand the release of Maduro as the legally elected president of the country, simply in order to avoid any suspicion that we identify with a bourgeois or bureaucratic force and administration?

c) In Palestine, such contradictions can reach the point of absurdity — for example, when the same organization [i.e. inside the ranks of Greek left or far left] says “Victory to the Palestinian Resistance” but not “Independent Palestinian State”... unless it is “from the river to the sea”. That is: ignoring entirely the correlations of forces and the demands of the Palestinian movement itself, we put forward (from the relative safety of our position) the most ultra-maximalist demands... so that there is no suspicion of legitimizing the Zionist state-terrorist entity!

The answers and the appropriate slogans to the above are quite simple and obvious. Any ambiguity only hinders the development of a genuine antiwar movement.

## WHO IS AN IMPERIALIST?

### Struggle against confusion – A brief comment

Within the Left and the workers’ movement [in Greece], the reformist apparatus of the KKE today takes the lead —often in a rigid and aggressive manner— in combating correct slogans such as “Victory to Iran – Defeat US–Israel”. It only promotes the slogan against the war of “the imperialists” in general and in the abstract, without analyzing and clarifying in each concrete case what type of country is under attack or who constitutes the most immediate and dangerous enemy for the workers’ movement.

The aim of KKE is twofold: first, to undermine the influence and the consistent policy of Revolutionary Marxists and, more broadly, of the more militant and class-oriented forces within the workers’ and youth movement. Second, to provide an additional credential to bourgeois forces — that is, to show that it “responsibly” rejects and combats every “excess.”

This policy of KKE is based on a long-standing trajectory of distortion and rejection of the theory of Revolutionary Marxism and Leninism on imperialism. Thus, for example, the Theses of its recent 22nd Congress (January 2026) are permeated by the logic of “equal distances.” In a manner unacceptable for a communist party (as KKE presents itself), positioned moreover in a country of Western imperialism, no reference is made to the historical specificities of China and Russia, nor to their economic, political, and other differences from Western imperialists. Wars, for example in Ukraine and the Middle East, are judged in a general, abstract and flattening way: they are imperialist, therefore all sides bear equal responsibility. In this way, there is no specific task or responsibility for the workers’ and revolutionary movement in the US and Europe — for example, the defeat of US–Israel in their war against Iran<sup>13</sup>.

In general, organizations of the far left [in Greece] tend to adopt a better or more cautious stance. However, one-sided formulations are not absent — for example, references to “totalitarian capitalism” to “Russo-Chinese imperialism” or the blanket characterization of various countries as “sub-imperialist” are leading to similar problems.<sup>14</sup> That is, to an inability to determine the specific position of each country within the global imperialist system (especially

---

*its weapons? By whatever means possible, of course — but certainly not from any workers’ or revolutionary state! Does that mean the Palestinian Resistance, too, is guilty of illusions about “favorable dependencies”?*

<sup>13</sup> “22nd Congress of KKE – Central Committee Theses,” *Ergatikí Pali* [OKDE’s monthly], November 2025.

that of weaker or dependent ones), the particularity of Russia, China or other “emerging” countries (which may often possess a complex, hybrid, or dual character) — and, most importantly, the immediate priority of the struggle for the defeat of US–Zionists–Western imperialists, along with the correct slogans that advance the development of a real antiwar movement.

Such errors and difficulties are part of a broader negative framework: the retreat of the Left in the “Western” countries (organizationally, politically, ideologically), and in particular of the far and revolutionary Left. A decisive role has been played here by concessions in the face of Western imperialism and its propaganda about “democracy”, “freedoms” and “rights” (of women, minorities, oppressed “identities” etc.), as well as regarding regimes that are oppressive, authoritarian, totalitarian, theocratic etc. – or those that are labeled as such by the imperialists themselves.<sup>15</sup>

## **CLASS INDEPENDENCE – INTERNATIONALISM OF THE WORKERS’ MOVEMENT**

In a insidious and poisonous manner, bourgeois propaganda and the apparatuses of Western imperialism attempt to trap militants of the workers’ movement in coercive dilemmas such as: You oppose the war on Iran — therefore you support a medieval, theocratic, oppressive regime. You protest the abduction of Maduro and the US intervention in Venezuela — therefore you support a bureaucratic and anti-democratic clique. You call Israel a murderer — therefore you are anti-Semitic and you support Hamas.

Various reformists or centrists often short-circuit and submit to this blackmail — or reproduce it where they think it “serves” them.

In all these cases, we must expose the dirty propaganda and lies of Western imperialism. But we must also not hesitate to point out the superiority, in this regard, of peoples —or even leaderships— that, although bourgeois, bureaucratic or even religious, have nevertheless the courage to stand up to imperialism and resist it to the end, with arms in hand and at the cost of their very lives.

