No. 17

16 November 2026

Political Courier

IWO
Internationalist Workers' Organization

From Protest and Resistance to Internationalist Politics and Organization



Towards the Reconstruction of Proletarian Internationalism



Part Nine: The Development of Internationalist Politics in the Workers' Movement

Contents

2 The Political Economy of War and Resistance to Warmongering States

4 US Elections and the Reproduction of Capital's Power

5 Protests in France and Europe: Class Struggle and the Contest over the Movement's Horizon

7 The Naumann Foundation: Whitewashing Neo-Fascism with Liberalism's "Freedom" Medal

9 Towards the Reconstruction of Proletarian Internationalism

The Political Economy of War and Resistance to Warmongering States



Jabalia, Gaza, 31 May 2024. Archive photograph of life amid destruction. Photo: Hussein Jaber / UNRWA.

The Republicans' defeat in the US elections has brought the costs of war back into the machinery of power. A war intended to consolidate Trump's authority has eroded his base. He now seeks a way out by proclaiming the success of sanctions. But the issue goes beyond Washington's tactical shifts: capital profits from arms orders, transfers the costs of destruction onto working people, and looks to contracts and investment returns from rebuilding those same ruins. Opposition to war must target this connection. Otherwise, even under the name of 'peace', people will be asked to pay the war's bill. [1]

From war profits to the reconstruction market

On 9 November, Trump announced that he would hold off on fresh strikes for the time being while maintaining the naval blockade. This position allows his administration to present a pause in escalation as victory. The United States wants a deal that will not be called a defeat; the Islamic Republic wants relief from pressure without surrendering its means of survival. Deadlock has not eliminated the capacity for destruction. In our assessment, the current course is economic pressure and bargaining alongside limited operations; failure to reach a deal leaves the way open to renewed escalation. An announcement of calm should not be confused with dismantling the means of war. [2]

War also continues through covert and extraterritorial operations. The Islamic Republic cannot erase its record of repression and murder by claiming to confront an enemy; nor can Western states evade responsibility for supporting Israeli assassinations by condemning operations attributed to Iran. When targeted killing by an ally is called a 'security success', while an enemy's actions are presented as evidence of its 'terrorist nature', propaganda confers selective legitimacy on state violence. These states compete over domination and material interests, each seeking to legitimize its own violence and portray its rival's as criminal. Attacks on civilians, political assassination and operations against military targets must be assessed separately; attribution in each case also requires evidence. Our opposition to murder does not follow the alignments of states.

States buy weapons with public money, and the consumption of munitions generates further orders. In the third quarter of 2026, Lockheed Martin recorded a 24 per cent rise in both sales and operating profit in its Missiles and Fire Control segment. This growth is not entirely a product of the Iran war; competition over energy, markets and regional influence also extends beyond one company's accounts. The arms boom therefore coexists with losses in other sectors of capital and pressures to contain the war. Private war profits are no sign of the health of the system as a whole. [3]

The promise of reconstruction reveals the next link in these relations. In June, citing a source with direct knowledge, Reuters reported a proposed $300 billion private investment fund, with more than half the sum reportedly committed. This was neither a grant nor reparations, but investment conditional on a final agreement. Funding remains unclear (Guardian, 7 November). Announced commitments should not be confused with money disbursed. What is clear is the presentation of reconstruction as an investment opportunity and an incentive for a deal. For an investor, a destroyed power station or refinery is a project that must yield a return. [4,5]

Who will provide that return and meet the costs of reconstruction? If contracts rest on loans, state guarantees and concessions, debt repayments and profits will be claimed from public revenue, natural resources and service charges. People may have to pay again for access to what they once had. At the same

time, the destruction of healthcare and public services transfers unpaid care work to families, predominantly women. Migrant workers, with weaker legal and social protection, face unpaid wages and unemployment sooner. By the historical crisis of capital's overall reproduction, we mean the chronic difficulty of profitable accumulation and the reproduction of social life: the tendency of the rate of profit to fall and excess capacity increase pressure to open markets and intensify exploitation. War and reconstruction contracts open channels of profit for sections of capital. Yet, by destroying productive forces and shifting costs onto wage-earners, they displace the crisis and wear down life. [6,7]

