Proletarians of all countries, unite!

NOTES TO THE DECLARATION IN SUPPORT OF THE IRANIAN PEOPLE[1]

In these notes, we offer some additional comments to clarify certain points in our DECLARATION IN SUPPORT OF THE IRANIAN PEOPLE (published on March 7, 2026)[2] and to outline the current situation of the war, more specifically, the ongoing military campaign by Yankee imperialism and its vassal, the Zionist State of Israel (the aggressor power), and the military counter-campaign by Iran (the oppressed, aggressed country). Therefore, regarding these questions, we clearly show our position:

1. The principal contradiction and the oppressed nations as the base of the world revolution. The focus of the conflict in the GME has shifted to the Persian Gulf.

The focus of the military conflict between imperialism and the oppressed countries of the GME[3] is shifting to Iran. Following the same trajectory, its center has shifted from Palestine (Gaza) to Iran, which is waging a war of national resistance, a just war.

The imperialist-Zionist war of aggression is part of the general counterrevolutionary offensive headed by Yankee imperialism, which targets the oppressed nations, base of the world revolution.

In this, the primary and principal contradiction, that is to say, between oppressed nations on the one hand,[4] and imperialist superpowers and powers on the other, is resolved with Democratic Revolution, which DEMANDS People's War. With People's War, the Marxist-Leninist-Maoist revolutionary counteroffensive is waged, which DEMANDS a Communist Party to lead it.

In this war of aggression by Yankee imperialism and its current genocidal military campaign, the third contradiction, which is inter-imperialist, is also expressing itself at its second level. The first level is between superpowers, and this level is currently being redefined.

The contradiction over the spoils, which in this case is Iran, occurs between the sole hegemonic superpower, Yankee imperialism, and the imperialist powers, which, depending on their alignment with the former, are grouped into vassals and vandals or barbarians.

The lackey governments of the region have aligned themselves with the imperialist-Zionist aggression.

Oil from the Persian Gulf goes to Europe, China, Japan, and India, among others. It has a strong impact on the world economy, which relies on 20% of the refined oil and 20% of the liquefied gas from these countries. That is why the conflict is clearly over distribution.

The military conflict has objectives of great importance for the contendents: the control of the Strait of Hormuz and the security of the region's oil wells.

Imperialist collusion and conflict

To stabilize the world oil market, Yankee imperialism has suspended sanctions on crude oil sales to Russian imperialism, thereby also seeking to drive a wedge between Russian imperialism and Iran. The war in Iran benefits Russian imperialism because oil prices are rising, and Yankee imperialist attention is shifting from Ukraine to the Gulf.

China, due to its dependence on supplies from the region, is at the mercy of the war's development and its outcomes. Much of the oil it imports from Iran and other Gulf countries passes through the Strait of Hormuz and, to a lesser extent, via the Saudi pipeline that reaches the Red Sea.

The issue of the security of the production of oil, gas, and other derivatives for industry and human consumption, as well as their transportation, is exploited by the contending parts for their own ends. It is a problem for both sides, one that involves managing the contradictions they face. The Yankee imperialists aim to score a victory by targeting the military occupation of Kahrgan Island, a key location for controlling the maritime passage through the Strait.

This is a region that has been in dispute since the late 19th century, following the collapse and dissolution of the Ottoman Empire.[5]

2. The relation between political-economic and war

The last part of the previous point leads us to examine the relation between political-economic and war. It is not merely a matter of oil; the underlying problem that has remained unresolved since 1979 is this: whoever advances and controls Iran secures and dominates the GME, a region that is key to the world economy and of great strategic importance because three continents converge there. This is the strategic objective of the war and of the current military campaign; that is why we have included Chairman Gonzalo's statement on this matter in our Declaration.

It is important to be clear on this point, based on a historical analysis of the concrete situation in the GME East and the relation between political-economic and war. This STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE OF YANKEE IMPERIALISM in its war of aggression, in collusion and conflict with the other imperialist powers, finds its concrete expression in REGIME CHANGE IN IRAN.

