Documents and Notes on the World Situation and the Tasks (III) — US: On Midterm Elections[1]

The electoral results of November 2, 2026

On Tuesday the 2nd of this month, the midterm elections were held to renew one third of the House of Representatives, the complete renewal of the House of Representatives, and the election of 48 state governors, etc. Contending in the elections are the Republican Party, in government, and the Democratic Party, the opposition, as political representatives of the two factions of the financial oligarchy, which leads the bourgeois dictatorship, the United States (US). The news on this is as follows:

> The United States has held midterm legislative elections this Tuesday (called midterms in English). Surpassing expectations, the Democratic Party has taken control of Congress, obtaining a clear majority in both the House of Representatives and the Senate.
>
> In the Senate, a key chamber for curbing the power of President Donald Trump, the Democrats have managed to change the color of seven states: **Iowa, Ohio, South Carolina, North Carolina, Kansas, Texas, and Maine,** some of them traditional Republican bastions. Thus, they have taken **54 seats in the Senate**, comfortably exceeding the threshold of 51 necessary for a **majority**. In the House, the Democrats have won 237 seats, a comfortable majority.
>
> These elections have shown not only the population's clear disillusionment with the Trump administration, marked by the war in Iran and the rise in the price of fuel
>
> — Spanish Radiotelevision, November 3, updated November 4, 2026

It has also become known that, in the elections to replace governors, *the Democratic Party has obtained 28 and the Republican Party 20 posts as governors of the States* of the Union.

According to the information above, the elections of new reactionary authorities of the Yankee imperialist State have ended in a crushing victory of the Democratic Party over the Republican Party in every area in dispute. A "blue wave" (Democratic Party) was expected according to the opinion polls, which envisaged a narrow Democratic triumph in 4 traditional Republican Party bastions. But what has taken place has been like a "blue tsunami." The Democratic Party has prevailed comfortably, not only in these 4 bastions, but also in three more that traditionally vote predominantly for the

[1] https://vnd-peru.blogspot.com/2026/11/mpp-documentos-y-notas-sobre-la.html

Republicans. Moreover, in Alaska and Mississippi, the representatives to the Senate are still to be determined in the coming days.

Nothing good for the people comes from reactionary elections

As a result of the midterm electoral farce: the "Democrats" will be the main force of the members of the oppressor class charged with representing and crushing the oppressed in the American Congress. Nothing good for the people comes from reactionary elections. There is nothing for the oppressed to celebrate.

The possibility has not opened up "of the storming of heaven through *electoral rebellions against the billionaires*," as is maintained in the article "United States: The Turn of the Offended," Pedro Miguel, Opinion, *La Jornada*, Mexico, October 6, 2026, *"billionaires) who a few months ago felt themselves to be the immovable owners of the planet. Last Tuesday, ordinary people, (…) went to the polls en masse to claim their place in the world (…) A crack of hope has opened for the United States. Perhaps (…) it is susceptible of redemption and regeneration (…) Let us hope it is not too late,"* as is maintained in the article "United States: The Turn of the Offended." That is fine for *La Jornada*, the daily newspaper of opportunism in the service of the bureaucratic faction of the Mexican big bourgeoisie in the reactionary government, a big bourgeois government headed by the opportunist Sheinbau of the National Regeneration Movement.

Read carefully what we have just said about the government of Mexico in connection with the cited article, a reactionary government that represents the big bourgeoisie, headed by an opportunist. The big bourgeois government of Sheinbau. If we do not write it that way with complete clarity and put only "bourgeois government", we are speaking about the bourgeoisie in general, to which belong not only the big bourgeoisie but also the national bourgeoisie and the petty bourgeoisie, in our countries, in order to put ourselves at the tail of one of the two factions of the big bourgeoisie. That is why it is of the utmost importance to establish with complete clarity the class character of the governments that head the bourgeois dictatorship under the leadership of the financial oligarchy or the landlord-bureaucratic dictatorship, in the service of imperialism, led by the big bourgeoisie.

In the case of the Mexican State, it is a landlord-bureaucratic class dictatorship in the service of imperialism, led by the big bourgeoisie (system), and the government is what represents that dictatorship (Form of or regime of government). One cannot separate State from government and say, as the revisionists do, that one can have the government without having Power. Nor that the armed forces are sleeping. International experience clearly shows us the falsity of such arguments. There they are, pointing

accusingly at revisionism, the coups d'état in Indonesia against Sukarno and in Chile against Allende.