The Islamic Republic does not stand outside these relations. The state is itself an owner and employer; foundations, military enterprises, banks and private capital are interconnected through contracts, credit and wage labour. Khatam al-Anbia ties military power to contracting and the appropriation of resources. Some capital needs sanctions lifted for trade and investment; networks with privileged access extract rents from intermediation and restrictions on competitors. The state manages this conflict within a framework that preserves capitalist property and command over labour. Neither the government's survival nor the opening of markets is therefore a workers' victory in itself. The question is who controls wages, resources and decision-making. [8]

Resistance and the power to end war

The US electoral defeat showed that social opposition had entered the calculations of power. The Reuters/Ipsos poll conducted on 6–9 November also found 71 per cent support for Congress passing legislation to end the war. The electoral mechanism absorbed anti-war discontent to the Democrats' advantage, but it did not give protesters control over the war machine. The class character of a struggle must not be equated with its political independence; the task is to transform social pressure into independent political power. By pursuing an end to operations and the blockade and a halt to arms support, anti-war networks and workers' organizations must prevent protest from dissolving into the calculations of ruling factions. [1]

In Israel too, the absorption of protest into factional competition raises the question of political independence. Opposition to Netanyahu remains within the limits of the existing order insofar as it accepts domination over the Palestinians. The joint presence of Arabs and Jews and the demand for equality at the Tel Aviv rally on 7 November point against this separation. Yet an electoral coalition cannot replace an end to occupation and dispossession. Equality is incompatible with the racial division of rights to land, work, movement and security. Linking protest to Palestinian rights will determine how far opposition to the managers of war becomes a struggle against colonial and war policies. [9]

In Iran, our starting point is the struggle for wages, healthcare and freedom that continues under repression. The Ahvaz steelworkers' protests on 9 and 10 November and the telecommunications pensioners' rallies on 9 November show that workers' lives and struggles have not been suspended by the command of 'national unity'. These protests should not all be described as an explicitly anti-war movement. The political connection is built when the defence of wages and public services is joined to opposition to imposing the costs of war, the release of political prisoners and the right to independent organization. Opposition to attack and blockade creates no obligation to support the Islamic Republic; equally, struggle against the government grants no licence to bomb and starve society. [10]

When the costs of war and reconstruction are met from wages and public resources, linking the struggle against war to the defence of livelihoods and workers' right to decide becomes a material necessity. Workers' and anti-war organizations in arms-supplying countries build this connection by pressing to halt the production and transport of weapons; workers in Iran by defending wages, freedom and the right to decide over production and reconstruction, and fighting to stop the war machine; and opponents of occupation by struggling against dispossession and discrimination. We do not assume that elected assemblies and committees already exist everywhere. Where workers' organizations exist, strengthening them and ensuring that representatives answer to assemblies is the basis; where they do not, the task ahead is to form groups suited to the conditions of struggle and connect them to existing organizations. In Iran, participants' security is a condition of this expansion. The criterion for unity is the advancement of these demands and independence from the states involved. The force that makes rulers bear the costs of war must also organize against making workers pay for 'peace and reconstruction'.

Sources: [1] Reuters/Ipsos, 10 Nov 2026 — post-election poll.
[1] Ipsos, 6–9 Nov 2026 — topline, p. 17, TM3530Y26_1.
[2] Reuters, 9 Nov 2026 — pause in strikes; blockade continues.
[3] Lockheed Martin, Q3 2026 results — Missiles and Fire Control.
[4] Reuters, 16 Jun (updated 17 Jun) 2026 — proposed $300bn fund.
[5] The Guardian, 7 Nov 2026 — Qatari proposal; fund financing.
[6] UN Women, Apr 2026 — military escalation, women and girls.
[7] ILO, 18 May 2026 — Middle East labour-market risks.
[8] Carnegie, 19 Aug 2024 — military and private business; Iran.
[9] Times of Israel, 7 Nov 2026 — Habima rally; Arab–Jewish partnership.
[10] HRANA, 18 Aban 1405 / 9 Nov 2026 — pensioners; Ahvaz steel.
[10] HRANA, 19 Aban 1405 / 10 Nov 2026 — Ahvaz steelworkers.

