

Some Considerations on the Current Developments in Afghanistan

[.PDF here](#)

[.docx here](#)

Proletarians of all countries, unite!

Some Considerations

on the Current Developments in Afghanistan

Introduction

We reaffirm that the main contradiction in the world today is between imperialism and the oppressed nations. This contradiction is concretised in local, regional and world wars. The basis of the proletarian world revolution is the Third World, where the peasantry is the largest class and therefore the main force, and where the proletariat leads through its party. Revolution is the main trend and it develops unevenly in all countries. Imperialism is not one and is made up of US imperialism, the single hegemonic imperialist superpower, Russian imperialism, the atomic superpower and the other imperialist powers. They exist in collusion and struggle.

This is developing more and more every day, for example, as recent events in the so-called Greater Middle East show, there is collusion between the USA and Russia, there is also collusion between them and powers like Germany, France, China and we see alignments of backward countries, defending the interests of the exploiters not their peoples, like Iran, Egypt, Syria, Turkey, Saudi Arabia, Pakistan, India, etc. The collusion is based on a growing and sharp struggle in a trade war and a struggle between the superpower, the atomic superpower and others like Germany, Japan and China that want to join forces and seek for the hegemonisation of the world, but the struggle for their own interests is stronger than "expediency", because the struggle is absolute and the collusion (unity) is relative.

To deny the inter-imperialist contradiction that develops as collusion and struggle between them is false and dangerous, because it leads to sustaining "super-imperialism"; it is not only an economic problem, it is a problem of contradictions, of conflicts of specific and diverse interests of each of the superpower, powers and the oppressed nations that also act there, obviously not for the benefit of their peoples, but for the benefit of the exploiting classes. This collusion and struggle stirs up the international class struggle, sowing winds that can explode into a great conflagration. It is part of the general counter-revolutionary offensive which is supported by the various opportunists and revisionists.

The collusion and struggle is increasing for spheres of influence and redivision of the world; it is for further exploitation of the world that accumulates strong explosive capacity, especially the Third World because it is the spoils. Asia, Africa and Latin America continue to be explosive zones, these zones constitute the cauldron that is accumulating more volcanic explosive capacity and this is going to produce big explosions much more shocking than those that have occurred so far.

West and Central Asia

The so-called Greater Middle East is an area of more complex contradictions, including Afghanistan. We should bear in mind that the most acute conflict in the region was the Palestinian resistance against the Zionist state of Israel until the late 1970s, when it began to shift to the decade lasting Iran-Iraq war. Thus, the focus of the struggle in the region shifted eastwards, coinciding with the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in an attempt to move out into the Indian Ocean, a dangerous situation for the US. Control of the Middle East was at stake. It moved to Iraq again in the 1990s, then to Afghanistan (and Iraq) in the early part of this century and, in the second decade of this century, to Syria (and Iraq).

Now, where will it move to? The basic problem for the imperialists is the whole of the Greater Middle East, the question of oil, the strategic situation of the region and the conflicts of the hegemonic superpower with the atomic superpower and the imperialist powers, the problem of how to guarantee control of the whole region, as in the case of the social-imperialist Soviet Union's invasion of Afghanistan.

So we see a confluence of powers and superpowers. But we also see that there are regimes of old feudal systems, of old aristocracy, kingships like those of Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, the Arab Emirates, Jordan; that all these oil countries and others see their situation threatened, their interests at risk. And that the different participants have their own interests; thus, an extremely complex set of interests, superpowers, powers, oppressed nations, rotten regimes that may fall and the interests of the Arab people exploited by imperialism and by the native regimes themselves. But the superpower, the powers and their lackeys are calling the shots, the Arab peoples are postponed in all these countries.

In this region we see several developing and twisted contradictions. The main one is the contradiction between

imperialism and oppressed nations. The second one is the inter-imperialist contradiction. From these contradictions arise those that are vulgarly expressed by the bourgeois media as: government vs. democratic opposition; ISIS vs. government; the Kurdish question; Russian intervention in Syria backing the government against the opposition and ISIS; US intervention disguised as support for the opposition and the Kurds against ISIS; Turkish war in Syria as war against the Kurds (PKK); Israeli war against Iran, its Shia militias and against Hezbollah.