## **Unity, Struggle, Organization of the working class in every country and throughout the world**

### **Against every imperialist, every bourgeois or reactionary force**

As Revolutionary Marxists, as militants who fight for the interests of the workers’ movement and for the perspective of Socialism —indeed on an international scale—, we are by no means indifferent to what takes place inside countries such as China, Russia, Iran etc., nor to the conditions faced there by the working class and the forces of the workers’ movement. No serious militant ignores phenomena such as, for example, the strengthening of Islamist forces or the authoritarianism of regimes in China and Russia. Concern over such issues, and the effort to address them correctly and in a timely manner by the workers’ movement (in their real

---

<sup>14</sup> *In brief, these are positions held in Greece by organizations such as Communist Liberation, SEK, KKE(m-l). Communist Liberation, the ex-NAR, is one of the main far left organizations. SEK is the Greek organization of the IST. KKE (m-l) is the main organization of the “m-l” current, i.e. stalinist or maoist-stalinist.*

<sup>15</sup> *A particularly negative example: in a statement on Syria by the IST (the international tendency including the greek SEK), the victory of jihadist forces —which opened the way for the US–Israel war against Iran— was welcomed as an opportunity for an “inclusive democracy” (reference to the IST website).*

dimensions, not those dictated by the propaganda of Western imperialism), are legitimate and necessary.

The values and the vision of World Socialist Revolution, of the construction of a global socialist society, cannot be served by invoking any powerful force as a “protector and liberator of peoples” or as an “anti-fascist.” If this applies primarily, first and foremost, to Western imperialism, it also applies, subsequently, to rival, emerging or nascent imperialisms such as Russia and China, and to the bourgeois classes of powerful countries or regional powers. None of these capitalisms and none of these bourgeois classes can be characterized as progressive.

For this reason, throughout the world, workers, militants and the forces of the workers’ movement must not place their hopes in any “good” imperialist, nor sacrifice their own politics and ideology on the altar of simplistic, cynical and ultimately false and dead-end calculations of the type “the enemy of my enemy is my friend.” This constitutes a powerful political line for the workers’ movement.

As a historical example, in the postwar revolutionary wave—in China, Cuba, and Vietnam—the combination of the struggle against imperialism and for national liberation with social objectives, and without any compromise with the domestic bourgeoisie (or its “phantoms”), as Stalinism always advocated, led to victorious socialist revolutions.<sup>16</sup>

More concretely, how can we outline the basic lines for applying this policy today?

A) Within a country or a movement that is in conflict with imperialism—such as Iran, Cuba, Venezuela etc.—we in no case accept the subordination or dissolution of the working class and its organizations before any leadership that may be at the helm, whether bourgeois, bureaucratic or even religious. We may and must (depending on the concrete conditions) enter into alliances and joint action with such a leadership at the tactical, practical or even military level—but we do not politically or ideologically identify with it, nor do we embellish it. In this way, we struggle so that, in the fight against imperialism, it is the workers’ movement and a revolutionary force that take the leadership of the popular masses. This not only opens the way for a revolutionary development in the given country but also exponentially increases the chances of victory against imperialism. More specifically, under present conditions:

1. In Venezuela, resistance to the Yankee gangsters will be a thousand times more decisive and profound if it is based on the mobilization and arming of the people, with the perspective of defending the Bolivarian Revolution and advancing it in a socialist direction, than anything a leadership marked by hesitation, illusions or a tendency to seek unrealistic compromises with American imperialism could achieve.

---

<sup>16</sup> *These are classic examples of the successful practical application of Trotsky’s theory of Permanent Revolution and of the Fourth International. By contrast, in the Greek Revolution of 1943–1949, the ideological and political subordination of the Stalinist KKE to the Greek bourgeoisie and to the “democratic, anti-fascist, liberating” Allied imperialists (Stage Theory, Popular Fronts etc.) led to a tragic defeat. It is also worth noting some data on Iran (recent post in thenextrecession.com) to avoid any idealized image: a) Sanctions by Western imperialists have severely damaged the economy and imposed great hardships on the people; per capita income ranks low globally (117th place). b) Workers suffer from inflation and rising costs; one-third live below the poverty line; average wages are around \$150–200/month. c) Over half of state assets have been privatized. d) 60% of national wealth is controlled by about 300 individuals; the richest 1% owns 30%, while the poorest 50% only 3.5%. e) Military strengthening and regional influence have drained resources; private investment is minimal. f) Privatizations and inequality have created an elite, part of which seeks compromise with the “West.”*

2. New threats of US imperialism against Cuba will be confronted far more effectively if the working and popular masses of the island enjoy a regime of workers' socialist democracy, and if it is clear that no bureaucracy intends to open the door to the danger of the restoration of capitalism.