US Elections and the Reproduction of Capital's Power

The Republicans' defeat in the US midterm elections dealt a blow to the Trump administration. Discontent over the cost of living, the war and government policy eroded its electoral base and brought victory to the Democrats. This is a real setback. But a change in the congressional majority has not placed political power in the hands of our class. Protest against the consequences of capitalist rule has strengthened another faction of that same rule. We need to understand the mechanism that turns anger against the existing order into support for restoring its legitimacy. [1]

Capital's power before and after the vote

Electoral competition in the United States rests on vast financial, media and organizational networks. According to the Brennan Center, the forty largest donors had contributed around $2.4 billion to election campaigns by mid-October; donors consistently backing the Republicans gave substantially more. The party's defeat shows that money does not guarantee the outcome of every election. But money does determine who has permanent resources for publicity, organizing and access to power, and which options are strengthened within the electoral contest. [2]

The differences between the two parties' programmes cannot be denied; those differences also help mobilize voters. Yet both take the preservation of capitalist property relations and accumulation as the basis for governing society. After the vote, capitalists retain the machinery through which they pursue their interests: they intervene in budgets, government contracts, labour regulation and foreign policy. Workers return to their workplaces; the owners of capital remain at the centres of decision-making. One faction's defeat does not dismantle this relationship.

Who turns protest into an electoral force?

Anger at war, racism and pressure on living standards is not manufactured by party machines. It grows out of real life. Turning that anger into support for candidates, however, takes political and organizational work. Union leaderships, community institutions and the electoral left build bridges between protesters' demands and the rival party's promises. Through this relationship, the force of struggle becomes dependent on the hope of placing a 'pro-worker' representative in government.

The United Auto Workers' endorsement of Abdul El-Sayed for the US Senate is a clear example. The union cited universal healthcare and a ban on stock buybacks among its reasons, and emphasized his refusal of corporate PAC money. Our concern is not to make an unsubstantiated allegation of financial dependence against this candidate. Our criticism concerns a strategy that ties the realization of workers' demands and power to strengthening a representative within the existing apparatus. The union apparatus puts pressure on the party while mobilizing workers' resources for its electoral victory. [3]

Protesters themselves also pursue different directions: putting pressure on the Democrats' left wing; building an electoral alternative outside the two parties; and working towards independent organization in the workplace. These differences matter. Leaving the two parties does not establish revolutionary political independence if the entire strategy still revolves around candidates' success. Equally, independent working-class activity has no ready-made answer to the question of political power without the development of a programme and strategy.

Internationalist intervention on changed terrain

The Republicans' defeat has changed the terrain of conflict; it has not produced an independent strategy for our class movement. Networks mobilized by parties and electoral institutions do not automatically become instruments of workers' independent decision-making. The same forces will work to maintain their political dependence. Reproaching voters, or waiting for their illusions to collapse, will not change this relationship either.

The task of internationalist organizations and nuclei is strategic intervention in every arena of class struggle: a sustained presence in struggles, links with militant workers, opposition to division, and the advancement of communist politics against the factions of capital. This intervention rests on theory, programme and strategy, and is tested and developed through an organic relationship with workers' initiatives and experience. Such a relationship both strengthens our class's capacity for independent organization and provides the ground for the organization's own reproduction as a revolutionary force rooted in the class. This is the path of our advance: building a power that entrusts control over its struggle and its horizon of emancipation to no victorious party of capital.

Sources: [1] Reuters/Ipsos, 10 Nov 2026 — election and public attitudes.
[2] Brennan Center, 27 Oct (updated 29 Oct) 2026 — largest donors.
[3] UAW, 5 Jun 2026 — endorsement of Abdul El-Sayed.

Protests in France and Europe: Class Struggle and the Contest over the Movement's Horizon



Place de la République, Paris, 5 November 2026. Photo: FreCha / Wikimedia Commons.

Do not turn the protest movement into a reserve force for the next government

In the previous issue, in 'From Schools to Ports', we wrote that our struggle crosses the boundaries between school, neighbourhood and workplace. Today we must extend this connection and retain control over it. Demonstrations continued in France on 14 November. On 15 November, reports citing the Paris police and prosecutor's office stated that 108 people, including 38 minors, had been placed in police custody. The strike called for 17 November still lies ahead. Through repression and limited promises, the government seeks to exhaust the movement; electoral forces are making plans for its future. Let us not hand that future over to them. [1]

We build our unity in struggle

Our class and our children are the driving force of this battle. Teacher shortages, crushing rents, inadequate wages and job insecurity put pressure on a single life from different directions. The historical crisis of capital's overall reproduction runs through this very life: capital's profitability and competition push our needs aside, while the state makes us bear the costs of preserving this order. Resistance to the destruction of education and healthcare cannot be separated from the struggle against the intensification of work, exploitation and militarism.

