

WORKERS OF ALL COUNTRIES, UNITE!

RED DAWN



INTERNATIONAL THEORETICAL ORGAN

NUMBER 10

JANUARY 2006

The Political Crisis and the Future Of
the European Union

3



The Illusions in Anti-Imperialist Struggle,
the Middle East and the Resistance
in Iraq

21



The Never-Ending Symphony
Cyprus Question and Marxist Attitude

35



The Course and Experiences of the
Working Class Struggle in Turkey and
Northern Kurdistan

45



MARXIST LENINIST COMMUNIST PARTY
TURKEY / NORTHERN KURDISTAN



contact:
www.mlkp.org
info@mlkp.org

Preface

We have the pleasure to introduce our readers the 10th issue of Red Dawn, in the first days of a new year.

In this issue we are presenting the analysis of the Marxist Leninist Communists on four important topics. These topics however will be continue to be discussed also in the following process, both because of their actuality and their theoretical-political importance.

Our first article is titled "The Political Crisis and the Future of EU". Summarizing the historical process since the signment of the European Economical Community (Common Market) Treaty in 1957 until present EU, the enlargement process of EU and its problems in this process are being discussed. The internal contradictions and the problems of EU, which are caused by the internal competition and the hegemony struggles in EU, especially the discussions about the Iraqi War and the EU constitution have been discussed with a socialist perspective and the political crisis of EU and its reasons have been analysed. Answering the question why EU is not the union of the workers and labourers but of the monopolies, the article deals with the Turkey-EU relations and the negotiations of membership, and as a conclusion, emphasises the tasks of the communists on this issue.

1

The article "The Illusions In Anti-Imperialist Struggle, The Middle East And The Resistance In Iraq" discusses imperialist aggression and war, not only in the Middle East, but defining its general lines, and posts the illusions in the anti-imperialist struggle, analysing specially the Iraqi resistance. Emphasising the moral motivation caused by the Iraqi resistance for the peoples, the article deals with how a consistent anti-imperialist line must be. The development of the Islamic movement is also mentioned in the article, and also it posts how to strengthen the solidarity with Iraqi and Palestinian resistance and it stresses the necessity of regional anti-imperialist coordinations.

In the third article with the title "Unending Symphony Cyprus Question and the Marxist Attitude", we are discussing the plans, among them the Annan plan, about Cyprus Island, which has always been a problem in Turkey-Greece relations, has an important place in the competition between USA and EU, and which has been controlled for a long time by British imperialism. The article also includes the place of Cyprus in inter-imperialist contradictions and the Marxist attitude towards this question.

Our last article is under the headline "The course and experiences of the work-ing class struggle in Turkey and Northern Kurdistan". The neoliberal attacks against the working class and the labourers are being carried out all

over the world. In this article, it is posted how and on what scale the neoliberal attacks are carried out in Turkey and North Kurdistan and some examples are given about the militant resistance of the working class against these attacks, among all, against the privatization attacks. The conclusions which must be drawn from the resistance realized by the working class in the last two years, and the attitude and the experiences of the Marxist Leninist Communists are also part of the article.

We wish a good new year to all our readers and we emphasise once more that the 21st century will be socialism's.

We look forward to meet in the next issue!

THE POLITICAL CRISIS AND THE FUTURE OF EUROPEAN UNION

EU is growing quite fast. This process of growth is directed and encouraged principally by the German imperialism. Last year ten countries joined EU. Bulgaria and Romania signed the treaties of membership. The negotiations with Turkey for membership began in October 3rd. The other Balkan countries are waiting their turn. In the think-tank centres of EU, they are thinking of the membership of Byelorussia and Moldavia. As a result of its expansion, EU can change into a 35-state free trade region or can be reconstructed as an internal market of national states.

Everything began with the Rome Treaty in 1957. European Economic Community (Common Market) was established on the basis of this treaty. After 1957 no other treaty was signed for 30 years. But after 30 years, many treaties followed each other to deepen and expand the economic integration: In 1987, Single European Act to form a unique market; in 1992 Maastricht; in 1997 Amsterdam; in 2000 Nice Treaties were signed and finally the Constitution of the European Union came to agenda.