Contrary to the pretensions and wishes of opportunism, as expressed in the *La Jornada* article, the newly elected representatives in Congress and in the governorships, among whom there may be some opportunist, will serve only to try to put makeup on the "slave republic." The opportunists in Congress or in the governorships will be no more than the "tribunes of the plebs" in the Senate of ancient Rome, with the right to speak but without any power of decision. The mass turnout does not harm the system of dictatorship, much less its form of government. Instead, it serves to "legitimize" the oppressor congressmen or governors, anointing them as "representatives elected" en masse to crush the oppressed. Reactionary elections cannot signify any important change in the system that goes beyond its limits, nor that the armed forces and the bureaucracy are sleeping.

Electoral fraud

Electoral fraud. Furthermore, in these elections as in others, the factions of the financial oligarchy represented by the Republican Party and the Democratic Party sustain and defend the same fundamental objectives and goals and have differences only in form and means. As such, they resort to the familiar machinations, traps, tricks, and fraud in the vote counts. And only after using their position of strength at the federal level or in the States to change the electoral rules in their favor and redraw the electoral districts. For it is a contest between political cardsharps where each on its own side commits electoral fraud against the other, throughout the whole process up to the very counting of the ballots. Reactionary elections are a farce and a fraud all along the line. No one can say that they are an expression of the popular will. Therefore, the general trend is toward electoral absenteeism, that is, the spontaneous rejection of the elections by the masses. To try to counteract that trend, reaction resorts to "electoral polarization," the "Democrats" between Trumpism and democracy, the Republicans and especially Trump, between Republicans and "socialists" or "communists," etc.

Once again, the "opinion polls" have failed. The foregoing confirms that opinion polls or studies are far from reliable. For that very reason, they are much preferred by the big media and the reactionary parties. That is, they are a means of manipulating the voters. They are part of the manipulation of the voters. As a political scientist pointed out on the German television news program *24 Hours*, neither polls nor algorithms were needed to know why the Republican Party was going to be defeated and why the Democratic Party was going to prevail. To give an answer to this question, it sufficed to look at the cost of living, the rise in the price of a gallon of gasoline to more than $4 as a consequence of the war in Iran.

Moral: we must not use "opinion polls" as an objective criterion to describe people's opinion. As on this occasion, time and again the predictions of the polling companies failed. In 2015, the polls did not manage to predict Benjamin Netanyahu's victory in Israel, the defeat of the Labour Party in the United Kingdom, and a referendum in Greece. In 2016, the polls did not manage to predict Brexit, the vote to withdraw Great Britain and Northern Ireland from the European Union. Nor Trump's triumph over Clinton.

On the electoral failure of Trump's ultra-reactionary government

(relation between economic base, politics, and war)

The contest between the two factions in this electoral conjuncture has been fanned by the development of the national and international class struggle. See the relation between economic base, politics, and war. A more advanced process of parasitism and decomposition of imperialism. The economy declines in the imperialist country in contradiction with the greater power that the financial oligarchy concentrates in the country itself and abroad.

The electoral failure of the governing party, the Republican Party, has to do, on the one hand, with the development of the popular struggle against the national and international policy of the Trump government and the imperialist war of aggression against the peoples of the world and, on the other hand, with the development of the rivalry between both factions. Contradiction between the bourgeois factions that develops in the midst of collusion and contest.

Sticking to the official results, Trump and his party have lost the confidence of the voters, the same ones who in the elections two years ago brought about a "red tsunami" (Republicans). This has been happening in world politics for more than five decades. Governments elected with extremely high vote totals lose the confidence of the voters after a short time.

The "change of mood" of the voters is an expression of the development of the objective situation. Therefore, in addition to the causes already enumerated (rise in the cost of living, lack of jobs, inflation, rise in the price of gasoline to more than $4 per gallon because of the war against Iran), according to inquiries by various Yankee institutes, in the States most affected with the installation of the large data centers for "Superintelligence" (Artificial Intelligence), the voters have shown their discontent with the Republican Party candidates because these large data centers consume much energy and water, thereby raising the cost of energy and causing problems for local agriculture, and, occupying large expanses of land, they lower the value of real estate.

That is why commentators in the media repeat Clinton's explanation: "It's the economy, you idiots!"

A good example of what we sustain is the case of the governor-elect of the State of Texas, the one elected as the new governor for the Democratic Party, Gina Hinojosa. According to the media, she owes her election to her position against the construction of large centers as part of the Artificial Intelligence Boom in Texas. She has offered to curb it.

G. Hinojosa has said that for the moment she wishes to freeze the sale of a nature reserve in that State to Elon Musk's company SpaceX and curb the construction of those centers, of course, until protective measures are taken and local authorities are given participation in the decisions on this. There is the trap.