In this confrontation, our movement develops new understanding and capacities. On 8 November, the high-school students' coordination called for visits to workplaces. The Paris inter-university assembly also adopted decisions on building links with workers. At the national cross-sector meeting held online on 11 November at the initiative of the Toulouse assembly, representatives of assemblies, unions, young people, Yellow Vests and parents' collectives discussed strike funds, common demands and extending the struggle. These efforts do not yet embrace the whole movement, but they are seeking a way forward in practice. [2]

Unity does not await us ready-made in the workplace. Different contracts, competition for overtime, individual assessment and managerial surveillance divide colleagues. Organizing means overcoming these obstacles, building trust and finding possibilities for joint action. Its forms develop through experience and collective understanding. Announcing the name of a committee is no substitute for this difficult work. Let us learn from one another's initiatives and widen the participation of colleagues held back by insecure contracts and the cost of striking.

Our protest is no party's electoral capital

The Socialist Party and Place publique have combined participation in protest with building a governmental alternative around Glucksmann. La France insoumise participates in the streets with more radical language, but Mélenchon's governmental programme is also explicitly directed towards winning office in the 2027 election and building a 'New France'. The French Communist Party connects social demands with Roussel's programme and 'producing in France'. Their programmes differ in real ways. Yet none secures political control for our class by placing a left government at the head of these same relations. Our struggle must not become a platform for restoring their legitimacy. [3]

We demand wages and public services today, and force every possible retreat from government and employers.

But we do not trade our right to decide how the struggle continues for promises of reforms after an election. When they speak of 'saving French industry', we must ask who pays and who profits. A migrant worker or a worker across the border is not our rival in saving the profits of domestic capital.

Within the unions too, there is a struggle over the direction and control of the movement. The CFDT had emphasized the priority of wage negotiations; on 13 November its public-services branch called for the 17 November strike after judging the government's response inadequate. The CGT also calls for extending the strike. Meanwhile, SUD Culture has called for continuing strike action between national days of mobilization and holding assemblies. [4] We must not equate militant members and branches with leadership apparatuses. We oppose attempts to contain the struggle through fragmented schedules, separate negotiations and a monopoly over decisions. Negotiations and their results must remain under the control of those engaged in the struggle.

Do not replace organizing with formulas and sects

Activists in Révolution Permanente and NPA–L'Anticapitaliste advocate coordinating assemblies and extending strike action. [5] These efforts are part of the real terrain of struggle. We should cooperate with militants in advancing them while stating clearly that the slogan of a general strike does not, on its own, answer the questions of strategy and political power. Wherever the power of a strike is confined to pressure for a left government or merely to winning concessions, we must criticize that horizon and advance independent communist politics.

We share struggles with the libertarian tendency that defends organizing and solidarity. Our criticism concerns the denial of the necessity of political organization, programme and strategy. Celebrating spontaneity and presenting horizontality as the answer to every problem leaves our class disarmed against capital's centralized apparatus. Collective control is not preserved by rejecting theoretical work, responsibility and the concentration of the struggle's capacities. Political organization must be an instrument for extending that control.

We expect living intervention and criticism from internationalist comrades who participate in assemblies and distribute leaflets. Yet the assessment that bourgeois political and trade-union forces fully contain these struggles in the late-October analysis published on Leftcom does not explain the initiatives and conflicts that the authors themselves record. [6] We cannot keep a movement outside the gates of class struggle until it conforms to our preferred model. Purism on the sidelines and using struggle to demonstrate a sect's righteousness both need criticism. Internationalist organization exists for the advance of the class; the class does not struggle to reproduce our political organizations.

Our advance requires an internationalist horizon

The fall in turnout at Saturday's demonstrations is a real problem. We should neither conceal it nor take it as a verdict that the movement is over. [1] Let us preserve and expand our strength through lasting relations, support for those facing repression, and links between strikes, schools and neighbourhoods. Wherever a fund, assembly or liaison group emerges from the needs of struggle, it must increase our own capacity for decision and action.

