

## **War in Iran: Imperialism, Inequalities, and Geopolitical Crisis The Consequences for Peoples and the Urgent Need for Peace**

*By Dr. Vasiliki Lazou, Lecturer in the Department of Political Science at Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Member of the Board of Directors and Scientific Council of the Nikos Poulantzas Institute*

The war in Iran is not an isolated geopolitical episode, but yet another manifestation of the deep and multi-layered crisis of the contemporary capitalist system. At a time when economic inequalities are widening and competition over markets, energy resources, and strategic interests is intensifying, imperialist conflicts emerge as instruments for the reconfiguration of power. Within this context, the aggressiveness of the United States and Israel toward Iran cannot be viewed as an isolated decision, but rather as a continuation of a strategy repeatedly implemented in recent years.

This is not the first time that major powers have attempted to control Iran. In 1953, the CIA, in collaboration with British intelligence services, orchestrated the coup against Prime Minister Mohammad Mosaddegh after he moved to nationalize the country's oil resources. The consolidation of the Shah's regime aimed to transform Iran into a regional "policeman" of the United States in the Middle East, safeguarding its strategic interests. This intervention paved the way for decades of political repression, followed by the Iran–Iraq War, embargoes, and sanctions, creating a framework of constant uncertainty and external pressure. The 1979 revolution brought about a radical shift in the country's domestic and international orientation. Iran was transformed into a theocratic state with a strong central authority and a new ideological framework that directly challenged Western influence in the region.

Internal repression does not justify military interventions, as such actions violate sovereignty and international law, exacerbate existing conditions, and ultimately harm the very populations they claim to protect. Invoking a country's political regime in order to justify or "soften" external intervention is not analysis—it is the acceptance of a dangerous logic: that the powerful can determine who has rights and who does not. This logic does not lead to greater justice; it leads to more wars.

Historical experience is revealing. From Iraq and Afghanistan to Libya and Syria, interventions by major powers have left behind collapsed states, destroyed infrastructure, and societies in profound disintegration. The promise of "democracy" has turned into chaos, while millions of people have been driven into displacement. The mass uprooting of entire populations and the transformation of countries into ruins constitute the true legacy of these interventions. The same pattern risks being repeated in the case of Iran, with incalculable consequences for the entire region.

At the same time, the rhetoric and policies associated with Trumpism reinforce this aggressive trajectory. The logic of raw power, unilateral action, and disregard for international institutions creates an environment in which war is normalized. The weakening of diplomacy and the devaluation of international law pave the way for dangerous escalations.

A confrontation with Iran is far from a simple matter. Iran possesses significant military capabilities, geostrategic influence, and alliances that could transform a localized conflict into a broader regional conflagration. The escalation of war could trigger chain reactions, involving additional countries and leading to an uncontrollable expansion of hostilities.

The consequences of such a development would be multiple. Beyond the humanitarian catastrophe, the energy crisis would intensify dramatically. The Middle East is a critical hub for global energy supply, and any destabilization directly affects oil and natural gas prices. Rising energy costs would be passed on across all sectors of the economy, exacerbating inflationary pressures and burdening everyday life. At the same time, the economic repercussions would be profound. International uncertainty, declining investment, and rising production costs create the conditions for a new economic crisis. Societies would face increasing unemployment, shrinking incomes, and widening inequalities.

In light of this reality, Europe's stance cannot but be subject to strong criticism. Instead of shaping an autonomous policy of peace and de-escalation, it largely— with few exceptions— aligns itself with choices that fuel tension, confirming its political dependence and its inability to act as an independent international actor.

The position of the Left acquires particular importance in this period. Historically, the Left has been identified with opposition to war and imperialism, and with the defence of peoples against interventions and destructive geopolitical agendas. A clear and unwavering stance in favour of peace, non-involvement, and international solidarity constitutes a matter of political consistency and credibility. Within this context, Greece must formulate a clear and responsible position. Involvement in such conflicts does not serve the interests of the Greek people and entails serious risks. On the contrary, the country should remain committed to a policy of non-involvement, the defence of international law, and the promotion of peace. The need for peace, cooperation, and respect for international law is not merely a moral choice, but a historical necessity. Every new outbreak of war concerns not only the peoples at its epicenter, but the international community as a whole.

At the same time, there is an urgent need to fundamentally reassess the political and economic trajectory that generates and reproduces such conflicts. The response of peoples can only lie in strengthening policies aimed at reducing inequalities, ensuring a fair distribution of wealth, and building an international system that serves peace rather than war.