The constitution draft was put to a vote in some countries' parliaments, and in some others they went to referenda. The results of referenda showed very clearly that EU is in a deep crisis and it can not go beyond being an economic integration. The effort of founding a federal super EU state on the base of mentioned constitution became a dream for now.

The political crisis which broke out during the process of the discussions on the budget and the approval of the constitution reflected the attitudes which were directly questioning the future of EU. An EU with a constitution is an important step forward to establishing a Western Europe centered new hegemonic system and to form a whole external policy and militarism. It is quite definite that the constitution will be the first relevant step of achieving a political union. Taking this step will strengthen EU before the USA and it will increase its competition

capacity in the world markets. In this context an EU with a constitution will be stronger than an EU without a constitution.

Whether in this manner or that manner, EU has arrived today expanding and growing. Its growth and expansion has brought into agenda its contradictions which were not on the agenda until today. The present political crisis shows that EU increases its internal contradictions, internal and external competition, while it is growing and expanding.

Does the growing and expanding EU deepen at the same time? There are two different opinions about deepening: One side understands democracy and welfare from deepening. This side generally consists of those who have expectations from EU. The other side, and first of all, Germany and France understands to keep "EU's capacity of moving". What those countries understand from deepening and from keeping "EU's capacity of moving" is to form a "nucleus" which they will lead. In this manner they will direct EU's development and the future according to their own interests such as they have directed until now. And the task which falls upon the other countries is to form a circle around this "nucleus" surrounding it.

The foremost imperialist countries of EU such as Germany and Europe understand a both expanding and deepening EU, a EU whose members do not have equal rights.

The constitution was prepared to legitimize and legalize this situation. But it was refused, before all, in France which is one of those who want this.

How democratic is the mentioned constitution? Saying pretentious and inflated words about democracy make no sense. If one day this constitution comes in force, it will make EU as "democratic" as USA. Because this constitution was prepared in order to form a European centered new hegemonic force under the leadership of Germany-France binary. This constitution is based on the neoliberal "values". The neoliberal "values" which have been realized by US imperialism for a long time take place in the EU constitution. In this context, the hegemonic force which is aimed to be formed can be at least as democratic as USA, with its mentioned neoliberal "values". We say "at least", because the constitution goes further than the neoliberal "values" of the US imperialism. The constitution is quite open to establish a "democratic" dictatorship. The neoliberal policy which took place in the Maastricht Treaties is constituted in the 3rd Part of the constitution. Majority is not enough to change this but unanimity is required. US imperialism can change its neoliberal "values" in force when it is suitable for its interests. But the constitution puts a neoliberal "straitjacket" on EU. Today the economical, political and social life as a whole is organized according to these "values" in the EU countries. Is it necessary to think about how democratic can EU be with its constitution of neoliberal "values"?

Briefly: The constitution projects an EU without democracy. Its preparers and ideologists are national and EU-wide technocrats, elites. These elements are the masters of the proceeding step by step strategy. First they began with the common market for coal and steel. The conception of Common Market followed this. The establishment of the Common Market or the formation of an internal market of the participating countries made certain rules, laws,

treaties inevitable. Every rule, law or legislation; or more correctly, every treaty had to serve the free circulation of commodities, capital, etc. from the beginning. The Single European Act was signed for this goal in 1987.

In order to utilize maximally the internal market which was formed, monopolies needed a common currency. Maastricht was signed for this goal. But a common currency was not enough. To utilize this common currency Euro maximally, it was necessary for the union to be formed on the base of a legal ultra-structure; a common foreign policy and security policy. This means, they had to think of a common defence, an army had to be formed, and this army had to be strong enough to defend and realize the will of EU outside the borders of EU.

So, a political union was necessary to utilize this economic union, common currency maximally. They reached this goal partially with the Amsterdam Treaty; to be clearer, the way of developing as a political union was opened legally. But later, they remembered that Europe didn't consist of Western Europe only; but this old continent also had a north, south and east! And a treaty was necessary for this. And this was realized: Southern and Eastern Europe were joined to EU with Nice Treaty, according to the interests of German and French capitals. This was not enough, either. They had to take the steps of establishing a Federal European Union state. And the first step of this only could be a constitution which binds the member countries to German and French monopolist capital's interests: These two imperialist countries were aiming to establish a quite centralized Federal European Union state under their control. France and Germany were relatives during the period of tribes also. Maybe for this reason they wanted to establish a new, modern Carolingian Empire! But as it was shown by the referendum results, they failed in their accounts!

