The imperialist jungle law is ultimately the highest and most binding law for capitalist imperialism. International law, institutions etc., in a sense there is a regulatory body, but once the status quo deteriorates, the only law in force is the right of the stronger until a new balance of power is established.
Qassem Soleimani was an official representative from Iran and Abu Mahdi Al-Muhandis was an official representative of Iraq. It is nothing ordinary that US imperialism killed these two representatives. From now on, it is the imperialist jungle law that rules the world. Assassinations, massacres, torture and occupation are indispensable companions of the imperialist world, without which bourgeois hegemony is inconceivable, but which „normal times“ cannot take the place of established international regulation and legality. Either they are carried out as covert acts or in any way adapted to international legality. Examples are the poisoning of Yasser Arafat, Chavez, innumerable secret attacks on Castro etc. But this officially carried out attack is an action with which US imperialism breaks the usual norms.

This is about more than just a problem between the United States and Iran. This could have happened between the United States and any other country. The Middle East is targeted because it is the current center of the imperialist and regional struggle for hegemony and Iran is targeted because it is a key player for regional hegemony. With this attack, the United States sent messages to Turkey, North Korea, China, Russia and others.

**Why was this assassination attempt carried out right now?**

Capitalist imperialism is in a complex crisis. The economic, political and ideological crisis is intertwined, we call it the existential crisis of capitalism. The capitalist law of uneven development manifests itself with all its violence. We are currently experiencing the hegemony crisis of the capitalist imperialist system. The economic, political and legal institutions that shape the world have become ineffective. Capital and the military have become the two main instruments of the hegemony struggle between the capitalists. If things are „normal“, capital becomes the determinant of hegemony, in times of crisis the military comes to the fore. War is the only means of resolving contradictions in any situation in which imperialist competition increases. In times like these, it is the state of war that determines all political, economic, legal and diplomatic relations until the new order of hegemony is established.

Capitalist imperialism was unable to overcome the 2008 crisis. US
imperialism is unable, as in the past, to rule the world economy and politics and to determine the world system. That is why its entire policy is aimed at stopping this loss of power and preventing the development of competitors. It tries to protect the hegemony with military power, because with the power of capital, this is not possible anymore. Other imperialist countries also focus on the development of the war industry. The competition for new production techniques is replaced by new weapons, missiles, etc. After the start of the hegemony crisis, the regional powers tried to take advantage of the „vacuum“. Iran and Turkey’s efforts to achieve regional hegemony are the two most important examples of this. The main tool of this hegemony effort is the most effective use of war power.

In times of the global economic crisis, competition for the control of raw material resources is intensifying. The Middle East is one of the most important areas of fossil fuels that are of great importance for the capitalist economy. The rule over the region will be a great step in the struggle for hegemony. Iran has become the main competitor of US imperialism in the region. Based on sectarian organization, Iran established what it calls the axis of resistance in Iraq, Yemen, Syria and Lebanon. Qassem Soleimani was the commander of this axis and this is precisely where the symbolic meaning of this attack comes from. This is why the attack on Iran is perceived as such a major blow: the attack on Soleimani was directed against this axis and if this axis is broken, the current Iranian regime can be destroyed.

How will Iran react?

Iran will respond effectively to this attack. If this does not happen, he must adapt to the demands of US imperialism and the axis of resistance will break. Iran was left alone in the face of the attack. The EU, which stands by the United States, the weak reactions from Russia and China and the lack of intent to venture on an adventure for Iran are major disadvantages for Iran. The tendency is towards a political-military struggle to force the United States to leave the Middle East.

Under these circumstances, although there are different tendencies in the United States, the United States will use all of its power not to leave the Middle East. This may not be an instant war. It should be noted that Saudi Arabia, like Israel,
is on the side of the United States against Iran and together they do not want to miss any opportunity to plunge into Iran. New attacks for the dissolution or overthrow of the Iranian mullahs regime are not removed from the agenda. There is a state of war. Once a state of war has arisen, a bullet can sometimes rule the entire process.

What is the attitude of the revolutionaries?