3. In Iran, a victory against US–Israel will be far more secure, stable and lasting —and far more beneficial for the people and nationalities of the country, and for the peoples of the region — if, for example, the bourgeoisie and the upper state officials are made to bear the economic cost of the war; if workers' and popular militias are created; if there is an appeal for a common struggle to the Arab masses and more broadly to the working and poor popular masses of the region.

Moreover, no one has the right to demand from the working and popular masses of a country such as Iran that they silently endure a regime of harsh repression of their democratic and political freedoms, or suspend their demands and struggles when they themselves judge it necessary or timely to advance them. Always on the condition that no covert attempt is made to open the back door to “regime change”, under the pretext of “freedom” or “democratization,” with US and the Zionists acting as sponsors and organizers.<sup>17</sup>

B) A corresponding stance (the cases are not identical) must also be adopted by the workers' movement, for example, inside Russia or China.

It is self-evident that the ruling classes in China and Russia will attempt to translate any retreat or defeat of U.S.–NATO–EU forces to their own advantage—either to shape more aggressive plans of their own, or to seek a better “deal” with US imperialism (there are precedents for such moves). In any case, they will seek to consolidate and strengthen their position against the Chinese and Russian proletariat.

It would be completely ineffective, foolish or even criminal if those struggling in the countries of the “West” were to urge the Chinese or Russian proletariat to side with its own bourgeoisie, to suspend its struggles (economic, political, democratic, antiwar etc.), supposedly so that the Western imperialists might “first” be defeated in this way. Such a line would only strengthen all imperialisms, both “old” and “new”: the former in their propaganda that these are totalitarian, backward societies that must be “civilized” and “liberated” for the sake of democracy and humanity; the latter in their effort to expand their economic, political, and military power, along with nationalism and anti-communism, on the basis of the exploitation and oppression of billions of workers.

Every defeat of the working class —whether in the “West” or the “East”— does not halt or reverse the drive toward war; it only strengthens and accelerates it. We do not subordinate the working class to any reactionary force, to any bourgeois or imperialist “camp”. We safeguard, like the apple of our eye, the independent politics and ideology of the workers' movement, the independent organization of workers (trade unions, parties etc.), the struggle for unity, for the interests and objectives of the working class – and the international relations of cooperation, common struggle and brotherhood among workers of all countries.

## THE PARTICIPATION OF GREEK CAPITALISM IN THE WAR

Amid the profound transformations of contemporary world, the so-called “multi-dimensional foreign policy” (assuming it has any realistic basis and substantive meaning) would

<sup>17</sup> *Nor does the recent agreement with US multinational energy-giant Chevron represent any real exercise of “sovereign rights,” despite government propaganda (Ergatiki Pali, April 2026).*

imply that a given capitalist formation attempts to exploit the “cracks” arising from the rivalries among the US, the EU, China, Russia etc., in order to extract greater concessions and to protect or advance its own interests. This is not easy in any case, and moreover it places significant requirements on a bourgeois class. It would require a coherent plan (for example, it cannot be pursued under a model of extreme privatizations, without at least some “national” state control over key sectors of the economy and infrastructure), as well as capable and appropriate leaderships (i.e. parties and political leaders not mired in permanent crisis and disrepute). In any case, this is not a pro-popular policy.

Greek capitalism, however, has shown neither the capacity nor the interest to pursue such a course — quite the opposite. After 2010, with the Memoranda, the regime of Debt Colony and the economic and overall downgrading of its international position, the dependence of Greek capitalism has deepened, along with its alignment and participation within the camp of Western imperialism.

This has reached a peak in a particularly blatant manner under the [current] Mitsotakis government, with its declarations about being on the “right side of history,” presenting itself as the “most reliable and willing ally” in the worst plans of US imperialism and Zionism. The country has become a base of operations for US–NATO forces, with the continuous expansion and upgrading of military bases (Souda, Alexandroupoli etc.), and with the increasing concession of ports and other infrastructure (e.g. Elefsina). At the same time, it is being turned into a site for settlement, recreation, military training and predatory “investments” by Zionist forces. Military expenditures are enormous and are deployed “not for the narrow waters of the Aegean” (N. Dendias, minister of Defence), but for operations on various fronts — for example, the dispatch of frigates (battleships) to the Red Sea in defense of the interests of shipowners and Western imperialists. The Mitsotakis government provides multifaceted support to some of the most reactionary and bloodstained regimes, such as the semi-fascist regime in Kyiv and the state of Israel — and is among the most ardent advocates and collaborators in the genocide of the Palestinians and of the Gaza occupation. In the case of Venezuela, it supported the gangster-style abduction of Maduro, with the astonishing justification that “this is not the time to speak about international law”. In the war against Iran, beyond its participation to date (Patriot systems in Saudi Arabia etc.), it is increasingly raising its level of involvement, effectively calling for escalation on the part of US–Israel.