Syria is divided into three parts and two spheres of influence. After a decade of war, Syria is divided between Russian and US imperialism. There are three relevant zones (not to mention the small areas where ISIS or other groups dominate). The first and largest is a Russian-Iranian-Syrian zone ruled by the Assad regime; the second is an area on the eastern shores of the Euphrat, dominated by the Yankees who have their Kurdish PKK mercenaries (these few oil wells are what US imperialism gained in the ten years of war); thirdly, there is a small area in the northwest of Syria dominated by Turkey, another more autonomous US puppet.

On the history of Afghanistan

In the early 19th century, after the death of Fateh Khan, Afghanistan entered a period of more or less constant (civil) wars and threats of foreign invasion. Punjab and Kashmir were lost to the Sikh Empire. In 1837 the Afghan-Sikh wars ended. In 1838, the British invaded Afghanistan and replaced Dost Mohammad with Shah Shuja Durrani. The period up to 1842 is known as the First Anglo-Afghan War, which resulted in the famous destruction of Elphinstone's army and the British withdrawal. Russia extended its influence and in 1878 the British launched the Second Anglo-Afghan War by their puppet in India, the British Rajah. The Third Anglo-Afghan War was fought after World War I, where Afghanistan was officially recognised by the British as an independent nation.

The so-called People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan, PDPA, took over the government in 1978. First, it initiated a genocide, killing tens of thousands, especially communists. On Christmas Eve 1979, the social-imperialist USSR invaded Afghanistan, triggering a decade of so-called proxy warfare. This converged with the beginning of the strategic offensive of the proletarian world revolution. The more than half a million Russian troops were unable to defeat the Afghan people and some 250,000 mujahideen, supported mainly by US and British imperialism. The "Taliban" took over without managing to stabilise control of the country.

On 7 October 2001, the Yankees, accompanied by an international alliance, invaded Afghanistan to eliminate their former allies. The death toll is not counted, more than

200,000 died. About 3500 invaders were also killed, mostly US soldiers (~2500). The Afghan lackeys of US imperialism lost some 65,000 men.

More than two centuries of war, both internally and against foreign crusaders, with small breaks, especially the last four decades of modern warfare, ground the Afghan people. A People, whose sons and daughters are forged in armed struggle as a daily normality, a fact that proves that the questioning of armed struggle on our hill is an absolute folly. Armed struggle is a reality and there is no alternative for anyone.

US – Taliban relations in the last decade of the 20th century

First of all we have to highlight the emergence of the movement called Taliban: "Jalaluddin Haqqani, an American ally from the Cold War ... founder of the feared Haqqani militant network [part of the Taliban and affiliated with Al Qaeda] ... among the closest proxies for Pakistan's military spy agency, Inter-Services Intelligence, known as the ISI. ... That relationship was forged in the 1980s, when Jalaluddin Haqqani and the ISI both were favored allies of the United States ..." [NYT: "Taliban Say Haqqani Founder Is Dead. His Group Is More Vital Than Ever.", Sept. 4, 2018] "Although the Taliban has a strong endogenous impetus, according to Taliban commanders the ISI orchestrates, sustains and strongly influences the movement. ... Directly or indirectly the ISI appears to exert significant influence on the strategic decision making and field operations of the Taliban ... it controls the most violent insurgent units ... confirmed that the ISI are even represented, as participants or observers, on the Taliban supreme leadership council ..." [Crisis States Discussion Papers: "THE SUN IN THE SKY: THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PAKISTAN'S ISI AND AFGHAN INSURGENTS", June 2010] The ISI is a direct product of British and Yankee Imperialism, dominating Pakistan. Hence, it is not to question if the imperialists found, lead and direct the movement called Taliban. The question is how firm the grip is.

In view of the current developments, it is important to look at the history of the relations between the USA and the Taliban, i.e. the Pashtun "fiefdoms" in Afghanistan, which according to the sources consulted failed because the Taliban always made higher economic demands in order to agree to the projects of the US monopolies, because they did not have control over the whole territory and above all could not provide security in the area through which the oil and gas pipelines should pass, and finally, because with the arrival of Osama bin Laden the Taliban government increasingly increased its verbal attacks against the US government.