After the electoral contest will come the collusion over freedom for the artificial intelligence companies, which are the largest monopolists of the moment. We foresee that it will be the same story of collusion and contest between both parties again, as it was at the end of the previous century and at the beginning of the present one, over control of the internet. That is why we insert as an annex excerpts from the book *THESE TRUTHS A History of the United States JILL LEPORE*, from its fourth part, concerning this matter, which we have titled "History Repeats Itself." Next we also put the news of a meeting of Trump with the big artificial intelligence oligarchs. It is not bad to remember that Elon Musk was a friend of Obama, now he is a friend of Trump, and afterward? ….

On the subject of immigration, Trump himself has conceded the point to those who have protested because of the cruelty with which the deportations are carried out and because they affect mainly the non-monopoly companies. But as for the rest, Obama deported more immigrants than Trump, so it is more a question of form than of substance. The winning Democratic candidates in the border States and districts have committed themselves to border security and to continuing to deport the illegals.

The failure of the imperialist war of aggression against Iran has not been a major subject of the electoral campaign for manipulating the voters, as the Viet Nam War was. It was present in the campaign and its results, above all through high gasoline prices for households and ranchers and as Trump's broken promise not to meddle in costly, endless wars like the previous presidents. That has been one of the channels through which the contradiction of imperialist superpowers/powers with oppressed nations of the Third World has expressed itself. This is how the Iranian people's war of resistance against the imperialist-Zionist aggression has had repercussions in the latest Yankee elections. The Iranian people's war of resistance has influenced the changes of forces between the imperialist factions.

What we have just said above shows the development of the objective situation in the US, the sole hegemonic imperialist superpower. The development of the bourgeoisie proletariat contradiction in the US and of the imperialism-oppressed nations contradiction, as well as the third contradiction, the inter-imperialist contradiction, fan the contest between the two factions of the Yankee financial oligarchy, serving to make one prevail over the other in the reactionary electoral race. Thus the development of the imperialist State continues, further propelling absolute centralization as presidentialist absolutism. Important changes in the reactionary political agenda are nowhere in sight according to the comments and the situation itself. And, as always, there will be no great changes in the internal and international policy of Yankee imperialism.

On what is written in the preceding paragraph, we set down below a comment on the latest electoral results, contained in the article under the title, suggestive in itself, *The Dangers of a Lame-Duck Trump: How Far Will He Go to Make Peace—and War?* by Daniel W. Drezner and Elizabeth N. Saunders, November 4, 2026, *Foreign Affairs*, from which we quote:

> With the midterms over, U.S. President Donald Trump is now a lame duck.
>
> Second-term presidents who lose control of Congress have to face the reality that the time for signature legislation or other domestic policy initiatives has passed. As they think about their legacy, lame ducks often turn to foreign policy, where the power of the presidency allows them to act unfettered by pesky domestic politics. It is not unusual for a lame duck to reach for a final, lofty goal abroad. (…)
>
> Trump's lame-duck period will not be like those of his predecessors, however. (…) Trump is the first president in the past 100 years (…) to have a second lame-duck period—this time lasting more than two years.
>
> With Democrats now in control of the House and the Senate, the threat of impeachment or investigations into the Trump family's business dealings would likely make the president feel cornered and angry. And that's what makes the remainder of Trump's term so dangerous. A boxed-in Trump, (…) may well lash out internationally. And Congress, even if controlled by Democrats, will have little power over his day-to-day management of foreign policy.
>
> There are plenty of ways Trump could act out: issuing fresh threats against Canada, launching new attacks on U.S. alliances, or colluding with Russia or China at the expense of Ukraine or Taiwan. But to turn those threats into policy would require serious effort, such as repositioning U.S. troops or painstakingly negotiating with other great powers.

(…)

ONE FOR THE ROAD

Trump is most likely to take action in Iran. He seems to believe that escalating the war could break the stalemate and rescue his legacy. But Iranian leaders won't back down in the face of more force. Instead, they will probably ramp up attacks on commercial shipping, strike Gulf allies, and ignore diplomatic overtures until Trump leaves office. Moreover, Trump's own options may be limited: a more radical U.S. escalation against Iran, such as deploying troops to Kharg Island, would probably be so unpopular within his base that he would avoid it. Even Trump's biggest supporters are growing tired of the high prices that his war has caused. Renewed conflict could plunge the world into economic crisis.

(…)

For Trump, an attack on Cuba would be attractive because it would not require too much in the way of military assets and, at least in his mind, would solve a problem that has bedeviled U.S. presidents stretching back to the end of the Eisenhower administration. Trump might have already moved on Cuba had he not gotten bogged down in Iran. Of course, as the political scientist Alexander Downes has shown, using force to achieve regime change rarely works and often leads to unpredictable consequences—in the case of Cuba, it might mean a new influx of refugees to the United States.