At the end of the year 2004 new measures were developed to make the "fortress-

Europe" a reality. They laid the foundation of a common shelter system, of the EU-Border Defence Unite, of closer exchange of information between police forces, intelligence services, in the meeting of the ministers of 25 countries in Brussels. These measures were gathered under the name "Haag Programme".

EU gives the right to "send the illegal immigrant back to their country" to the member countries under the name of "guaranteeing fundamental rights".

"Haag Programme" is valid for all EU countries; and forms the basis of travel and immigration measure in the context of EU.

Every important big political crisis brings out into the open the basic problems and motives which were hidden until that time. The refusal of the EU constitution in France and Netherlands, after that, the budget problem and breaking out of the financial crisis must be taken as the means and, at the same time, the reasons of the breaking out of the present political crisis. When we go through the EU process, we always see many contradictions, discussions, competition. There is a contradiction in EU between the big states and small states. There are countries which refrain from the Germany-France dominance. At the same time there are ones who see this dominance as the motor force of EU. Recently the contradictions between the "old" and "new" Europe came to agenda. What is mentioned here is the opposition of the pro-USA states in EU to the dominance of Germany-France binary. And of course there are contradictions in EU between poor countries and rich countries; between poor regions and rich regions and between the poor and the rich.

EU was able to control and limit its self contradictions and conflicts to some extent by subventions and promotion policies which it had been realizing until now and because of this, there were no serious obstacles against the progress of the integration process, the growth and expansion of EU. But the miserable situation of the world and

EU economies in the last years; the massive opposition developing as a result of the neoliberal attacks; US imperialism which wants to keep its hegemonic position in the world politics and its steps in this direction resulted in national interests being expressed again in a strong, vivid manner in old Europe.

By the exact meaning of the word, the Iraqi War divided EU into two, and left nothing behind from the common external and security policy or concept which they spoke about a lot. So, it became clear that EU had not proceeded even a little as a political integration.

EU was going to enter a new stage of its development with the approval of the constitution: At the end of this process, Europe was going to have realized its integration both economically and politically. This means, somehow, "United States of Europe" was going to be founded.

5

They could hardly make a consensus on the preliminary constitution. EU was going to enter a new stage of its development with the approval of the constitution: At the end of this process, Europe was going to have realized its integration both economically and politically. This means, somehow, "United States of Europe" was going to be founded. But this did not happen. The refusal of the constitution by the people in France and Netherlands, the quarrels of the foremost countries of Europe such as Germany, France and England during the summits following this, resulted in that they had to postpone the realization of the Europe project.

USA orients Great Britain to make EU remain as a union of national states. Great Britain really sabotaged the hegemony

plans of Germany-France binary, yes, destroyed them, with its recent clear oppositions. The prime minister of this country, T. Blair expressed this in his statement to the press with the following words:

"This is important. A Europe with a structure that G. Britain can establish alliances, can feel at home; a Europe without any dominant opinions in it, where there is flexibility and progress."

"No one who considers seriously the agreement can claim that it forms the basis of a federative super state. This is a new Europe and the difference can be felt when gathering around a table with those new states. There is a fight still continuing on the question of how the future Europe would be shaped. There are the ones who want to make taxes harmonious or abolish the right of veto in the policies of foreign affairs and defense. But there came out a new situation: Instead of that, to find a common alliance in order to guaranty that Europe stays as the Europe of national states..."

"The common ally who they found for guaranteeing that Europe remains as the Europe of national states" was nobody else but the support of the US imperialism and the Eastern and Middle European countries which were members of EU as well as of NATO.

And in this manner T. Blair was saying that they (G. Britain and the USA) were dictating the future of Europe. Blair considers that the participation of G. Britain in the formation of EU, in the EU project is an obligation and believes that it can struggle against the German-French dominance in EU, with the US support. This means, he is determined to develop EU as a free trade land which has no contradiction with NATO and USA.

Beyond this, T. Blair has another trump in this struggle: The Prime Minister of Great Britain aims to organize the new members of EU in a pro-American course and to reshape EU with their contributions.