US relations with the Taliban, some media data:

"The United States wants good ties [with the Taliban] as well, but can't openly seek them while women are severely repressed. (CNN: "U.S. in a diplomatic hard place in dealing with Afghanistan's Taliban", October 8, 1996) Therefore it has to be done secretly.

"... some Western business interests are warming up to the Taliban ... Several U.S. and French firms are interested in developing gas lines through central and southern Afghanistan,

where the 23 Taliban-controlled states are located ..." (IPS: UN Considers Arms Embargo on Afghanistan, Dec 16 1997)

The interest of the imperialists is, according to the Wall Street Journal to make Afghanistan a transferring country for oil and gas exports as well as other resources of Central Asia. Whether you like them or not, according to the WSJ, the Taliban are the ones most capable to bring peace to Afghanistan at the just moment. (see WSJ: "Great Game Endgame", 23 May 1997)

"The Clinton Administration has taken the view that a Taliban victory ... would act as a counterweight to Iran, and would offer the possibility of new trade routes that could weaken Russian and Iranian influence in the region." (NYT: "In Afghanistan, a Triumph of Fundamentalism", 26 May 1997)

The International Herald Tribune reported in summer 1998 that the Clinton-Administration bargained with the Taliban on a pipeline from Turkmenistan via Afghanistan and Pakistan to the Indian Ocean.

It became clear to the Bush-Administration that the Taliban would not be able to fulfil the role of a yankee-friendly government. They recognised an increasing anti-american world outlook within the Taliban.

According to several sources the Taliban used a more aggressive tone after the arrival of Osama bin Laden in Afghanistan and the bombings in Eastern Africa: Against the USA, the UN, the Saudis.

Something happened regarding the negotiations on oil and gas exports between the USA and the Taliban as well:

"The Taliban made more demands and went beyond the \$100 million budgeted in the middle of the year. They wanted water supply, telephone and power lines, as well as a tap on the pipeline to bring oil and gas to Afghanistan. Unocal became suspicious and finally abandoned its plans after the bombing of the embassies in East Africa." [Oil & Gas International: "Unocal & Afghanistan", 29 October 2001]

Afghanistan's Strategic Significance

Afghanistan is seen as the gateway to Central Asia and the Caspian region and key to the control of the MOA.

A Brookings Institution conference (May 2001) shows that the exploitation of Caspian and Asian energy resources was a top priority for the Bush administration. According to the government report: the "growing international demand for oil will increase pressure on international oil markets and the availability of oil will ensure". Developing Asian economies and population growth, especially in China and India, will be a major contributor to this increased demand. (...) Over the last decade, several options have been discussed to build Caspian natural gas pipelines. region to supply the Asian market".

Afghanistan as the hub of Central Asian dominance:

In the book, "The One World Power, America's Strategy for Domination (1997), a study by the Council on Foreign Relations (Council on Foreign Relations, CFR)" the issue of detailed strategic planning for future US interventions in the region is discussed. The author is Zbigniew Brzezinski, former

national security adviser from 1977 to 1981 in the Carter administration.

Brzezinski writes that control over Central Asian countries is the key to governing Eurasia. According to him, Russia and China border Central Asia and are the two main powers that could threaten US interests in the region, with Russia being the biggest threat. Therefore, the US must control and manipulate 'weaker' neighbouring powers, e.g. Ukraine, Azerbaijan, Iran and Kazakhstan to counter Russian and Chinese advances to control the oil and natural gas reserves and other natural resources of the Central Asian region – of Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan, Tajikistan and Kyrgyzstan.

Brzezinski writes that "if China and Russia were to dominate Central Asia, it would be a direct threat to US access to oil resources in and outside the region, as well as in the Persian Gulf. The Central Asian republics "have (...) security policy and historical importance because at least three of their immediate and most powerful neighbours, here Russia, Turkey and Iran, have always had intentions and China has always had major political interests in the region".

"... The economic boom in Asia is already triggering a massive rush of exploration and exploitation of new energies, and the Central Asian region and the Caspian basin are well known oil and gas reserves that put those of Kuwait, the Gulf of Mexico or the North Sea in the shade".