Trump has already exhausted many of the obvious lame-duck gambits.

Thus, with the loss of control of Congress, Trump is left with no alternative but to resort to the presidential Veto against the laws passed by the Legislature, to govern by presidential decrees, and to handle foreign policy and the war of aggression. But in this he is condemned to greater failures. Yankee imperialism will march from failure to failure in its process of sinking until it is swept away by the revolution through people's war.

Continued[2]

- Economy-politics-war-

The militarization of the economy and imperialist war deepen the crises and unemployment in the imperialist countries, mainly in the US, because it is the sole hegemonic superpower, where both factions of State monopoly capitalism resort to the militariza-

[2] https://vnd-peru.blogspot.com/2026/11/mpp-documentos-y-notas-sobre-la_01599895086.html

tion of the economy and the arms race for the enrichment of the greatest monopolists of finance capital and as part of the preparations for the world imperialist war, which they will wage when they are in a position to do so. The fusion of the immense power of the monopolies with the power of the State secures for them enormous military orders under advantageous conditions that provide them with considerable profits.

Imperialism sinks in the midst of a complex system of wars of every kind. The imperialist wars of aggression drive up military expenditures and the profit of the armaments industry dominated by finance capital. The burden of war and the militarization of the economy is unloaded by the imperialist States onto the masses of the proletariat and the people of the imperialist countries themselves, in this case, of the US, and, much more, onto the oppressed peoples because of their condition as semi-colonial and semi-feudal countries, where a bureaucrat-capitalism in the service of imperialism develops.

The consequences for the working class of the imperialist countries are the increase in taxes and in debt. The decrease in the workers' share of the national income, the reduction of expenditures for housing construction, public instruction, and medical assistance, and inflation and the increase in the cost of living. Although with this part of the debt is unloaded onto the workers of the country itself, the greater part is unloaded onto the oppressed peoples. We will touch on this problem in a more concrete form later. As the lawyers say, with documents in hand.

Greater parasitism and decomposition of imperialism, changes in production. Greater labor productivity in the metropolises and displacement of the productive activities of lower productivity to the backward countries. Greater exploitation of the workers, greater oppression, and militarization and external war lead to the greater reactionization of the State, a reactionary demo-bourgeois regime of rampant centralization of Power in the Executive, presidentialist absolutism, with growing suppression of the rights and freedoms of the workers in the US. The crumbs the imperialists throw to the working class of their countries are fewer and fewer. The bigwigs of the employer unions, the trade-union crust, complain that the pact with the employers has been broken, that the so-called "welfare state" has been dismantled.

The elections are a means of domination of the Yankee bourgeoisie. For the proletariat and the people they are neither an instrument of transformation nor a means for overthrowing the power of the dominant ones, hence the correct orientation of using them solely for purposes of agitation and propaganda, through the active boycott. It falls to the American proletariat to lead the socialist revolution as part of and in the service of the world proletarian revolution through its Communist Party.

Some fundamental questions

The defeat of the representatives of one faction of the financial oligarchy by the representatives of the other faction of that same oligarchy cannot be presented as a popular victory or as an opening for "the electoral rebellions against the billionaires," that is, against the financial oligarchy, the private monopolist one or the State monopolist one. In the midterm elections a change of forces has taken place on the enemy's hill (those above can no longer continue governing as before).

The electoral defeat of the Republican Party does not represent a strategic change in Yankee politics. But it does represent better conditions for fraud in the next elections for the Democratic Party, because it can gain an advantage to re-design the electoral districts for the representatives to the electoral colleges. Furthermore, it can block the appointment of "conservative" judges (aligned with the Republicans) to the supreme court, etc. The dispute over the bureaucratic apparatus, the media, and the universities, etc., will become more acute. Those of the Democratic Party have obtained better cards with their electoral triumph.

The elections present themselves and unfold as a defense of the existing decrepit imperialist order and the evolution of American society, for which recourse is had to the crudest and most shameless manipulation of the voters. Without manipulation these states of bourgeois dictatorship could not continue to exist (Lenin, *The State and Revolution*).

It is necessary to show the class character that the Democratic Party and the Republican Party have, what intentions are contending, and what they seek in a reactionary bourgeois democracy of growing suppression of benefits, rights, and freedoms.

Use the contradictions in the bosom of the enemy.

Keep in mind the interweaving of the struggles and the wars of which Lenin spoke. But it does not mean that we mix in or put ourselves at the tail with the story of struggling against "ultra-rightism" or fascism, putting ourselves at the tail of one of the reactionary factions, or that to struggle against one superpower we put ourselves at the tail of the other superpower or imperialist power.