Of course, the attack by US imperialism has to be condemned. However, the rejection of US imperialism does not mean, to support Iran’s reactionary fascist regime. Some leftist movements support Iran against the United States as a requirement of anti-imperialism. These are indeed archaic leftists who are not aware of the changes in capitalist imperialism. We are in the stage of imperialist globalization. In the phase of imperialism, the national liberation struggles against colonialism and semi-colonialism had been a blow to imperialism and its followers and served to advance the working class and the oppressed to socialism. Although led by the national bourgeoisie and the main program of this bourgeoisie was to remove the obstacles to capitalist development, the national liberation struggles against imperialism were of a democratic nature because imperialism drove colonial policy by working together with the most important representatives of the reaction, the comprador bourgeoisie and the feudals. Any struggle for national liberation inevitably required a struggle against this inner reaction as well as against imperialism.

The situation is different in the
era of imperialist globalization. The imperialists are forcing colonial countries to create new types of financial-economic colonies in order to integrate them into the world market following their own interests. Where economic, political and diplomatic forces are not enough, military forces are deployed. The invasion of Iraq is only the result of such a process and is similar to the brutal massacre of Gaddafi by NATO, which attacked Libya once the civil war broke out. In contrast, the leap in Turkey’s financial and economic colonization, which started with an official from the World Bank who enforced 15 laws in 15 days immediately after the breakout of the crisis in 2001, was a „peaceful“ example of the use of economic and political violence.

The rulers who oppose the measures of imperialism have absolutely no progressive quality, on the contrary, they try to maintain their reactionary fascist rule. For this reason, if the struggle against imperialism is not combined with the struggle against this reactionary fascist rule, it falls in the reserve of reaction and fascism in the name of anti-imperialism. To stand for Saddam in Iraq or Assad in Syria means to fall into such a line.

The situation in Iran is similar. The reactionary fascist mullahs regime in Iran is a people’s enemy. The mullah regime is capitalist. A handful of rich people are ruling. Hundreds of people were massacred in the recent popular uprising against petrol price hikes. The mullahs regime keeps East Kurdistan under colonial yoke. It pursues an anti-people policy in both Iraq and Iran. The fascist mullahs’ regime is behind the attacks on the popular uprising in Iraq. It is also responsible for the attacks that took place in South Kurdistan after the independence referendum. This regime is neither anti-imperialist, nor anti-capitalist, not democratic, and it carries out reactionary fascist repression against the people. It competes with US imperialism for regional hegemony. The only interest of the people in Iran and the region is not to defend the side of imperialism or the side of the reactionary regime, but to unite on the third front with the aim of an anti-capitalist order on the axis of the struggle for political freedom against both sides. The people’s resistances against the regime are getting lost in a reactionary nationalist delusion because of the US attacks which therefore have to be strongly rejected.
The AKP emerged almost two decades ago under the conditions of an economic, political and social crisis. The economic crisis in which Turkey is now and the concrete effects of which have been observable for almost a year is exacerbating and getting out of control. It is assumed that the crisis will extend over a few years and has the potential to put an end to the „legend“ AKP.

When we talk about an AKP economic model, it is difficult to talk about anything other than construction projects. All public companies, agriculture and nature have been squandered to the international monopolies and their collaborators; huge transport and construction projects as well as the transfer of public funds to capital have become the hallmarks of the AKP’s economic miracle.

The pillars that ensured the palace’s social legitimacy were shaken...
by the defeats of fascism in Rojava, the Gezi uprising in 2013 and the electoral defeat of June 7, 2015. However, by coping with the crisis through chauvinism, war and fascist aggression, the regime was able to compensate for the weakening of its social base. However, this possibility of fascism is disappearing more and more with the economic crisis.

Pressure from the economic crisis has brought about the end of the „economic miracle“, the only pillar that keeps the palace alive.

The economic crisis not only disintegrates the power of the palace regime, but also the social support that should be maintained through chauvinism.

The recent discussion about the Istanbul Canal, an ecological destruction project, is of greater importance when viewed on this basis. This „crazy project“, which was launched as a vision of the „reign“ of the AKP to put its stamp on the city, has become a symbol of the new war in the palace.

A period of the palace regime, which has been characterized by playing for balance in the struggle for hegemony between America and Russia, is currently ending. The regime’s goal was to take geopolitical advantage from the imperialist contradictions associated with international agreements on the Istanbul Canal (Montreux Agreement). Alternative routes to the Black Sea should be created under their own control.

The Canal should provide NATO with a tool of weakening Russia’s growing influence, and a new geopolitical balance policy should be found.