If they fail to achieve this primary strategic objective in their war of aggression, no matter how many successes they may achieve in what Trump and Netanyahu have called their "strategic military objectives" Yankee and Zionist imperialists will have failed in their war of aggression. That is why, taking stock of the war's development so far, we say that they are failing and have become bogged down in their war, which has now been going on for three weeks.

Therefore: it is not that the imperialists lack a clear strategy, but rather that they are failing and failing despite all their military power, despite all the genocide they are unleashing. THE REGIME OF IRAN, which is heading the war of national resistance against the imperialist-Zionist war of aggression, HAS NOT CAPITULATED. The enemy faces an entrapment in the current war, just as it did in its previous wars in the present century.

They thought it would be easy, that they could repeat the false Venezuelan success with the regime's capitulation, but they hit a brick wall. Within the leadership of the resistance, the partisans of national capitulation before imperialism have been crushed.

The genocidal Donald Trump has declared: "We don't know anyone now; there's no one to converse with". Although Trump and Netanyahu have proclaimed their "military victory", they say the military campaign will continue until all "strategic military objectives" are achieved. But if war is the continuation of politics by other means, if they fail in their political objective of the war, they will inevitably reap their military failure.

For the reasons outlined above, Yankee strategists are discussing rethinking the next steps of their military campaign in light of the possible entry into a new phase of the war, the deployment of ground forces, which would be very limited and dangerous for Trump, as he lacks internal support. This includes what they have planned from the beginning, which is the use of mercenaries from the region as "boots on the ground" as we will see in point 5. At this point, the revolutionary character of some national movements, such as those in Iran, Palestine and others, and the reactionary character of other "national movements" become clear. When the proletarian element is not present through its Communist Party, it is always a concrete and relative problem, which answers the question: Do they serve to weaken or do they serve to strengthen the front of imperialism?

Once again, we reiterate what is stated in the Declaration: it has been proven that the decisive factor in war is not weapons, but people.

3. Yankee imperialism is beset by insurmountable internal and external contradictions. It must rely on troops from its vassals and lackeys.

Yankee imperialism is sinking into a long process, just like all the empires of the past, new forms of imperialism are emerging to challenge it, some are losing ground, and others are on the rise but threatened by bankruptcy.

Imperialism is in the process of collapse and being swept away by the world revolution. Imperialism is the stage of the general crisis of capitalism, which stems from its economic essence, the monopoly. It is monopolist, parasitic, and in a state of decomposition and agony. Yankee imperialism is in a more advanced state of decomposition than its rivals.

The Yankee imperialists, the sole hegemonic imperialist superpower, thought the time had come to advance

and take Iran with their current military campaign in their imperialist war of aggression, assisted by their vassal, the Zionist state of Israel. But as we are seeing, they are going from failure to failure.

The collapse of the regime, followed by the internal subversion that would be triggered by their deluge of fire, destruction and death, has not been produced. As is clear, a country cannot be conquered from the air or the sea; “boots on the ground” are needed. To this end, they planned to use their special forces to support internal subversion, joined by Iranian mercenary forces from the Kurdish minority stationed in Erbil, in so-called Iraqi Kurdistan. An Iranian rocket recently killed a French imperialist official in Erbil who had been training them. The alternative of using Yankee troops to conquer the country is not viable, due to time constraints and the political situation in the US, as this option would require them to deploy between 200 and 300 thousand soldiers. They say: “a limited and dangerous option for Trump given the political situation in the country” (information on this matter in point 5).

Imperialism is beset not only by external contradictions but also by its own internal contradictions, such as the contradiction with the other imperialist faction, on the one hand, and the antagonistic internal contradiction with the proletariat and the American people, on the other.

The vassal imperialists are unwilling to come to their aid because they, too, face similar problems. Furthermore, Merz, Macron, and others claim that this “is not their war”, that they were not consulted beforehand, and that, consequently, they would not receive a significant share of the “fruits of victory”. With elections just around the corner and the risk of losing them, they are unwilling to risk so much for so little.