"Once pipelines are in place in the region, Turkmenistan's truly gigantic natural gas reserves promise its people a prosperous future (...) An Islamic revival, which is already receiving external support from Iran, but also from Saudi Arabia, is likely to inspire aggressive nationalisms that will oppose any reintegration under Russian rule, and other powers seen as unbelievers". "Pakistan seeks to gain geostrategic depth through political influence in Afghanistan – and to prevent Iran from doing the same and interfering in Tajikistan – and to capitalise on any new pipeline connecting Central Asia to the Arabian Sea." "Shrewd politicians in Russia's leadership also recognise that the population explosion taking place in Russia's new southern border states could create a precarious situation if these states cannot sustain their economic growth." "Turkmenistan (has) actively examined the possibilities for the construction of a new oil pipeline through Afghanistan and Pakistan to the Arabian Sea" (...).

"Therefore, the primary interest of the United States must be to help ensure that no single power gains control over this geopolitically important area and that the world community has unimpeded economic and financial access here."

"China's growing economic practice in the region and its interest in its independence are also congruent with US interests." "The United States is the only superpower in the world today, and Eurasia is centre stage. Therefore, the question of how power is distributed on the Eurasian continent will be of vital importance for global supremacy and America's historical legacy".

"In the middle of Eurasia, the space between an expanding Europe and a regionally emerging China will remain

geopolitically a black hole as long as Russia has not yet penetrated any post-imperial self-definition, while the region south of Russia: the Eurasian Balkans. – A cauldron of ethnicities. Great power conflicts and rivalries are threatened”.

“In this context, it depends on how the US deals with Eurasia. Eurasia is the largest continent on earth and is geopolitically axial. A power ruling Eurasia would rule two of the three most developed and economically productive regions in the world. Nearly 75 percent of the world’s population lives in Eurasia, and its land and businesses contain most of the world’s material wealth. Eurasia accounts for 60 per cent of the world’s gross national product and approximately three-quarters of the world’s known energy resources.”

“If one uses terminology reminiscent of the most brutal era of old world empires, then the three most important imperatives of imperial geostrategy are: to avoid collusion among vassals and preserve their security dependence, to keep tributary states docile, and to protect them to ensure that “barbarian peoples do not unite.” “From now on, the US faces the question of how it can deal with regional coalitions that want to drive it out of Eurasia and thus threaten its status as a world power”. “Therefore, support for the new post-Soviet states – for geopolitical pluralism in the area of the former Soviet power – must be an integral part of the policy that should induce Russia to exercise its European Option without ifs and buts. Three of these states are of particular geopolitical importance, namely Azerbaijan, Uzbekistan and Ukraine. (...) Uzbekistan, the most vital and densely populated Central Asian state in terms of population, represents the main obstacle to any renewed Russian control over the region. Its independence is of crucial importance for the survival of the other Central Asian states, and it is still best defended against Russian pressure’.

Brzezinski also notes:

“Given the climate of people on the political horizon in Europe and Asia, any successful US policy must focus on Eurasia as a whole and be guided by a geostrategic plan. (...) This requires a high degree of tactics and manipulation lest an opposition coalition be formed that might ultimately challenge the primacy of the United States (...)”.

From the above it can be concluded how important it is for the US imperialism to dominate Afghanistan for its global domination, because if it secures its control, it gains control over the key region of Central Asia.

But, the USA have reaped only failures in the war of conquest in Afghanistan, what conclusions should the USA draw from this fact and what are their plans for the area? That is the question and they have to follow the logic of all reactionaries:

“Make trouble, fail, make trouble again, fail again... till their doom – that is the logic of the imperialists and all reactionaries the world over in dealing with the people’s cause, and they will never go against this logic. This is a Marxist law.”

Chairman Mao: "Cast Away Illusions, Prepare for Struggle"
(August 14, 1949)

The present situation

The so-called „Agreement for Bringing Peace to Afghanistan between the Islamic Emirate of Afghanistan which is not recognized by the United States as a state and is known as the Taliban and the United States of America” contents first to „prevent the use of the soil of Afghanistan by any group or individual against the security of the United States and its allies” and the „withdrawal of all foreign forces from Afghanistan”. This is explained as follows (excerpts):

„The United States is committed to withdraw from Afghanistan all military forces of the United States, its allies, and Coalition partners, including all non-diplomatic civilian personnel, private security contractors, trainers, advisors, and supporting services personnel ...”