The regime also tried to participate in the escalating trade war between the imperialist centers.

The cost of the Canal, which is estimated 200 to 300 billion, should create new resources through investments that guarantee capital flow and reduce the pressure caused by the economic crisis.

Millions of trees will be felled as a result of the project, the project area will be opened for construction, the respiratory pipes of Istanbul will be closed, the groundwater will be looted and extreme ecological destruction will be caused.

By disrupting the natural balance of the Black Sea and the Sea of Marmara, a process is being initiated that will have short, medium and long-term consequences. Whole species will die out, the smell of rot-
ten eggs will spread across Istanbul. Today, the Istanbul Canal is the trademark for all economic, ecological and social crises of Turkish fascism. The fascist chief clings to the project with all his might and it is therefore not to be expected that it will be abandoned so quickly. The only force that can stop this multi-destruction project is the anger of the masses that will arise in every way. And the tension increases along with the potential associated with it. The palace and its opponents are polarizing on both sides of the Istanbul Canal discussion.

The Mayor of Istanbul Imamoglu and his CHP dominate the opposition to the palace on this issue. The CHP’s relationship to this process is to take advantage of social polarization to strengthen its position in the elections. In this polarization, the toiling left must form as quickly as possible and organize a line that is suitable for exploiting this new potential. A line of resistance that is organized in various forms, as we did during the forums in the Gezi uprising on the streets and in the public sessions on the no-referendum against fascism will strengthen the revolutionary front.

It is important to organize the will on the street and to establish this policy within the movement. The Istanbul Canal is the next planned ecological destruction strike by fascism, which will meet with resistance. As with the Gezi Uprising in 2013, when the rage over felled trees in a park in the heart of Istanbul exploded into a nationwide uprising against fascism, the Istanbul Canal also offers the opportunity to become the tomb of fascism, because Istanbul is a metropolis of struggle.
Discussions about the need for a unified struggle have recently increased within the revolutionary democratic forces, workers’ organizations and anti-fascists in Turkey. This is undoubtedly an expression of a search for more qualitative struggles and a declaration of intent to strengthen the fight against the fascist chief regime.

The will and striving for unity are not limited to the revolutionary vanguard or anti-fascist organizations of the left. Large sections of society are oppressed by the official and civilian forces of the fascist palace regime. The permanent repression, the endeavor of fascism to control the entire social structure, and the institutionalized existence of the fascist chief regime lead to the need for defense and unity to develop within the broadest parts of society. However, an essential part of the discussions in the ranks of the revolutionary democratic movement is far from taking a path that can lead to a solution to this question. If we look at what has been said, we will see that there is a combination of right and wrong opinions. As with any other topic, the right solutions and the right results can only be achieved if the right questions are asked. It is clear that not all of these efforts go beyond subjective theoretical and political considerations. The necessary method is therefore always to highlight the concrete problems of political practice. Which political goal should the struggle against fascism target? How should an anti-fascist power alternative be achieved? The common agenda in the fight against fascism is known to play an important role. However, it is necessary to remember that the fight against fascism does not need bourgeois-democratic solutions. Since the current regime cannot change its fascist character towards bourgeois democracy, the success of the anti-fascist struggle contains the victory of a democratic people’s revolution. The fight against fascism is a question of revolution and must target the existing state structure, as the revolutionary movement often said in the period of revolutionary ascent from 1974 to 1980.