Through this contradiction among those at the top, one can see, as through a window, the bourgeoisie-proletariat contradiction in the imperialist countries. That is why they need to absolutely centralize the power of the imperialist state, whether through presidential absolutism or fascism, these are the two forms that the reactionary transformation of the bourgeois State takes. We use their contradictions, but we are not about to align ourselves with any of their factions, we stand for the destruction of the bourgeois State through people’s war, through which we will crush fascism, the contrary leads to the defense of bourgeois democracy.

They thought that by subjecting the country to intense bombardment and barbaric genocide, the regime would crumble and the people of Iran would rise up, believing that “the moment of their liberation” had arrived, as Trump and Netanyahu shouted themselves hoarse. But they were wrong, neither has happened, and the internal front, the national front against Zionist imperialist aggression, remains intact.

4. STRATEGIC AND OF PRINCIPLES PROBLEM: Who is the main enemy of the Iranian nation in the present situation?

Yankee imperialism is the principal enemy of the peoples of the world and, specifically, of the oppressed nations of the GME. Imperialism is not one whole, to view it as such is Kautskyism, pure rightism. The contradictions among the imperialists function as reserve forces of the revolution (Lenin).

The regime that heads the State of Iran, despite its nature as a Muslim theocracy led by the Shiite cleric Khamenei, has come to head a just war.

The fact noted above expresses the dual character of the class that leads that landlord-bureaucratic State, which, in the face of imperialist aggression, can be part of the national front, as in this case, and forms part of the Iranian nation.

The struggle of Iran’s Ayatollah and his partisans for national resistance against the imperialist war of aggression, for the defense of their country’s sovereignty and formal independence, is an objectively revolutionary struggle, because that struggle weakens imperialism, decomposes it, and undermines it, since they are opposed to the New-Democratic revolution and its uninterrupted step to socialism (due to its dual character), they function as reserve forces of the world revolution.

That is why the problem facing Iran’s war of national resistance at this moment is that its development into a New-Democratic revolution against imperialism, bureaucratic capitalism, and semi-feudalism, and its uninterrupted step toward a socialist revolution, requires proletarian leadership through its Communist Party, which must transform that struggle into a people’s war. The condition for the victorious development of the new great wave of the world revolution.

What has been outlined above is of the utmost importance not only for the national resistance struggle in Iran, Palestine, Lebanon, and the entire region, but also for the world revolution to sweep imperialism and reaction from the face of the earth.

Therefore, how the parties, movements, and any other forces in Iran or the region position themselves determines their class character, that is, whether they are national movements serving the liberation of the oppressed peoples and thus the world revolution, or whether they are “national movements” serving as outposts of the most dangerous enemy in the East.

5. The reactionary character of a “national movement”

Comrades from Dem Volken Dienen (Serve the People) recently published an article titled “Komalah: The Interests of the USA and Israel in Iran and the Kurds”,[6] which, as they noted, originated from the “maoistdazibao” blog in Germany. We would like to highlight only the central information it contains, which is:

“There are reports (in the media) according to which the United States and Israel would enlist the armed forces of certain Kurdish parties to use them as ground troops against the Islamic Republic. According to American and Israeli functionaries as well as some political sources, a plan is being considered under which the armed forces of Kurdish parties in the Kurdistan region would march into Iranian Kurdistan and take control of part of that region.

This means that this plan, originating from the Israeli government and the Mossad, has been proposed and subsequently adopted by the US-Central Intelligence Agency (CIA). There are also reports of contacts and discussions between U.S. officials and some leaders of the Kurdish party coalitions. According to this plan, the armed forces of these parties would be used as ground troops to carry out the political and military objectives of the US and Israel.”

The article also cites two historical examples of how the armed forces of Kurdish parties have been used to advance imperialist aggression in the region, specifically the 1990–91 Gulf War and, more recently, the imperialists’ exploitation of the Kurdish movement in Syria.

Regarding the fundamental issue raised in this information, we wish to clearly state our position:

In assessing the above information, we state: how the parties, movements, and any other forces in Iran or the region position themselves determines their class character, that is, whether they are national movements serving the liberation of the oppressed peoples and thus the world revolution, or whether they are “national movements” serving as outposts of the most dangerous enemy in the East.