„The Islamic Emirate of Afghanistan ... will send a clear message that those who pose a threat to the security of the United States and its allies have no place in Afghanistan, and will instruct members of the Islamic Emirate of Afghanistan ... not to cooperate with groups or individuals threatening the security of the United States and its allies.”

„The Islamic Emirate of Afghanistan ... will not provide visas, passports, travel permits, or other legal documents to those who pose a threat to the security of the United States and its allies to enter Afghanistan.”

„The United States and the Islamic Emirate of Afghanistan ... seek positive relations with each other and expect that the relations between the United States and the new post-settlement Afghan Islamic government as determined by the intra-Afghan dialogue and negotiations will be positive.”

„The United States will seek economic cooperation for reconstruction with the new postsettlement Afghan Islamic government ... and will not intervene in its internal affairs.”

It can be seen as political proof that the Yankees and the Taliban are making a deal of “mutual convenience” for both, on the one hand, US imperialism will gain “stable” dominance over Afghanistan and end a war they could not win, on the other hand, the Taliban are recognised as partners, not enemies.

It is a deal that would be subordinating the Taliban under the US, relations under imperialism are not of equals but of subjugation and violence, which turns Afghanistan into a “stable sphere” of influence for the US, explicitly directed against those who threaten the “security of the US and its allies”. Less explicit seems to be the case for Russia, China and Iran. Thus, the US offers the “sell-out of hope of democracy and equality in Afghanistan”, as it is called in the Western media. It is noteworthy that this agreement is the result of twenty years of war. You only negotiate what you have won or lost on the battlefield. The old US-Taliban relationship is back. Presumably, these twenty years of war have seen changes in the correlation of political forces within the Taliban that make this deal of convenience possible; presumably, therefore, the US, despite defeats on the battlefield, has conducted successful operations to strike

at the top of the Taliban leadership and bases against the most hostile forces. That is why Chairman Gonzalo has insisted so much on developing our counter-operations against such operations that are carried out within the enemy's campaigns and our counter-campaigns.

US imperialism is trying to prevent the three main forces in the region, Russia, China and Iran, from joining forces with each other. This is explained by several imperialist think-tanks:

"President Joe Biden faces a nightmare scenario of global consequence: increasing Sino-Russian strategic cooperation aimed at undermining US influence" and intelligence services are warning about "Russia's growing strategic cooperation with China ... to achieve its goals." (The Atlantic Council: Why growing Sino-Russian common cause raises Biden's nightmare; <https://www.atlanticcouncil.org/content-series/inflection-points/why-growing-chinese-russian-common-cause-poses-bidens-nightmare-scenario/>)

„Iran's influence over potential proxy forces in Afghanistan, notably the fighters of the Fatemiyoun Brigade recruited to fight for Tehran's ally regime in Syria (but also including elements of the Taliban in the southwestern part of the country, and some armed groups in the north).“ Further: „Iran is almost certain to extend support, even protection and arms if need be, to fellow Shiite and ethnic-Tajik communities“ and „This [Iranian] dynamic is also reflected somewhat in Russia and China's stance toward Afghanistan“ (FES: Neighbors Abhor a Vacuum;

<http://library.fes.de/pdf-files/bueros/kabul/17753.pdf>)
„Moscow sees the long-term presence of NATO in Afghanistan as a serious threat to its regional interests,“; „Russia's primary security interest in Afghanistan is to curtail the spread of terrorism and radical Islam, including ISIS, into Central Asia and Russia“; „Russia has historically perceived Central Asia as within its sphere of influence“ (i.e. beneath Afghanistan: Kasachstan, Usbekistan, Turkmenistan, Tadjikistan und Kirgisistan); „Russia aims to enhance its regional weight and ultimately protect its future security interests in the event of state collapse or a Taliban takeover (what is near at hand after the Yankee-Taliban-Deal); „Russia's future policy towards Afghanistan is intertwined in its complex geopolitical dynamics with the U.S., the EU, ... Russia's ties to and its intelligence agencies' cooperation with Iran in Afghanistan and beyond are likely to further complicate these dynamics.“; „Russia has little appetite to fill in the gap by sending troops to Afghanistan, not just because of its failed experience in Afghanistan but because Moscow is already engaged on several fronts – Syria, Ukraine, and Libya – and lacks further resources.“; „Moscow may also spoil the process by prematurely recruiting regional strongmen-type figures to build a buffer zone around the northern border.“ (FES: Meeting in the Middle? Russia, Afghanistan, and Europe; <http://library.fes.de/pdf-files/bueros/kabul/16999.pdf>)
In another document the FES states: „Beijing increasingly appears to register Afghanistan as a priority on its western