Our battle is not confined to France. Struggles over wages and housing in Spain and resistance to austerity elsewhere in Europe are arenas for cooperation by our class. [7] Let us bring experiences together, oppose divisions directed against migrants and prevent capital's national interests from setting us against one another. As an internationalist tendency within the workers' movement, this is the advance we work for: expanding independent organization, developing communist politics and building common strength against exploitation and war. The force that set this battle in motion must also take control over its continuation and its horizon of emancipation.

Sources: [1] AFP/Le Parisien, 15 Nov 2026, 12:20 — Paris custody figures.
[2] High-school coordination, 8 Nov (published 9 Nov) 2026 — appeal.
[2] RP Toulouse, 14 Nov 2026 — 11 Nov national online meeting.
[2] Interfac IDF, 10 Nov (posted 12 Nov) 2026 — assembly decisions.
[3] PS Finistère, 2 Nov 2026 — 5 Nov mobilization appeal.
[3] LCP, 5 Nov 2026 — Glucksmann's campaign initiative.
[3] La France insoumise, 2 Nov 2026 — 2027 programme.
[3] PCF, 14 Oct 2026 — Roussel's demands and campaign.
[3] RTL, 14 Oct 2026 — Roussel: production and public aid.
[4] CFDT public services, 9 Nov 2026 — negotiations.
[4] CFDT public services, 13 Nov 2026 — 17 Nov strike call.
[4] CGT, 9 Nov 2026 — extending the 17 Nov strike.
[4] SUD Culture, 8 Nov (posted 9 Nov) 2026 — strike and assemblies.
[5] Révolution Permanente, 14 Nov 2026 — cross-sector meeting.
[5] NPA–L'Anticapitaliste 822, 12 Nov 2026 — editorial.
[6] Leftcom, Arthur, 31 Oct 2026 (URL: 30 Oct) — France.
[7] UGT, 10 Nov 2026 — wages, housing, 11 Nov strike.
[7] EFFAT, 9 Nov 2026 — European solidarity.

The Naumann Foundation: Whitewashing Neo-Fascism with Liberalism's "Freedom" Medal



Freedom Prize ceremony, St Paul's Church, Frankfurt, 7 November 2026. Photo: © Stefan Krutsch / Naumann Foundation.

On 7 November 2026, in Frankfurt, the Friedrich Naumann Foundation entrusted its 'Freedom Prize', awarded in the name of the Iranian people, to Reza Pahlavi. This ceremony is an affront to the struggles of workers, women and all those who have fought for freedom from despotism and exploitation. An institution aligned with capitalist liberalism has appropriated the standing of these struggles and bestowed it on the central figure of the Iranian monarchist and pro-war right. Our protest concerns precisely this political act: whitewashing neo-fascism in the name of freedom and turning people's suffering and resistance into propaganda capital for new claimants to domination. [1]

The foundation says the prize belongs to the 'Iranian people' and Pahlavi is merely its 'trustee'. This formulation is the ceremony's political trick. They draw legitimacy from struggles and from those who have died, then hand that legitimacy to someone they themselves have chosen. Who gave them that authority? Striking workers, women in struggle and political prisoners have not appointed the Naumann Foundation to select their representative. The language of trusteeship gives a polite appearance to this violation of their right. On paper, the foundation makes the people the prize's owners; before the cameras, it makes Pahlavi the owner of its prestige.

For more than a year, images of Trump, Israeli flags and Pahlavi symbols have appeared together at monarchist rallies, bringing support for an attack on Iran into the streets. Reuters reports from London in June 2025 recorded approval of US intervention. In Berlin in March 2026, explicit support and gratitude were displayed towards Trump and Netanyahu for military action. [2] This politics sells the destruction of human life as its salvation. Workers and their families are expected to live under bombardment so that claimants to the throne can applaud their own ascent to power from beyond the borders.

Pahlavi stands at the centre of this alignment. His 2023 visit to Israel, meeting with Netanyahu and reception by Gila Gamliel demonstrate his public connection to that state. [3] His appearances at the National Conservatism conference and CPAC connect the same project to Western right-wing circles. [4] His role is to tie Iranian monarchism to Israeli policy and the Western right: he supplies these circles with an Iranian figure for advancing a shared horizon, while presenting proximity to the powerful as proof of his fitness to lead. These relations reduce the Iranian people to an object of others' decisions.