Blair acts through the fact that these new members of EU, the Eastern and Middle

European countries which are also NATO members have the same vision with G. Britain about the future of Europe and they are determined to keep their independence within EU. So that Blair claims that these countries have a "duty" to USA; they are "aware of that it helped them to gain their freedom" and they will continue this friendship or collaboration in EU. Such a claim shows that the British vision of the EU is an organized activity.

It is clear that T. Blair's -the Prime Minister of Great Britain- vision of the EU consists of breaking the influence of Germany-France binary and guaranteeing that USA will remain as a European force and will use EU as a "democratic bridge-head" in its Eurasian geo-policy.

Briefly:

The old Europe, which has been the scene of wars, destructions, uprisings and revolutions, or EU which forms a part of it is experiencing the deepest political crisis ever since the 2nd World War. The refusal of the constitution in the referendums in France (May) and in Netherlands (June); the fiasco of the financial summit of EU which took place again in June; the fact that many EU countries put aside the approval of the constitution meanwhile and this was also accepted in the EU summit; finally the quarrel between the heads of the governments almost "swearing" at each other in the summit, all these were not like the sharp discussions which had happened until that time. The recent duel of accusing each other shows that EU is in a deep political crisis. It is clear that European Union project; the project of transition from economic integration to political integration had faced the obstacle of inter-imperialist contradictions, had reached a dead-end street of competition which was the expression of these contradictions.

The mentioned political crisis has shown that EU does not and cannot easily go beyond being an economic integration.

EU has capitulated to "national" political interests and national egoisms.

Many factors play a role in the breaking out of this political crisis:

1- EU has the financial opportunity to reduce the regional and social inequality between the member countries to some extent. But globalization impedes this. The capital of EU countries cannot afford the expenses for agricultural subventions, regional funds and some other subventions to compete globally with the countries which offer low wages and take low taxes, any more. This also contains the financing of the social systems such as retirement, health etc. For this reason the Prime Minister of G. Britain, T. Blair finds the agricultural subventions foolish. Because 40 per cent from EU's budget is spent on agricultural subventions.

But it is not so easy to abolish these expenses. The social and political structure which has been established in Western European countries after the Second World War and which has been balanced with great attention is destined for destruction, without these expenses. The destruction or the steps which may cause the destruction of these structures will not only cause a national political crisis, but also will bring the national interests of the EU countries face to face and in this manner it will sharpen the rivalry of the countries within EU. The row between Germany-France binary and G. Britain is a clear reflection of this situation. As the last developments within EU has shown, the countries and the governments which always praise a united Europe are not slow to show their real faces when the problem touches the national interests.

2- The pressure of US imperialism which is getting harder everyday is another reason for the political crisis. Since the Iraqi War the US imperialism has been using its influence intensely on EU which does not support its world hegemony, in order to prevent the development of this union as a rival on the international scene. The US imperialism has succeeded in its efforts and it seems to have reached its goal. USA has carried the "old"- "new" Europe to agenda and has towed the members of EU in

Eastern and Middle Europe which are defined as "new" Europe and together with some countries of "old" Europe; it has divided EU into two, on the base of Iraqi War.

The American Minister of Defense, Donald Rumsfeld expressed the split/contradiction between USA and EU; between USA-G. Britain binary and German-France binary, which broke out because of the imperialist war, US plans of war and which became more and more clear since the first Gulf War in 1991 until today. Rumsfeld explained after the question of a journalist: *"When they say Europe, you think of Germany or France. But I do not think so. This is the old Europe. Look at many other countries of Europe. They do not agree with France and Germany in this subject. They support USA."*

USA had never attacked so sharply and clearly these allies and it had never before questioned the union of Europe in the context of EU as something questionable.

The US imperialism was expressing its aim to form an influence area in Europe which would be opposed to Germany and France and under its control.

There were not so many alternatives for the German and French monopolist bourgeoisies: Whether they would submit to the demands of USA and in this manner they would accept that EU would openly change into the protectorate of US imperialism, or, they would behave as "false wrestlers" and they would show that they supposedly stood against USA. The monopolist bourgeoisies of EU; particularly German and French monopolist bourgeoisies could not save themselves from this dilemma.

In the contradiction between USA and EU, G. Britain takes the side of USA. This country has acted and is acting as the partner of US imperialism against Germany-France binary in EU.