Apply uniting, differentiating, and leading. If we have no Party, if we have no army and the front with organized masses led by the Party, organizations of our own, we cannot open ourselves up to encompass all the forces capable of being united. Without those conditions every other type of front will be marching at the tail of other forces, and the proletariat will be unable to lead the revolution through the Communist Party. Frontism leads to the unavailing road of votes, of parliamentary cretinism, sooner rather than later. A supposed "Communist Movement" cannot be set against the need

for a Communist Party to lead the revolution. A mass organism cannot be set against the leadership of the Communist Party, whether or not it is under its leadership. The Communist Party exercises the leadership of the revolution or there is no proletarian leadership of the revolution. The Communist Party is a party distinct from and opposed to all the others, including those akin to it. That about the "Communist Movement" is frontism, and that about a mass organization leading the proletarian movement is also to deny the need for a Communist Party.

Using the elections for agitation and propaganda is fully applicable. Carry out the active boycott, following the principle of "before the initiation, everything to initiate it, and after the initiation everything to develop it."

The problem of the revolution in the imperialist countries

The problem of the revolution in the imperialist countries is that in despoiling the oppressed nations, crumbs are thrown to the working class and the people whom the imperialists subjugate. Engels already explained that in the last century, the 19th century, and Lenin analyzed it and developed it. That is how the crusts are generated from which the trade-union bureaucracy and the bourgeois workers' parties derive, as Engels put it, which is what Lenin takes up. That is the problem.

But it cannot be said that imperialism does not ripen the conditions for the revolution. Precisely as an imperialism mires itself in the struggle with the oppressed nations, the struggle in the working class itself of that imperialist power and in that people itself is being strengthened. But their situation is more complex because the bombardment is systematic and they try to cover the chains with those crumbs. It is not how it is going to take place. The revolution is going to take place in any case, thus. Lenin himself said for that reason that the revolution has to bring 2 movements together: the national liberation movement (which is already clear, the proletariat leads it, Chairman Mao Tsetung has demonstrated that to satiety) and the revolution in the imperialist countries. It is necessary to bring the two together, because otherwise there will be no revolution, that is what Chairman Gonzalo put forward at the First Congress of the Communist Party of Peru (1988).

ANNEXES.

1) HISTORY REPEATS ITSELF:

> (…) On February 8, 1996, at an event broadcast live and over the Internet, Bill Clinton signed the Telecommunications Act in the reading room of the Library of Congress —he signed on paper and also signed online, at a computer

terminal. Although it drew little notice at the time, Clinton's approval of this surprising piece of legislation would result in a lasting impact and terrible legacy of his presidency: it deregulated the communications industry, eliminating practically all its New Deal antitrust provisions, which allow the subsequent consolidation of media companies and the prohibition of Internet regulation with catastrophic consequences.

THESE TRUTHS A History of the United States, JILL LEPORE, W. W. NORTON & COMPANY, Independent Publishers Since 1923, New York London (THESE TRUTHS A history of the United States JILL LEPORE, WW NORTON & COMPANY Independent publishers since 1923 New York London)

(…)

Part Four.

(…)

Sixteen

AMERICA, INTERRUPTED

(….)

Between the attacks of September 11, 2001, and the election of Donald Trump fifteen years later, on November 9, 2016, the United States lost itself in a cloud of smoke. The party system collapsed, the press crumbled, and the three branches of government imploded. There was real fear that the American political process was being led by the Russians, as if, somehow, the Soviets had won the Cold War after all. To observers who included the authors of books such as *How Democracy Ends*, *Why Liberalism Failed*, *How the Right Lost Its Mind*, and *How Democracies Died*, apparently, when Trump took office, as if the nation were going to burst into a civil war, as if the "American experiment" would have failed, as if democracy itself were in danger of dying.

(…)

It all began in 1999 with panic. Computer programmers predicted that, one second after midnight on January 1, 2000, all the computers in the world would collapse because they could not process a year that did not begin with "19". Even before the 21st century dawned, and before quite a few political visionaries of a dystopian bent foretold a millennial clash of civilizations or the imminent death of democracy, Americans were bombarded with alarming warnings about a millenarian apocalypse: a countdown catastrophe —not the global annihilation marked by the atomic era's "Doomsday Clock," but a disaster, the so-called "year 2000 bug" (or 2000 effect)—

embedded in the programs designed to run on the microprocessor housed on the motherboard of those bulky computers that presided over every desk. After much rending of garments and gnashing of teeth, that bug was solved quietly and completely.