This dangerous abomination —which also constitutes an unspeakable humiliation of the history, struggles and sentiments of the Greek people— is not the exclusive “property” of Mitsotakis’ party (New Democracy). Essentially the same policy is pursued by all bourgeois forces and parties, including the non-existent “opposition” (PASOK, SYRIZA... Pleafsi Eleftherias [leader Zoi Konstantopoulou], various reactionary formations of a far-right type). Occasional statements in favor of “international law” or warnings about “dangers” serve only to deceive the Greek people, as long as these forces are not in government. In all other respects, they support the fundamental choices regarding armaments, military bases, the “strategic upgrading of relations with the United States” and so on.

As workers and the poor popular strata know very well, not only do they derive no economic or social benefits from the participation of Greek capitalism in the war, but they pay a very heavy price. Through the sacrifice of all social expenditures and needs, of wages and labor rights. Through the plunder of privatizations, taxation and high prices. Through the intensification of repression, the erosion of democratic freedoms and the establishment of a permanent, increasingly “dark” State of Emergency. Through the cultivation of a climate of militarism, with reactionary changes in the armed forces and conscription, and with propaganda about a “spirit of self-sacrifice” and the need to welcome “coffins with flags” [all these raised

recently by N. Dendias]. Through the transformation of the country into a target for attacks, for example on military bases or elsewhere within its territory.

At the same time, big capital and a wealthy elite reap windfall profits, especially those doing business with the US–NATO–EU imperialists (for example, in the transport of overpriced American LNG). This does not constitute any real development of Greek capitalism (another propagandistic construct). On the contrary, this “war-oriented” and predatory functioning of the economy continuously diverts resources away from production, investment etc. The same applies to the heavily advertised extractive projects, for example those of the American energy company Chevron, which —leaving only a few crumbs (and even these tied to “fiscal stability” and “primary surpluses,” to debt repayment)— turn the Greek economy into an underdeveloped supplier of cheap raw materials, pushing it ever lower into an insignificant ranking in the international division of labor.<sup>18</sup>

In essence, Greek capitalism, in the most adventurist and opportunist manner, believes it has found an opportunity for a “big leap forward,” to “escape” its crisis by aligning itself with the chariot of US–Zionist imperialism in the catastrophic trajectory toward the spread, generalization and escalation of war — in the “race” toward World War III. Thus, Greek capitalism is not merely “dangerously involved” [the phrase usually put forward by Stalinist CP and/or so called pro-patriotic forces] — it actively participates in the imperialist war from among the most reactionary positions. This makes the dangers even greater for the working class, the poor popular strata and the youth—and renders the struggle for an overthrow all the more urgent and imperative.

## THE REACTIONARY GREEK–TURKISH RIVALRY

### The struggle against “our own” bourgeoisie

Beyond the chronic economic and political crisis into which it plunged after 2010, Greek capitalism faces another challenge of historical proportions. Over the past three decades, Turkish capitalism has undergone a multifaceted development and strengthening: in the economy, industry and domestic arms industry; in its capacity to exert influence and intervene in many countries of the broader region; in its centrality to the plans of the “old” Western imperialists,<sup>19</sup> including the management of “migration flows” etc. Indeed, the “gap” has widened so much to the detriment of Greek capitalism (which has been mired in crisis and downgraded) that Turkey has become a characteristic example of what is termed “sub-imperialism”— that is, a regional power possessing its own distinct interests, at times even in contradiction with those of the United States.

Especially with the war against Iran, this trajectory of Turkey now confronts “existential” problems, with an explosion of contradictions and instabilities. This is reflected in the ongoing intensification of its conflict with Israel, which is approaching a dangerous breaking point. In

<sup>18</sup> *From North Africa and the Balkans to Sudan, the Middle East and the Caucasus — especially where Turkey borders Russia or is crucial to its encirclement, and where there exist large Muslim or Turkish-origin populations.*

<sup>19</sup> *At the same time, KKE has for years characterized Greek capitalism as more or less “imperialist” leading to blatant contradictions: calling workers to defend “sovereign rights” not of a dependent country against imperialism, but of a capitalist power seeking expansion. These contradictions reach absurdity. But this is not unusual for a reformist bureaucratic mechanism, that seeks to maintain and reproduce itself on the basis of mass confusion and passivity.*

this context, even the threat of its fragmentation—driven primarily by Zionist forces and the United States— cannot be excluded: a difficult and alarming possibility, yet real.