In a speech published on his own website, Pahlavi connects hostility to Marxism with the defence of Western civilization and describes his desired future through an alliance with the United States, close partnership with Israel and security for foreign investment. [4] Behind the myth of restored national greatness lies this class programme: rebuilding political authority to guarantee capitalist relations and realign their allies. In this picture the worker is to supply labour power, the nation is to line up behind the leader, and capital is to be assured of future security.

His support for war is also an avowed position. In an interview with Reuters in July 2026, Pahlavi affirmed his shift towards supporting US military intervention, justifying it as a means of saving lives. [5] The Naumann Foundation entrusts a medal of freedom to such a figure. In the language of a claimant to power, bombardment becomes an instrument of salvation; in

the foundation's ceremonies, its advocate is elevated into a representative of freedom. This inversion must be exposed. The lives of workers, children and families are not building material for the future government of any claimant to a throne.

We speak of a neo-fascist monarchist movement because leader worship, the myth of lost greatness, the manufacture of enemies among the left and other opponents, intimidation and the glorification of war are interwoven within it. In its July 2026 investigation, Reuters documented at least four incidents of violence or harassment by Pahlavi supporters in Britain, the Netherlands and Austria. Pahlavi condemned the violence in response. [6] But the political responsibility of a leadership apparatus does not end with a verbal condemnation. When the leader is installed as the embodiment of the nation, eliminating opponents can also be justified as defending the nation. This logic threatens workers' independence and their right to political organization.

The record of previous recipients also shows what kind of 'freedom' this foundation honours. Helen Zille, the 2014 recipient, called for the army to assist the police during the Western Cape farmworkers' protests in November 2012. Workers were fighting to raise daily wages from around 69–75 rand to 150 rand. Zille justified her request for military intervention by invoking public order and the prevention of violence and arson. [7] From the workers' standpoint, the class meaning of this response is clear: a wage demand is met with a call for military forces; the politician responsible then receives a medal of freedom at liberalism's ceremony.

Joachim Gauck, the 2018 recipient, was an advocate of Agenda 2010. In an official speech in May 2014, he praised Schröder for pursuing these policies and described them as far-sighted. This was the programme associated with the Hartz reforms, reduced support for the unemployed and greater pressure to accept work. [8] What capital calls the restoration of economic capacity meant, for sections of the working class, a diminished basis of subsistence and greater compulsion in the labour market. The freedom celebrated in this circle is compatible with praising the imposition of these pressures. The foundation confers prestige on capital's advocates for their services, and now places that prestige at the disposal of the Iranian pro-war right. [9]

Repression of protest continues in Germany today. In the same country that hosts a freedom ceremony for Pahlavi, police attack demonstrators in solidarity with Palestine. Citing observers and testimonies, a Civic Space Watch report updated on 4 November 2026 describes beatings, pressure on the neck, the detention of children and obstruction of journalists at the Berlin demonstration on 7 October. [10] This is an ongoing pattern: the German state and police restrict and repress protest against slaughter, while a German liberal foundation confers the credentials of freedom on a political ally of the Israeli state. The institutions have different names; the political direction of their actions converges in insulating war policy from opposition and strengthening its defenders.

In such cases, prizes and symbolic ceremonies are instruments for producing this immunity and prestige. Protocol, office-holders, speeches and media turn a political selection into an apparently universal moral judgement. Protests against Israel's participation in Eurovision 2025 also lifted this veil: a festival of unity could not keep Gaza's killing and destruction offstage. [11] In the Naumann case, the foundation itself identifies the development of liberal civil society as the criterion for its prize. Here, capital's ideological apparatus openly grants credentials to its favoured political force.

We condemn this ceremony from the position of the class that pays for war and domination. The same worker whose wages the Islamic Republic devours and whose protest it represses is also expected, in the warmongers' plans, to put home, workplace and life at risk. That worker's anger at despotism is not the political property of Pahlavi and his foreign backers. The struggles of women, prisoners and those who have died are not spoils for liberal circles to adorn a new claimant to power.