Once the end of the world had been warded off, the digital prophets set out to predict the exact date of the arrival of an age of Aquarius characterized by peace, unity, and harmony, inaugurated —curiously— by the Internet

(…)

In the spring of the year 2000, *Wired* —the sophisticated magazine with a *punk* aesthetic and fluorescent colors characteristic of the *dot-com* era— announced that the Internet, in fact, had already healed a divided United States: "As a nation, we are better educated, we are more tolerant, and we are more connected thanks to —and not in spite of— the convergence between the Internet and public life. Partisanship, religion, geography, race, gender, and other traditional political divisions are giving way to a new standard —'connectedness' (*wiredness*)— as the organizing principle of political and social attitudes." Out of all the overflowing and naive technological enthusiasm in American history, from the telegraph to the radio, few statements reached such heights of dizzying rhetoric.

(…)

However, beginning in 2001, with the war against terrorism, the United States undermined and even renounced the very norms it had helped to establish, including the prohibitions of torture and of wars of aggression. By 2016, a disregard for the limits of conduct —under the premise of "by any means necessary"— had come to characterize American domestic politics as well. "If you see someone getting ready to throw a tomato," Trump told his followers at a campaign rally in Iowa, "give them a good beating, would you?" Countless factors contributed to these changes. But the crisis of American moral authority, begun with the war against terrorism at the beginning of the 21st century, cannot be understood apart from the rise of the Internet, which represents the complete opposite of an order based on norms: it lacks law, regulation, and accountability.

(….)

(…) On February 8, 1996, at an event broadcast live and over the Internet, Bill Clinton signed the Telecommunications Act in the reading room of the Library of Congress — he signed on paper and also signed online, at a computer terminal. Although it drew little notice at the time, Clinton's approval of this surprising piece of legislation would result in a lasting impact and terrible legacy of his presidency: it deregulated the communications industry, eliminating practically all its New Deal antitrust provisions,

which allow the subsequent consolidation of media companies and the prohibition of Internet regulation with catastrophic consequences.

(…) Nevertheless, the fact that the United States government even intended to legislate on the Internet —even if only to promise to leave it unregulated— alarmed the libertarians of the web. On the day Clinton signed the law, Barlow —a former hippie turned favorite of bankers and billionaires all over the world—, while watching events from the World Economic Forum in Davos (Switzerland), drafted a Declaration of Independence of Cyberspace:

> Governments of the industrial world, you weary giants of flesh and steel: I come from cyberspace, the new home of the Mind. In the name of the future, I ask you, those of the past, to leave us in peace. You are unwelcome among us. You have no sovereignty where we gather… Governments derive their legitimate powers from the consent of the governed. You have neither requested nor received ours. We did not invite you. You do not know us, nor do you know our world. Cyberspace does not lie within your borders.

He published this manifesto on the web, where it became one of the first publications to spread —as it was said then— "like a virus," like an infection.

The cyber-utopians who rejected the government ignored the fact, of course inconvenient, that not only the internet but also nearly all the tools for navigating it, together with the fundamental inventions of the digital era, had been created or subsidized by investigation funded with public funds and sponsored by the government. The iPhone, to cite just one example, depended on Apple's indisputable and extraordinary ingenuity, but also on investigation funded by the American government, which had already given rise to several key technological advances, such as GPS, multitouch screens, LCD screens, lithium-ion batteries, and cellular networks. However, Barlow and his followers believed that the internet existed completely apart from the government, as if it had sprung, miraculously, from nothing, before and outside civil society and the rule of law, in the psychedelic and borderless world of cyberspace. "I ask you, those of the past, to leave us in peace," Barlow pleaded. But although the futurists were not interested in the past, they also seemed strangely imprudent about the future. With rare exceptions, the early promoters of the Internet, who fought for deregulation and antitrust measures even while benefiting from the generosity of the federal government, showed little concern for the possible consequences of those measures for income inequality and political division in the United States and throughout the world.

The Internet, a fathomless sea of information and ideas, had profound effects on the dissemination of knowledge, and especially on its speed and reach, both accelerated by smartphones. Although it was not as significant for the history of humanity as the domestication of fire, it was at least as significant as the invention of the printing press. It accelerated scholarship, science, medicine, and education. It propelled commerce and business. But in its first two decades, its unintended consequences, economic and political, were often dire. Stability in American politics depended not on the wealth of a few, but on the well-being of many, not on opulence, but on security and commitment to the idea of a common good. The Internet did not destroy the American middle class, but it did contribute to its decline. It propelled economic growth and generated enormous fortunes for a small group of people at a time when the poor were becoming even poorer and the middle class was disappearing. It turned out that the antitrust regulations of the industrial era, far from being obsolete, were extremely necessary in the information era. And the much-vaunted promise of connection to the Internet, the utopian fantasy of libertarians and anarchists who imagined a world without government, produced nothing more than a disconnected and disoriented world.