Discussing the question of unity in the fight against fascism is therefore not a discussion of the unification of action at the usual time, but
the creation of a basic strategic means and the construction of a suitable mode of action. Wherever the need for unification is discussed, the forms, means and organization of the revolutionary struggle must be discussed. In this sense, the unified struggle must respond to the concrete needs of the struggle. The demand for an abstract unification against fascism, which does not involve a concrete struggle and does not undertake any concrete action and work, can have no effect and remains a simple declaration of intent. Then the question remains: what is the need for the current struggle, which political requirements will be the lever of the unified struggle and the source of new impulses? The question of the allies determines the unified struggle and is taken in hand with the contradictions in the socio-political environment of the struggle. The MLKP answers this question with the structural contradictions between state and society and, based on political freedom, developed the idea of the unified revolution and the unified revolutionary leadership. A state structure that pursues a policy of assimilation, destruction and annihilation against a religiously, culturally, nationally and ethnically diverse society inevitably causes contradictions and violent confrontations. The resistance of social diversity to the monistic formative constraints of the state has created a historical course in which uprisings on the one hand and fascism on the other were caused. The state tried to control the structural contradictions by provoking conflicts between Alevi and Sunnis, secular and religious, Kurds and Turks. Where that was not enough, coups and methods of reactionary civil war followed. In this connection, the conflicts caused by the capitalist development resulting from the contradiction between labor and capital were suppressed. From this reality, we are pursuing the revolutionary strategy of letting the state’s divide-rule tactics foil. This strategy manifests itself with the demand for political freedom. The flag of political freedom is raised where the state produced contradictions, namely in the unification of the Turks and Kurds, Alevi and Sunnis, religious and non-religious against the fundamental and irreconcilable contradiction of capitalist society, the contradiction between labor and capital. This requires a programmatic rapprochement that brings these social dynamics together, positions them against the fascist regime and forms them into a social and political force. It is particularly
about the connection of the Turkey revolution with the Kurdistan revolution. An understanding that is not aimed at uniting these two revolutions and their vanguards is far from a successful unified struggle. Trying to distance oneself from the Kurdish revolution and its vanguards does mean not to see that our revolution started in Kurdistan. As a result of the uneven growth in the relationship between the two revolutions, wrong and apolitical approaches to the Kurdistan Revolution are emerging. Kurdistan is a great revolutionary motor that can influence all revolutions in the region if the political-military struggle is expanded and the conditions are created for a stronger confrontation with the fascist regime. Trying to keep as far away from the Kurdish revolution as possible and to close one’s eyes to its meaning is nothing other than the wish to remain in „safe waters“ in the fight against fascism. Today’s need for unity requires an active defensive stance; this active defense secures the morale of the anti-fascist forces and continually strengthens their ranks, organizes the masses of people and develops revolutionary forces. To sum up, the unified struggle against the fascist chief regime is carried out a) in the political-military struggle, b) in the de facto legitimate and militant street fights, c) in the mass movement and the social movements. On the political-military struggle: Throughout history, the problem of the unified struggle against fascism has also been discussed with the question of creating a revolutionary war force against fascism. Because the problem of fighting fascism, which is a regime of terrorism, also means the organization of revolutionary warfare, which is the only form that can defeat it. Therefore, the demands for anti-fascist unity, without considering the revolutionary war and political-military struggle, have no strategic goals and are far from the demand for revolution. Any topic that sees the fight against fascism as a question of revolution must also take on the task of expanding its basic strategic instrument. The unified revolution of Turkey-Kurdistan created a strategic level of war, a means that should not be underestimated. It manifests itself within the HBDH. Attempts are currently being made to intensify the war from the rural areas to the cities.

Another need for the anti-fascist struggle is the practical legitimate militant struggle. The importance of these street fights is greater than ever under the conditions in which
the streets have been torn from the masses to liquidate any revolutionary politics. A measure of action has to be created that militantly fights the street to overcome the current state. And it is clear that one way to do this is through revolutionary action.

The history of our struggle against fascism shows that the first step is the unity of the revolutionary actions that are carried out on the street. A continuous line of resistance that develops from the grassroots despite the state attacks is a position on a militant line. For the organization of self-defense of the population and creation of revolutionary mass violence, there are also fighting organizations, the foundation of which has been planned well in advance. These are the unified and flexible anti-fascist resistance committees that are waiting to be mobilized for the revolution. It is clear that the energy of the revolutionary vanguard must focus on the organization and functioning of these committees in all areas of life instead of repeating the simple demands for unity.

A similar problem exists in the discussion of unified organizations in which the mass movement is organized. There may be dozens of platforms, fronts, initiatives or organizations of revolutionary forces. It seems that the problem is the lack of action and movement. Regardless of which new organization is built in the unified struggle, without a practice on the street, without a revolutionary mass policy, without changing the previous perspective, the new platforms will soon resemble the old ones. It should be briefly noted that the most advanced form of alliances, platforms and units of force was obtained on October 15, 2011 with the founding of the Democratic Peoples’ Congress (HDK). As a result of upcoming elections, the Democratic Party of the Peoples (HDP) emerged from it. The HDK, which creates examples of direct democracy in the form of councils, has turned to a key attraction in its history.