Awarding this prize is an appalling act against the independence of emancipatory struggles. The defenders of capital and the pro-war right confer legitimacy on one another and seek to register it in our name. We reject this appropriation. Such ceremonies lose their authority when their function is exposed: through this choice, the Naumann Foundation has served monarchist neo-fascism and the politics of war. Our freedom grows out of our own organization and struggle. Neither the bombs of Pahlavi's allies nor the Naumann Foundation's medal bring emancipation to the working class. We entrust our struggle and our future to neither.

Sources: [1] Friedrich Naumann Foundation, 7 Nov 2026 — Frankfurt award.
[2] Reuters, 23 Jun 2025 — London: support for US intervention.
[2] Reuters Connect, 7 Mar 2026 — Berlin monarchist rally.
[3] Reuters, 28 Jul 2026 — Pahlavi's 2023 Israel visit.
[4] Reza Pahlavi, 10 Sep 2024 — Returning to the Nation State.
[4] Pahlavi's archive — National Conservatism, Jul 2024; CPAC, 28 Mar 2026.
[5,6] Reuters, 28 Jul 2026 — interviews; supporters' violence.
[7] Mail & Guardian/SAPA, 28 Nov 2012 — Zille's army request.
[8] German Federal Government — Gauck's speech, 27 May 2014.
[8] Bundestag — Agenda 2010 and Hartz reforms.
[8] German Chancellery — Agenda 2010; unemployment benefit.
[9] Friedrich Naumann Foundation, 25 Oct 2018 — Gauck's award.
[10] Civic Space Watch, updated 4 Nov 2026 — Berlin, 7 Oct.
[11] RTÉ, 10 May 2025 — Israel, Eurovision and protests.

Towards the Reconstruction of Proletarian Internationalism

Part Nine: Internationalism and the Development of Communist Politics in the Workers' Movement



Delegates to the Second Congress of the Third International, summer 1920. Boris Souvarine archive, Graduate Institute, Geneva.

Capital does not rely solely on the boss's orders and the threat of dismissal to keep workers obedient; it intervenes in relations among workers themselves. It organizes competition over contracts, overtime and individual advantages, turning colleagues into rivals. Against this command, even building unity requires knowledge, initiative and organizing. This is the question addressed here: how do organic links between militants and organized internationalist activity contribute to the development of knowledge and strategy in the workers' movement, while also creating the conditions for the communist organization's own reproduction as a revolutionary force rooted in the class?

Unity has to be built

A view that sees workers as initially engaged in a 'sectional, economic and spontaneous' struggle, and then awaits the arrival of politics and theory, fails to grasp their actual activity. To begin joint action, workers have to overcome obstacles embedded in the organization of work and in everyday relations. Working alongside one another does not in itself create trust and unity. Management can even organize a work team so that its members take responsibility for pressuring one another in order to preserve a group bonus.

Post-Fordist methods, lean production, subcontracting and digital management have produced different combinations of control; older methods have not disappeared either. Divisions between contracts, individual assessment and the appointment of team leaders, together with digital surveillance, shape the possibilities for communication and collective action. Management uses its knowledge of behaviour and group dynamics to direct cooperation towards profit.

This systematic control and division have gone so far that even capital's more far-sighted institutions have raised concerns. A joint study by the International Labour Organization and the European Commission's Joint Research Centre examines the effects of algorithmic management on work organization and the risks of intrusive worker surveillance in logistics and healthcare. [1]

Organizing against these relations itself requires theoretical work: understanding how competition is produced, how trust develops, and which actions expand the scope for collective decision-making. Under conditions of repression, security surveillance and the persecution of militants compound these problems. From the outset, organization comes up against the power of employers and the state; as it expands, it rapidly acquires explicitly political dimensions. This politicization raises the struggle over its direction. A communist and internationalist horizon has to be developed within this very arena.

How experience opens the way to strategy

Workers' circles and networks make efforts to build links and exchange experience. Every industry and region faces particular problems and achieves particular gains. In one workplace, different contracts obstruct unity; in another, separate shifts or divisions between migrant and native-born workers do so. Experience in confronting each obstacle is valuable, but its general significance emerges through comparison and examination of the conditions. Copying a success is no substitute for understanding.

An organic relationship means that militants share in formulating questions, examining experience and

criticizing conclusions, and that cooperation does not end when a protest subsides. A centre where workers' groups and networks can meet, for example, makes it possible to examine organizing methods, identify common problems and develop new initiatives. Such a centre has its own specific function; its formation should not be equated with the emergence of a political organization. Its significance lies in the lasting relations that make mutual learning and cooperation possible.