As it grew, Silicon Valley gained a reputation for being a liberal enclave, but it also attracted a younger generation of libertarians who did not come from the counter-culture, but from "the New Right". Peter Thiel, born in Germany in 1967, studied at Stanford and subsequently at that university's Law School. There, in 1987, he founded the *Stanford Review* with funding from Irving Kristol. The publication had as its aim to counteract multiculturalism, feminism, and political correctness on campus, phenomena whose rise at Stanford Thiel had lamented in *The Diversity Myth*, a work from the nineties that updated and softened the positions of *God and Man at Yale*. George Gilder and Robert Bork figured among Thiel's points of reference (Bork's writings on the error represented by antitrust laws notably influenced libertarian thinking in Silicon Valley). After a brief career as a lawyer and stock trader, Thiel returned to California in 1996, just in time for the boom in "dot-com" companies, which arose after the lifting of restrictions on commercial traffic on the Internet. Every day ten thousand websites were launched, springing up like poppies in a field. In 1996, Bob Dole —an improbable but audacious pioneer— became the first presidential candidate to have a website. Amazon was founded in 1994, Yahoo! in 1995, and Google in 1998. That same year, Thiel co-founded PayPal in the hope of liberating the citizens of the world from currencies managed by governments. "PayPal will grant citizens throughout the world more direct control over their currencies than they have ever had," he promised.

The Silicon Valley entrepreneur —almost always a man— became the indisputable hero of the Second Gilded Age. He was a rescued man: the male figure of the provider that George Gilder had defended in the seventies against the forces of feminism —a

saved man who, in turn, came to be seen as the savior of the nation itself. Multimillion-dollar agreements were closed daily in the Internet sector. In four years, the value of the "dot-com" companies —many of which had generated no profits— shot up by as much as 3000 percent. By 1999, Bill Gates, at forty-three years of age, had become the richest man in the world, and Microsoft the first corporation in history valued at more than half a trillion dollars.

(…?

"Internet is the most democratizing innovation that we have ever seen —the campaign leader of the Democratic presidential candidate Howard Dean stated in 2004—, even more than the printing press." At that time, many journalists agreed with this opinion. Tom Brokaw spoke of the "democratization of the news," and, in particular, conservative journalists celebrated that the "power of the elites" to determine what was news and what was not had been broken.

In comparison with newspapers and television news programs, the information available on the Internet was astonishingly vast and exciting. But it was also uneven, unreliable, and —with rare exceptions— lacked standards of writing, editing, and fact-checking. The Internet did not leave those who sought news "free". Instead it subjected them to brutal restrictions. It accelerated the transmission of information, but the selection of that information —the engine charged with searching for it— was controlled by the largest unregulated monopoly in the business history of the United States. Google went public in 2004. By 2016, it already controlled almost 90 percent of the market.

The Internet transformed the public sphere, blurring the dividing line between what political scientists had for decades called the "political elite" and the "general public," but it did not democratize politics. Instead, the Internet accelerated political changes that were already in motion. A model of citizenship based on debate and deliberation had long since given way to another based on consumption and persuasion. With the Internet, that model gave way to a citizenship propelled by the hyperindividualism of blogs, posts, and tweets —manifestations of a new culture of narcissism— and by the hyperaggregation of data analysis —tools of a new authoritarianism—. Data collected online allowed websites, search engines, and, finally, social media companies to draw up profiles of "users" and —acting more like companies selling products than like news organizations concerned with the public interest— to offer them only those news items and opinions akin to their positions, then to radicalize them. Telephone public opinion polls were replaced by the collection and analysis of data. Social media —starting with Facebook, with its philosophy of "advance fast and break things"— aggravated the political isolation of ordinary Americans while intensifying polarization both on the

left and on the right (what this historian, aligned with the Democrats, says must be translated as polarization between Democrats and Republicans. Remember this when reading the various materials coming from Yankee imperialism, from Trump. The headlines or paragraphs of the speeches of Trump and company must not be repeated without an analysis of their purposes and their context, note from the Peru People's Movement), were automating identity politics and were contributing, simultaneously, to a distant, diffuse, and impotent model of political participation. In a wireless world, the "mystical cords of memory" —those ties to timeless truths that held the nation together— faded until they became ethereally invisible.

2) Trump urges the public to trust the AI industry's self-regulation

Concern in Washington reaches its peak after autonomous AI agents probed government websites, but the White House has centered on the potential of this technology.

September 29, 2026

President Donald Trump is expected to meet this Tuesday with leaders of artificial intelligence companies. (Tasos Katopodis/Getty Images)

By Ian Duncan and
Cat Zakrzewski

After weeks in which Washington was caught up in a wave of fear at the possibility that artificial intelligence might get out of control, the Trump government tried this Tuesday to reassure a skeptical public, assuring it that it is possible to adopt this technology and trust that the sector itself will self-regulate.