If the needs of the political struggle change and develop, the organizational policy needs of the unified struggle can of course also change. Today we have organizations that can lead the unified struggle from revolutionary war organizations to areas of legitimate mass struggle. The use of revolutionary energy to strengthen these organizations will contribute much more to the future of the unified struggle than abstract discussions.
A brief review of 2019

The year 2019 was a year of popular uprisings in which the effects of the existential crisis of capitalism intensified. The will for change and the end of social approval for bourgeois rule only deepened the bourgeoisie’s crisis of rule. In contrast to the social movements and uprisings after the Great crisis of 2008, today’s popular uprisings are even more destructive, the impoverished are on the streets against poverty, unemployment, hunger and futurelessness in capitalism. In the phase of imperialist globalization, the old forms of political rule no longer work, and the demands and aspirations of the workers and oppressed can no longer be locked away as easily.

Women play a key role in these uprisings. They rise both against the crisis of the imperialist-capitalist system, as well as for their gender liberation, against the inequality and violence that this crisis exercises on their bodies, their sexuality and their labor. The international women’s movements and actions, which have developed through the collectivization of slogans, symbols and forms in recent years, have also progressed this year. The will of women for social change remains a fundamental dynamic in social struggles.

Hope and the topicality of the revolution are spreading through these developments.

But in the popular uprisings this year, the question of revolutionary leadership remained largely un-
solved, a lack of direction is spreading, the opportunities also increase the risks. The rulers let the world workers and oppressed pay the price for the existential crisis with their lives, the nature and the heritages of human history. The development of fascism and political reaction in many countries, hostility to migrants, chauvinism and racism are concrete effects of the crisis of rule, because the crisis of the capitalist system is not an ordinary one. It is increasingly taking the form of a crisis of the social order that runs from the imperialist centers to the colonies.

Within the imperialist competition and polarization, the Middle East remains a focus.

As a result of the uprising of 2010-2012, Rojava emerged as a 3rd front that offered a different future, a new life to the whole world. Rojava is a flagship of today’s will for change. The AKP fascism tries to solve the ongoing regime crisis of the Turkish state, which is linked to the Kurdish question, with occupation attacks and a war policy against northern and eastern Syria. After the occupation of Afrin, the state is now taking action against the achievements of the Kurdish people all over Rojava. However, the resistance in northern and eastern Syria has written history. Chauvinist agitation and war propaganda cannot hide the critical situation in which fascism finds itself. We saw last year that all the fascist violence only deepened the regime crisis.

The disintegration phenomena within the AKP are illustrated by the founding plans of new parties by old companions. The appointment of trustees in the municipalities of Northern Kurdistan after the municipal elections of March 31 and June 23 only expressed the AKP’s crisis of rule. The war of occupation in Syria, the attempt to overcome the economic crisis through war economy and expansionism in the eastern Mediterranean are nothing but desperate attempts to overcome the crisis. The AKP-MHP rule block produces less and less approval within the population. With the economic crisis, the political ties of fascism to its masses are also braking. The will for change is spreading.

The workers and oppressed, however, have passed a period of important resistances. Even if they do not yet have the desired mass power, the oppressed have filled the streets with various social and de-
mocratic demands. They have not bowed to regional war politics, isolation, prison, square prohibitions and trustees. The Kurdish liberation struggle, the women’s liberation struggle, the workers’ movement and newly growing ecological movements have shown that a social combat force is accumulating.

Last year the silence was broken by the hunger strike started by Leyla Güven. The Justice Commissions for Şule Çet, a young student whose murder was tried be disguised as suicide by ruling class men, and many other actions against feminicides, the struggles of workers, ecological struggles from Hasankeyif to the Ida Mountains were among the most significant moments of resistance last year. The communists positioned themselves according to the willingness for change of the working class and the oppressed, with the vanguard mission to carry all the struggles of the movement forward. Political and military strikes were inflicted on the armed colonial fascist state from the mountains to the cities at every opportunity. Despite all the state’s liquidation attacks, the revolutionary movement could not be stopped. While on the one hand the self-sacrificing defense war continues in northern and eastern Syria, the search for the most effective means of anti-fascist struggle continues with all determination and the forces for the resistance of the masses against fascism are strengthening. At this critical stage, the situation bodes well for future struggles.