Greek capitalism, observing the undeniable shift in the correlation of forces against it (in economic and demographic terms, geopolitical reach etc.), has attempted at times to find the so called “calm waters” with Turkish capitalism — to agree on certain controlled arrangements or even concessions in the Aegean and the Eastern Mediterranean, always passing the cost onto workers within the country. This policy, pursued also by the Mitsotakis government, periodically reappears and remains one of the possible options (albeit with significant obstacles).

However, with the US–Israel war against Iran, Greek capitalism appears increasingly willing to “pull the pin”, to engage in the most reckless adventurism. Like a hyena, it declares itself “willing” to support US–Zionist plans for the encirclement of Turkey or even for its partition, should such plans be decided. This is the real meaning of the deployment of F-16s and frigates in Cyprus, Patriot systems in Karpathos etc.— actions for which not only the Mitsotakis camp but also the “opposition,” the media apparatus and military figures boast loudly, even while pretending that... the country is not involved in the war!

All bourgeois parties and forces align with this “national” line. Indeed, an otherwise ineffective “opposition” finds here a field for “patriotic” posturing and outbidding, aiming at electoral gains, calling on the Mitsotakis government to be even more uncompromising towards Turkey.

Greek capitalism believes that in this way it has found a golden opportunity to turn the tables or take revenge, to abruptly compensate for years of relative decline vis-à-vis Turkey. This policy has nothing to do with the “defense of the homeland”: it is an aggressive, adventurist, warmongering nationalism — regardless of how realistic such calculations may be or how far these capabilities truly extend. It bears many similarities to the logic and ambitions of the Greek capitalist offensive during the Greek-Turkish War (1919–1922), when it acted as a “proxy” of British and French imperialism — before being abandoned by them. It is worth recalling that this campaign ended in Minor Asia Catastrophe (1922), at a time when Turkey was far weaker.

The Turkish bourgeoisie, with its ambitions and strength, constitutes a reactionary and dangerous sub-imperialism. But this does not make the Greek bourgeoisie in any way less reactionary or less dangerous. The rivalry between the two bourgeois classes is reactionary on both sides. The danger is immense. A military conflict between Greece and Turkey would be a heavy defeat and a regression of decades for the peoples on both sides of the Aegean — for their rights, their freedoms, their very lives. It must be prevented at all costs, through common struggles. And in Greece, this means first and foremost confronting and defeating the Greek bourgeoisie itself.

This bourgeois nationalism is also consistently echoed and reinforced by KKE. It constantly denounces the bourgeois parties for making “unacceptable” concessions on the so-called “sovereign rights of the country” (whether old or new, already established or still claimed/pursued) through their commitments to US–NATO–EU. It speaks exclusively of “provocation”, “aggression” and “revisionism” from the side of Turkey. In other words, KKE reproaches the Greek bourgeoisie for not being even more consistent and aggressive in defending the “homeland” and its “borders” — that is, the framework of its class domination.<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup> *At the same time, for several years now, in all its texts and positions/analyses, the KKE has considered Greek capitalism to be more or less “imperialist.” In other words: it calls on workers to defend the “sovereign rights” not of a dependent country against imperialism (which is generally understandable and justified), but of an imperialism*

In this way, the Stalinist leadership of KKE disorients workers and youth, effectively pouring water into the mill of bourgeois forces.

## FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF AN ANTIWAR MOVEMENT

The development of a genuine, mass antiwar movement against the trajectory toward the catastrophe of a World War III (or even the outbreak of a Greek–Turkish military conflict) is of vital importance. Militants and organizations of the workers’ movement must take up to this task with the utmost consistency and seriousness, as it is literally a matter of life and death. We must all contribute to this effort — workers, poor popular strata and youth must actively participate, all those who suffer daily, who are threatened, who are anxious want to struggle.

At the end of March 2026, the millions of antiwar demonstrators across the world and in the United States show that the peoples do not want war, that they understand the US-Zionists lies... and that this struggle can grow to massive proportions and win. Indeed, within the United States itself, for the first time, support for a war waged by American imperialism is so low (not exceeding 20%).

### United and Mass Struggle

A first basic precondition for such an antiwar movement is that it possesses a united and mass, broad and active character. Thus, from the standpoint of militants and organizations of the workers’ movement, the following must be avoided: first, any “bureaucratic” and “elitist” mentality that constantly blames the people themselves for passivity, lack of conclusions, conservatism, “complacency” etc. Second, any sectarianism that leads to sterile rivalries, to shadowboxing over slogans, dates of mobilizations and so on. Such policies and practices are conservative, divisive and ultimately completely ineffective. They cannot contribute to a mass mobilization on an issue where large sections of workers and youth understand or feel that their rights and gains —their very survival— are at stake.