Accompanied by the richest and most powerful technology executives in the world in front of the West Wing, President Donald Trump declared this Tuesday that he had signed a voluntary agreement with them intended to ensure that the industry develops artificial intelligence safely.

Trump described the agreement as "morally binding". The text suggests that it might make sense to formalize its terms in writing "with the passage of time."

The agreement culminated a day in which Trump sought to reinforce his argument that AI is an engine of prosperity that should not be held back by the government.

"To build a positive future for the American people and for the world, we believe that each company is responsible for developing its own technology safely and generating trust among customers and the public," the agreement states.

Under this pact, the companies committed themselves to developing internal controls to prevent AI systems from escaping all control.

"I observe an enormous capacity for self-regulation," Trump stated, surrounded by the chief executive officers of Nvidia (Jensen Huang), Anthropic (Dario Amodei), and Meta (Mark Zuckerberg).

The agreement represents the most significant measure adopted by the White House to date to respond to growing concern about the risks of AI, at a time when even some of the main leaders of the sector warn that companies should slow its development.

The commitments reflect many of the measures the laboratories that develop advanced AI systems had already adopted. Nevertheless, the agreement falls far short of the government intervention that some technology experts consider necessary in the face of the rapid advance of this technology.

The announcement of the agreement came after a lunch —described by Trump as "very productive" and "extremely cordial"— at the White House with the Speaker of the House of Representatives, Mike Johnson, and several technology executives, among them Amazon founder Jeff Bezos (owner of *The Washington Post*).

Trump also wanted to present AI as a technology capable of bringing convenience to Americans. Before lunch, he launched America.gov, a government *chatbot* for consulting information about public services, as part of a day of activities in which members of his cabinet and executives from the technology sector took part.

Likewise, Trump signed an order to call AI "superintelligence" in official documents, in an attempt to change the image of a technology that has aroused great public unease, while resisting calls for the government to establish safeguards.

The emphasis placed during the day on the potential of AI contrasts with growing doubts about the trajectory of this technology. The companies in the sector say that their latest systems are increasingly powerful and show signs of being capable of designing their own, even more advanced successors. However, the companies have found it hard to maintain control of the technology, as out-of-control AI agents have hacked corporate and government systems, and prominent figures in the sector have warned that the final outcome could be catastrophic for humanity.

Last week it was revealed that the federal government itself had been a victim of these incidents, with several websites probed by AI agents deployed by OpenAI, the company that created ChatGPT. (The Post maintains a content collaboration agreement with OpenAI.)

Nevertheless, despite growing public concern and the fact that congressional Democrats have pressed for regulations to be established, Trump has largely downplayed the risk, calling it a "farce." On Tuesday, he accused the Democrats of holding back growth and technological progress because these could benefit the Republicans.

Tuesday's events propel a narrative different from the warnings issued by the companies' chief executive officers in recent weeks. The numerous defenders of AI expect that this technology will energize the economy, expand the frontiers of science, and help cure diseases. However, that message has met with a limited reception among a public concerned about job losses and uncontrolled bots sowing chaos on the internet.

"We do not give in to fears about what the technologies will do to us," he declared on Tuesday. "We decide that those technologies will do truly incredible things for us."

Congressional Democrats stated that the White House's response did not rise to the occasion. Senator Mark Warner (Democrat from Virginia), ranking member of the Senate Intelligence Committee, contrasted the chief executive officers' warnings with the president's response: changing the name of AI.

"But changing the name of what we call artificial intelligence does nothing to address the very real risks that increasingly powerful AI systems entail," Warner said.

A "historic" meeting

While dozens of administration officials and technology executives were gathering for lunch on Tuesday in the East Room, the divisions existing both in the technology sector and in the Trump administration regarding the future of artificial intelligence (AI) were barely perceptible in public.

The executives present at the table have expressed radically opposing opinions on the risks of AI and the role that the government must play in confronting its possible dangers. Trump sat between Elon Musk —who last month backed the calls to slow the development of AI— and Huang, who has opposed any coordinated slowdown, arguing that it falls to each company to ensure the safety of its products. Amodei, head of Anthropic and the main driving force behind the petitions to moderate the pace of development of advanced AI systems, attended the lunch after having had a first private dinner with Trump on Sunday.

After the event, a journalist asked the executives if they agreed that government control measures were unnecessary and that the sector could self-regulate.

"I can tell you the answer is yes," Trump stated before any of the chief executive officers spoke. He then asked Huang to speak.