borders“; „China might well seek to bring Afghanistan closer under its economic and political scope of influence, having alluded for years to including the country under its multi-billion-dollar Belt and Road Initiative.“; „In August 2020, China signed a strategic partnership agreement with Iran on trade, politics, and security, giving Beijing a strategic foothold in the Persian Gulf.“

The Afghanistan Study Groups „Final Report“ states: „Iran’s ties to Afghanistan are both physical, ... and intangible, in the form of a shared history and culture. Iran sees itself as a protector of Afghanistan’s Shia population, which had been the target of Taliban persecution when the movement controlled Afghanistan in the late 1990s, and its long-standing connections with Shia leaders give it a certain prominence in Afghan domestic politics. After 2001, Iran was reported to have been helpful to the overall objectives of the United States ... Iran’s position shifted ... to ... discreet support for U.S. enemies, including the Taliban. ... Iran has significant leverage in domestic Afghan politics, which it uses to support the interests of the Afghan Shia population, frustrate U.S. interests, and otherwise attempt to secure political outcomes that accord with its own agenda. Iran ... does not want to see the return of a Taliban regime ...“ But this is exactly what will happen, and even more.

The RAND Corporation obviously agrees upon this but explains it the other way round: “You may no longer be interested in war, but war is interested in you.” by quoting Trotzky. And resumes: „Decisive action always looks good—but navigating a turbulent world requires trying to avoid unintended consequences, hedging bets, not foreclosing options, and above all, responding to inevitable events. In some cases, like in Afghanistan, this means aiming to secure the least bad outcome.“ (The RAND Corporation: Getting Out of Forever Wars: What Are Biden’s Options in Afghanistan?; Comment by Brian Michael

Jenkins;
<https://www.rand.org/blog/2021/03/getting-out-of-forever-wars-what-are-bidens-options.html>)

US imperialism has to act. But what should it do? First of all, bring Iran back under the control of US imperialism. They lost it after the “Iranian revolution” (the historical moment of the beginning of the strategic offensive of the proletarian world revolution) on which the mullahs were mounted.

It is obvious that they need a free hand to handle the problem. One approach that serves this purpose is the Abraham Accords, a treaty to “normalise” relations between Israel and the United Arab Emirates, Bahrain, Sudan and Morocco. Other potential signatories include Indonesia, Mauritania, Oman, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia and Uzbekistan.

But how to regain dominance over Iran? Violence and deals. Direct acts of war against Iran such as the annihilation of the head of Iran’s Revolutionary Guard, indirect acts of war through the IDF, sabotage, assassination, espionage, etc., etc., etc. It deals, for example, with the Iranian atomic programme, cuts it off, generates pressure and offers new deals. New agreements that have expanded the content: “US

Special Representative for Iran Elliott Abrams ... insisted that addressing Tehran's missile program and regional behavior in a new agreement would make for a better deal, adding that one of the great shortcomings of the 2015 nuclear accord ..." (The Atlantic Council, The risk of a too comprehensive deal with Iran)

Note on the assassination of Qasem Soleimani: The Yankees acted in this case as we said above on influencing the internal contradictions within the Taliban. They killed Soleimani because he was too close to the Russians. Iran's former defense minister Hossein Dehghan stated: "Well, for example, when the Russians came to Syria [in 2015] to fight ISIS, we had several meetings with Hajj Qasem on various issues of support and communication with the Russians ... I was supposed to have a meeting with President Vladimir Putin in Moscow prior to the meeting with Qasem and the Russians, which actually led to the Russians entering Syria ... It was Qasem's art to persuade Mr. Putin ..." [Jerusalem Post: "Qasem Soleimani's life: Secrets of his role with Turkey, Russia, Syria", 17 Feb 2020]