For the development of an antiwar movement, what we primarily need is not the “purest” political positions or forces. Nor can we set, from the outset, as a precondition a strategic agreement on the question of imperialism or socialism. Such questions —their discussion, as well as ideological and political struggle around them— must develop through the advancement of the experience of workers and youth, through real action and struggle. We must avoid any artificial division that leads to unnecessary fragmentation of forces, to the perpetuation of conditions of stagnation, passivity, lack of organization or even paralysis among broad masses.

We can and must seek the participation of workers and youth, of ordinary pacifists, trade unionists and unions, artists, public figures etc., who sincerely oppose war — even if they hold their own positions or illusions. Or, depending on the situation and the correlation of forces, we may even seek practical collaboration with reformist or perhaps even bourgeois forces (even if the latter is today a rather marginal possibility).<sup>21</sup>

---

*itself — that is, of a powerful capitalism seeking to expand even further and seize more! Here the contradictions of the KKE’s policy reach the point of extremity and absurdity. On the one hand, “anything less than workers’ and popular power is bourgeois management.” On the other hand, “communists will be the first to defend the borders against Turkish provocation and aggression” (D. Koutsoumbas). But this is not unusual for a bureaucratic and reformist (Stalinist) apparatus that relies on the confusion, deception, and passivity of workers and youth in order to reproduce itself and preserve its privileges.*

<sup>21</sup> Many parties in Europe and the US labeled “progressive” or even “left” are in fact bourgeois.

The precondition and criterion here is not full ideological or programmatic agreement or “purity”, but active participation and opposition to war — the genuine commitment of real forces to concrete mobilizations and actions. The same, in any case, necessarily applies to every militant of the workers’ movement and to all organizations of the Left, especially the far left.

Only on this basis can broad layers of workers participate in the struggle — especially the most oppressed strata, such as women and youth, who are among the primary victims of war.

In the mid-2000s, the development of a large, global antiwar movement against the US war in Iraq (2003)<sup>22</sup> stands as a good example of such a successful movement. More recently, similar characteristics can be found in the international solidarity movement for Palestine. In earlier periods, these elements were also present and essential in the antiwar and peace movements — for example, against the Vietnam War or against the installation of US–NATO bases and nuclear weapons in Europe.<sup>23</sup>

### **The “war machine” is not stopped by speeches in parliament or by “defending the homeland”**

At the same time, we must not cultivate illusions about the real limits and aims of any political force that may participate in antiwar mobilizations — especially regarding the consistency of bourgeois and reformist forces, even when they oppose a particular war. Because their policy ultimately amounts to a deception of workers, the poor popular strata and the youth.

Thus, today, beyond their differences with Mitsotakis’ party of New Democracy and with various reactionary and far-right forces, there exist on the question of war certain substantial common or converging points among forces and parties such as PASOK, SYRIZA, Pefsi Eleftherias... as well as MeRA25 [the formation around Yannis Varoufakis], New Left [split of SYRIZA, now in decay] and even KKE. The same applies to many forces in Europe and the US that present themselves as “left” or “progressive” — but which in reality have pushed to the extreme the dead-ends of older reformist currents that have now degenerated, mutated into bourgeois formations or disappeared (Social Democracy, Stalinism).

These basic common or converging points on the question of war among such bourgeois and reformist forces (with variations depending on context) are the following:

a) They subordinate everything to elections and voting, maintaining a weak or nonexistent presence within the struggles of workers and youth.

b) They promote utopian and disorienting myths about “international law.”

c) They accept or reproduce the propaganda of Western imperialism: “bloodthirsty Putin’s Russia”, “the theocratic mullah regime in Iran”, “the dictatorship of authoritarian Maduro in Venezuela” etc. — or they add only verbal caveats, producing a practically meaningless differentiation.

d) They vote for or support armaments and the “war economy,” as well as anti-worker, anti-popular measures and austerity programs.

e) In every case, they detach the question of war from any real opposition to the capitalist and imperialist system — let alone from the struggle for its overthrow.

Especially in the case of the reactionary Greek–Turkish rivalry, it is a common position of the main official political forces in Greece to align with the aggressive, adventurist,

---

<sup>22</sup> This was rooted in the anti-globalization movement of the late 1990s (European and World Social Forums).

<sup>23</sup> A key difference: earlier movements had a strong revolutionary left presence — largely absent today, creating new challenges.

warmongering nationalism of the “sovereign rights of the country” against “Turkish provocation and aggression”, with the reactionary “axis” with Cyprus–Israel (an attempt to provide strategic depth to Zionism) and with Greece’s participation in the war through military bases, recently through the alleged “protection of Hellenism in Cyprus” etc.