“The national question is a part of the general question of the proletarian revolution, a part of the question of the dictatorship of the proletariat. (…)

Hence the necessity for the proletariat of the ‘dominant’ nations to support — resolutely and actively to support — the national liberation movement of the oppressed and dependent peoples.

This does not mean, of course, that the proletariat must support *every* national movement, everywhere and always, in every individual concrete case. It means that support must be given to such national movements as tend to weaken, to overthrow imperialism, and not to strengthen and preserve it. Cases occur when the national movements in certain oppressed countries come into conflict with the interests of the development of the proletarian movement. In such cases support is, of course, entirely out of the question. (…)

In the ’40s of the last century Marx supported the national movement of the Poles and Hungarians and was opposed to the national movement of the Czechs and the South Slavs. Why? Because the Czechs and the South Slavs were then ‘reactionary peoples,” ‘Russian outposts” in Europe, outposts of absolutism; whereas the Poles and the Hungarians were ‘revolutionary peoples,” fighting against absolutism. Because support of the national movement of the Czechs and the South Slavs was at that time equivalent to indirect support for Tsarism, the most dangerous enemy of the revolutionary movement in Europe.

“The various demands of democracy [writes Lenin] including self-determination, are not an absolute, but a *small part* of the general democratic (now: general socialist) world movement. In individual concrete cases, the part may contradict the whole; if so, it must be rejected.[7]”

This is the position in regard to the question of particular national movements, of the possible reactionary character of these movements — if, of course, they are appraised not from the formal point of view, not from the point of view of abstract rights, but concretely, from the point of view of the interests of the revolutionary movement.”[8]

With this quote from c. Stalin,[9] we conclude this additional note.

PERU PEOPLE’S MOVEMENT

1. https://vnd-peru.blogspot.com/2026/03/mpp-notas-la-declaracion-en-apoyo-al.html↩
2. Red Library: https://redlibrary.info/works/mpp/declaration-the-war-of-national-resistance-of-the-iranian-people-will-prevail-against-the-imperialist-zionist-war-of-aggression.pdf↩
3. Red Library: Greater Middle East.↩
4. Red Library: To see the three fundamental contradictions in the current world, see the Communist Party of Peru's International Line here: https://redlibrary.info/works/pcp/international-line.pdf.↩
5. **What does USA strategic doctrine mean by regional balance in the Greater Middle East?**

   It should be recalled that the strategic orientation of Yankee imperialism in the 1960s regarding nuclear and conventional warfare was known as the "1½ strategy". This strategy considered the USSR and China as a single bloc, with the Middle East serving as the "half", a region whose balance of power was determined by four major powers, with the US and the USSR acting as arbiters of that regional balance. Since 1970, with Nixon's government, the Americans' strategic orientation regarding theaters of war has shifted, coming to be known as the "2½ strategy" because it treats the USSR and China separately, not as a single bloc. That is, if one of them goes to war with the US, this would not automatically mean that the other would do so as well.

   The scenario of lesser strategic importance, the ½, is the ME, and considerations of its balance are maintained. It is clear that during the 1970s, this balance tilted in favor of Yankee dominance. But, in 1979 a new power entered the picture as the Yankees" "lapdog", the Shah of Iran, was overthrown, and the U.S. lost control of the country, which became known as the Islamic Republic of Iran. The new Shiite regime challenged the role of the superpowers in the regional balance, primarily affecting Yankee imperialist dominance and calling into question the existence of the State of Israel.

   When the USA new National Security Strategy refers to restoring regional balance, it is referring to the need for Yankee imperialism to regain the control over Iran it lost in 1979 and to establish a regional balance among the powers of the region under the authority of the sole hegemonic superpower. This concept of "balance" stems from the European balance from the 19th century up to the First World War, which was arbitrated by the imperialist superpower England.↩
6. Red Library: Read online in German: https://demvolkedienen.org/de/2026/03/komalah-interessen-der-usa-und-israels-im-iran-und-die-kurden/.↩
7. V. I. Lenin, "The Discussion on Self-Determination Summed Up," *Collected Works*, Vol. XXII.↩
8. J. Stalin. Foundations of Leninism, VI. The National Question.↩
9. Red Library: Comrade Stalin.↩