Deals are also favourable for the Yankees in regards to the development in Yemen where Yankees as well as Iran are active through proxies. The RAND Corporation wrote in a report worked on also by the Yankees Office of the Secretary of Defense and the Department of State called "Building an Enduring Peace in Yemen": "... a coordinated approach to Yemen's security. This approach should be consistent and emphasize the mutual interests in a stable and peaceful Yemen. In recent months, even Iran has indicated that it is more willing to support the negotiations and contribute to the peace process, lest it be marginalized in any deal that the Houthis make with its rival Saudi Arabia. Such progress should be welcomed and encouraged as the international community builds a broad framework for the peace process."

This would be the smart way, with lower costs and risks. Reconciliation. The other way is to try to conquer Iran, probably failing (as always), but destroying its national unity, creating chaos – balkanisation, as in Iraq, Syria, Yemen, etc. To succeed in either option, the US has to break Iran's dependence on Russia and China. As can be seen in Belarus and Ukraine it is not the time to initiate direct confrontation with either Russia or China (see the conflict over occupied Taiwan and in the South China Sea).

But this illustrates exactly what the Yankees are trying to do: create problems for Russia and China so that they have to focus on these issues and not on Iran. The imperialist aggression against Ukraine, Syria and Belarus or the Alexei Navalny affair (as well as Faezeh Hashemi in Iran or Ai Weiwei in China) are well-known examples of exactly this tactic of stirring up trouble against Russia. What is new will be the pressure on "Islamic terrorist" forces. After the Yankees have solved the problem of Syria, Iraq, Kurdistan, Yemen and Afghanistan, they seek to push "Islamic terrorism" eastwards and northwards from Afghanistan. Towards China and Russia, mainly Russia as the main opponent (atomic superpower). See

the agitation of the Western media regarding the Uygur people in China, and don't forget the East Turkestan Independence Movement as threats to the fascist regime of social-imperialism (note: as well as the immense number of (militant) uprisings in China against corruption, for higher wages and better living and working conditions). See also the case of Chechnya and other "Islamist" approaches in Russia and in "their" oppressed nations.

The Yankees are trying to avoid their own casualties as a result of continuous military failure since World War II (except for the genocide in Grenada). So they change their military approaches on the basis of their failure, that is the important difference with the war against Vietnam. They use mainly special forces and mercenaries as cannon fodder: Turks, Kurds, Saudis and future Taliban. They are using a global system of bases, satellites, long, medium and short range missiles (offensive and defensive), air forces, aircraft carriers, battleships, submarines, drones, etc. to enforce their hegemonic dominance (the so-called "Obama war strategy"). They use low-intensity warfare (LIC) to achieve limited political objectives. A counter-subversive warfare that they have learned not only from their own experience, but also from the German "huns" in the drowning of the Boxer uprising that was passed on to the murderous SS, transferred directly to French imperialism in the Indochina war, developed for example in Algeria. In this way, the USA can try to split Iran from its allies, thus increasingly completing the encirclement of Russian imperialism and, in the process, cutting off the "New Silk Road" to China.

But we shall never forget imperialism, mainly Yankee-imperialism as the sole hegemonic superpower, is in its general and final crisis. They are in decline. They are doomed. They are confronted by the tremendous billions of masses all over the world, especially in the Third World, who reject to keep on living on their knees and straving to death but raise in struggle. The International Communist Movement is advancing in overcoming dispersion. Marching forward to the United International Maoist Conference and the New International Organisation of the Proletariat (NIOP). New militarised Marxist-Leninist-Maoist Communist Parties will be re-/constituted. New People's Wars will be initiated, the existing will overcome their difficulties. The old mole is digging. The Titan with feet of clay will fall. Communism will be.

Finally some few more words on Afghanistan itself. We are fully convinced that the people, our class and its vanguard in Afghanistan will inevitably succeed, insisting on the main form of struggle, armed struggle, i.e. People's War, the main form of organisation, the army (the party is leading), daringly mobilising, politicising, organising and arming the masses, mainly the poor peasants as the main force of the revolution (the proletariat is leading).