There is a particularity in the policy of the KKE reformists, as it formally positions itself against what the bourgeois parties say regarding the US, NATO, the Zionist state of Israel etc. However, the KKE leadership leads matters to the same negative outcome, in an indirect but essential way. First, through a divisive and conservative policy within the workers’ movement, the trade unions, the students’ associations: separate mobilizations, refusal to develop and escalate the struggle in a real way or efforts to hastily “close it down” at critical moments, anti-democratic attacks against any force out of its control (usually to its left etc.). Second, by imposing on the workers’ movement the inviolable limit, i.e. that it must submit to the bourgeois regime “normality and stability” — and even more so to a “real defense of the homeland and its sovereign rights” in the Greek–Turkish rivalry. Through this policy and practice, the KKE leadership and apparatus contribute significantly to the ideological, political, and practical disarming of the workers’ movement and its militants — and almost always reduce the struggle against war to a “symbolic” action, to a form of “protest” or “pressure” with elections as the sole horizon.

## **From partial mobilizations to a robust antiwar movement**

### **What is to be done**

The first basic task is to develop all antiwar mobilizations: against the participation of Greek capitalism and against any assistance to US–Israel. For the return of all expeditionary forces and weapons systems from abroad; for the cessation of all support to reactionary regimes; for the closure of military bases... For the provision of concrete aid to the peoples under attack, demanding, for example, the immediate severing of relations with Israel and its isolation, and the recognition of an Independent Palestinian State. On the basis of such “immediate” slogans and demands, we must work tirelessly —with outreach and broad agitation— for the densification, mass expansion and strengthening of demonstrations and all antiwar actions.

A second necessary direction is to bring the issue of war into trade unions, students and popular associations, into workplaces and universities, into schools and neighborhoods. Not merely through formal statements or emails from a board (a common practice of the trade union bureaucracy, in all its variants), but through workplace visits, campaigns and general assemblies — so that it becomes a subject of living discussion, decisions and initiatives are taken, workers and youth themselves participate actively.

It is also necessary to build, as far as possible, a unified framework for the development of such an antiwar movement. We must prevent divisive and sectarian actions — above all, for example, the familiar tactic of separate mobilizations by reformists (especially KKE), usually for trivial, narrow “party-interest” reasons. Instead, we should create militant and functional coordinating bodies and committees, based on the most committed and sincere forces that genuinely want to act and struggle. Advancing united mobilizations, alongside the necessary political and ideological discussion within the movement. Wherever steps can be taken in this direction —through cooperation, dialogue and common action among organizations of the far left and the most militant and active forces—, this is useful, promoting the cause and should be actively pursued.

Ultimately, our orientation and practice must be guided by a basic principle: a real antiwar movement cannot be merely an “aggregate” or a continuous “accumulation” of mobilizations on

a calendar of protests, one following another in a routine sequence. It requires escalation — both militant and political:

1. To link the struggle against war with all our demands for labor, social, democratic and political rights and freedoms. There is no antiwar struggle without class struggle — without confronting and breaking the total class offensive of capital against wages, rights, freedoms.

2. To block and render inoperative the “war machine.” For example, whether the military bases themselves or the “normal” functioning of the economy, transport etc., that sustains the conduct of war. Struggles such as strikes and blockades by workers in railways and ports (which have taken place in the US, in Europe, in the Greek port of Piraeus etc.), aimed at preventing the loading or transport of material for US–Israel, are among the most important and valuable elements.

3. To help create political conditions of “unrest and disobedience,” that is, conditions that will shake the stability of the bourgeois political framework and the capacity of a government — and of bourgeois forces in general— to participate in war.

These points mean that we must advance the call not only for demonstrations and events, but also for **Strikes and Occupations**, in the direction of a general **POLITICAL STRIKE** against the war and against any participation of Greek capitalism. A good example here is provided by the recent mass strikes in Italy in solidarity with Palestine, which were accompanied by rallies and demonstrations.<sup>24</sup>

Obviously, such a policy can and must also take on an anti-government character and content —otherwise it remains an empty phrase. Not, of course, in the sense of seeking new elections or a mere change of government in order to bring another bourgeois administration to power.<sup>25</sup> But because the fall of a bourgeois government that is participating in war —such as the current New Democracy government of Mitsotakis— under conditions of rising social and class struggle, constitutes a real step toward shifting and overturning the social and political balance of forces in favor of workers and youth, in favor of the forces of the workers’ movement.

The key to all of the above is this: a real, consistent struggle against war requires the independent **POLITICAL** action of the workers’ movement, of workers and youth, in an anti-imperialist and anti-capitalist direction. It cannot be reduced to ineffective “protest” or “pressure,” to “symbolic actions” that do not shake the balance of forces and that ultimately aim only at being “capitalized” into votes in elections. Any such policy drains the struggle of its substance, neutralizes it and pushes it backward —because it severs it completely from the root of the problem, from the capitalist/imperialist system, from the struggle to overthrow capitalism, from the only real way out: **Socialist Revolution**.