Developing strategy, however, goes beyond exchanging experience. Each struggle must be understood within the broader organization of production, state policy and the global movement of capital. A threat to move orders elsewhere is not merely one manager's ploy; it draws its strength from capital's mobility and competition between sections of the class. Resisting it requires knowledge and cooperation among workers at different points in the chain. Through such inquiry, local experience opens onto a wider understanding; general knowledge is in turn criticized and developed through fresh experience. The internationalist horizon informs this very process of understanding and determining policy.

The role of internationalist organization

Internationalist organization does not emerge from the automatic growth of protests. Its formation and development require theoretical work, a critique of historical defeats, and the formulation of a programme and strategy. Small internationalist organizations and nuclei participate in struggles with the gains of this history, gains that themselves need further development. They take part in sustained support for independent struggles, links with militants and joint research into problems of organizing, and seek to influence the direction of struggle.

This presence is one condition for the advance and organization of struggle; at the same time, it provides the ground for the organization's own reproduction as a revolutionary force rooted in the class. The organization encounters new problems and tests its understandings, while militants participate in producing its knowledge and politics. In this way theory and programme become a force within the struggle. A relationship that treats one side as a supplier of information and the other as the sole possessor of answers breaks this process. Maintaining it also requires conscious work; mere presence at a protest guarantees no revolutionary character.

This cooperation concerns both how to win a particular demand and the general direction of struggle. Which forces should we unite with? How does the pressure to 'save the national economy' relate to our exploitation? How can resistance to repression and war expand the class's independent power? Through its critique of capitalist relations and its horizon of abolishing wage labour, the communist programme gives direction to these questions. Examining experience clarifies both the means of realizing that direction and the need to correct policies. Organic centralization should develop this shared capacity for inquiry, decision and action.

A global horizon in concrete struggle

Internationalism cannot be reduced to contact with groups in several countries or the export of theory from a centre to a periphery. If a struggle to preserve jobs comes to defend the profitability of 'our own' capital against migrant workers, cross-border contacts and cooperation will not rescue it from nationalism. Internationalist politics advances the class's common interests against this competition: equality among workers with different citizenships and contracts, cooperation against strikebreaking, and linking the struggle against war to the struggle against exploitation and repression. An internationalist perspective and politics in organizing workers' struggles become all the more vital as imperialist competition and militarism intensify. But unless this perspective and politics are rooted in our answers to the problems of the workers' movement, they become a discursive construction without political strategy, serving only the maintenance of an organizational apparatus.

Internationalist organization requires a global connection between organizing within the workers' movement and developing a common theory, programme and strategy. Every region and industry reveals part of the problems; none alone grasps the total movement of capital and the path to emancipation from it. Militants must be able to examine one another's experience and contribute to producing knowledge and determining a common direction. This process makes international political organization a necessity for advancing the struggle today.

For our current, the reconstruction of proletarian internationalism means organized participation in building this relationship: a presence within struggles, support for lasting links between militants, and the concentration of theoretical and programmatic work within a global horizon. The organization learns from the movement and intervenes in its development; through this relationship, the movement also expands its capacity for knowledge and political action. The advance of this relationship strengthens class struggle while contributing to the reproduction of communism within its living historical ground.

Sources: [1] ILO/European Commission JRC, 19 Feb 2024 — Algorithmic Management Practices in Regular Workplaces.

Political Courier

Political and analytical journal

Internationalist Workers' Organization

No. 17

16 November 2026

internationalistworkers.com

IWO

Political Courier is the political and analytical journal of the Internationalist Workers' Organization, published every two weeks. Publication is planned for a limited period, at the end of which the need for and form of continued publication will be reviewed.

Political Courier's Basic Positions

1 **Capitalism is immersed in a historical crisis; war, poverty and authoritarianism are among its consequences.**

2 **The working class is no auxiliary force for any state, faction of capital or national project.**

3 **Our answer is the worldwide solidarity of the working class against war, nationalism and every capitalist bloc.**

4 **Emancipation is possible only through workers' independent organization, direct struggle and collective power.**

5 **We fight for socialism: for an end to exploitation, domination and wage slavery.**

6 **Reconstructing the working class's internationalist politics is the historical condition for turning worldwide protest into worldwide emancipation.**