## A basic program of slogans and struggle

For the Class Independence and Internationalism of the workers’ movement, against War and Imperialism:

---

<sup>24</sup> *By contrast, the silence of trade union bureaucracy in Greece [both from the bourgeois parties’ fraction (ND, PASOK, SYRIZA) and from the Stalinist fraction of PAME/KKE] is an obstacle, avoiding the need for political strikes.*

<sup>25</sup> *Reformists often distort and attack the slogan “Down with the Government”, because it radicalizes struggle beyond elections.*

- We fight for the defeat of “our own” imperialist camp of US–Zionism–NATO and of “our own” reactionary bourgeois government. Victory to Iran, Cuba, Venezuela.
- No to armaments and arm race. Funding of the social needs.
- Down with the reactionary “axes” with Israel — no cooperation or support: military, economic, diplomatic, political etc., for the Zionist killer-state. Victory to the Palestinian Resistance. Recognition of an independent Palestinian state.
- No participation in the wars and interventions of the US, NATO and Western imperialists. No army missions beyond the borders.
- Bases and nuclear weapons out — Greece out of NATO & struggle for its dissolution.
- No to the aggressive, chauvinistic adventurism of Greek bourgeoisie. Against the reactionary rivalry of both bourgeois classes: common struggle and internationalism of the peoples in Greece and Turkey against nationalism and the threat of war.
- No to reactionary changes in military service, to militarism, to the militarization of society.

## **BUILDING A STRONG REVOLUTIONARY LEFT**

War, imperialism, Zionism... are ultimately defeated and uprooted through **Socialist Revolution** —through the advance toward a global socialist society, where the criterion is social and human needs; where the major problems of our time (environmental destruction etc.) are addressed collectively and rationally; where there is democratic planning of all major choices (energy, labor, culture etc.); and where there is international cooperation among countries, peoples and movements. A democratic and radical society, having nothing in common with the tragedies of Stalinist dictatorships. A society where democratic rights and freedoms are not forced into a Procrustean bed, but are far more developed and guaranteed — even compared to the most “advanced” bourgeois democracy.

To strengthen such a course, to achieve revolutionary victories toward this goal —starting perhaps from certain countries— requires the **ORGANIZATION** of the working class and of revolutionaries, at every level.

An essential tool and spearhead is a mass organization of revolutionaries — a revolutionary party. One that will confront the system and its decay, the bourgeois class and its state, ideologically, politically, and in practice. By contrast, illusions about how “useful” can still today the old reformist currents be (Social Democracy, Stalinism), lead to dead ends or total collapse; their long domination of the workers’ movement has come at a very high cost in painful retreats, betrayals and defeats. The same —and worse— applies to the ineffectiveness and discredit of various so-called “progressive” parties. It must be stressed in particular that in Europe and the US (but not only there), the policy of building or supporting so-called “broad” parties —as a supposed shortcut to avoid the difficult task of building a strong Revolutionary Left— has proven utterly disastrous.<sup>26</sup>

All of the above applies even more sharply to the struggle against war, which is among the most demanding, since it confronts the “hard core” of the capitalist system and the bourgeois state.

---

<sup>26</sup> *A characteristic example is SYRIZA and similar formations, which often began as “radical” but ended (rather quickly) in bourgeois and neoliberal adaptation.*

Moreover, the struggle against war is by its nature international. This is why we must fight for the international organization of workers, of the most conscious and dedicated militants — for their unity in a renewed **Revolutionary International**, a World Party of Socialist Revolution, with “national” sections rooted in their own countries while acting within a framework of real international solidarity and cooperation. This perspective is necessary in order to avoid the national fragmentation of movements and struggles (even though each of them inevitably begins and develops first on a “national” basis, within a given country).

The current of **Trotskyism** —that is, Revolutionary Marxism and the Fourth International —, throughout its long history, has made an enormous contribution to the struggle against war and imperialism, to the defense of countries, movements, and revolutions. There are countless examples, even if we limit ourselves to the postwar period (especially the revolutionary wave of 1965–1975). Among them: the leading role in the struggle for the victory of the Vietnamese Revolution through the antiwar movements in the US and Europe; the defense of Cuban Revolution, even within the territory of its most deadly enemy, US imperialism; the concrete, material and self-sacrificing support for the victory of the Algerian Revolution for independence from French imperialism<sup>27</sup> — and many more.

This struggle is a precious legacy in today’s effort to build a **Strong Revolutionary Left**, in our country and worldwide — one that can serve as the driving force of the struggle against war. \_

---

<sup>27</sup> *For advancing the win of the Algerian Revolution, the Fourth International organized clandestine networks, sent militants, produced and transported weapons and fought politically against the defeatist line of the French CP, which adapted to the “national interest” of French imperialism. \_*