And another reason why the Middle and Eastern European countries take the side of USA is that they are not comfortable about German-French dominance and the axis of France-Germany-Russia.

The passing time has neither reduced the importance of nor did away with the mentioned dilemma of EU. On the contrary, it resulted in voices in "old" Europe defending the USA.

The passing of time has shown Germany and France that their present potential is not sufficient at all to compete with US imperialism in Europe or in the international area and that they cannot trust EU as a force. So they had to postpone their intentions to challenge seriously the USA.

Because of the reasons that we have mentioned, a political crisis broke out in France as a result of the refusal of the constitution of EU. The reason for the political crisis that broke out in Germany was also the same

8

3- The social opposition, which has been formed against the imperialist war and neoliberal attacks for the last few years and which has sometimes been expressed by hundreds of thousands and millions, must be taken as one of the most important reasons for the breaking out of the political crisis in EU.

The movement against imperialist globalization on the world scale organized itself in Europe as the European Social Forum and culminated in February 2003 in the demonstrations aiming to stop the imperialist war against Iraq. Millions filled the streets against war, and at the same time, to protest against the neoliberal attacks. In some European countries, the governments tried to utilize the opposition of millions against war for their own interests. The foremost of them are Germany and France who declared that they were against the US aggression against Iraq. In these countries the governments of the monopolist bourgeoisies opposed the war on the basis of the interests of their capital and were able to use

the movement against the war for their benefits. For example when the coalition of the Social Democrats and the Greens won the elections again in Germany in 2002, it played an important role that they had pretended to be between the working class-the labouring masses and the bourgeoisie turned clearer and clearer against war.

But the reason why masses took to the streets in these countries to protest against the war was not that they thought "our governments are against war, so let us take to the streets to protest the war as well". Their motives to stand against war and the governments' motives were basically different: The working class and the labouring masses were protesting the war and militarism which was serving the interests of monopolist capital, while the governments were against the imperialist war with the motive of defending their own interests against USA.

Massive chronic unemployment; realization of the neoliberal policies which have been prepared for the interests of monopolist capital; reduction of the social rights captured in the fields such as retirement, health, education etc; irregularisation of the working life are the main policies of the monopolist bourgeoisie in recent years in Europe. All these caused millions to fill the streets.

This contradiction became the main factor of the reformation of the social and political life in these countries. For this reason the fact that masses were against the neoliberal policies and attacks in France played an important role in the refusal of the constitution: this means, in France, the majority of the voters said "no" to the constitution not only because it was the constitution of the monopolies. There is no doubt that the neoliberal policies, the neoliberal attacks, which found their reflections in the reduction of the democratic, economic and social rights as a whole, play a determining role in the refusal of the constitution.

The results of the referendums were the expressions of the non-confidence in the



governments in these countries. The process of approval of the constitution was frozen in some EU countries in order to prevent the crisis, which broke out in the context of approval of the constitution, to spread to the other countries.

So, the refusal of the EU constitution in this country should not be taken only as a result of wide masses understanding that the constitution was antidemocratic. The same thing is also valid for Netherlands. Also in this country, the neoliberal policies and attacks within the country and within Europe played an important role in the refusal of the constitution. So that in Germany the government had to hold early elections.

Because of the reasons that we have mentioned, a political crisis broke out in France as a result of the refusal of the constitution of EU. The reason for the political crisis that broke out in Germany was also the same.

In France, which has no other way else than realizing the neoliberal policies in order to be sure of itself in the world markets under the conditions of imperialist globalization, French monopolist bourgeoisie are preparing N. Sarkozy, who follows a neoliberal, pro-US political course, as the successor of the president, Jacques Chirac.

In Germany, before the elections, the social democratic wing of the coalition emphasized that they were determined about Agenda 2010 and that it was necessary to carry out the neoliberal policies in a determined way in order to make Germany sure of itself in the world markets.

4- The contradiction between Continental Europe and G. Britain is one of the reasons for the political crisis of EU. Considering these developments in Continental Europe, T. Blair is planning to utilize the political crisis in these countries and generally in Europe, to shape EU and beyond this, entire Europe according to the British model. Anyhow, he has an opportunity, Presidency of the Council of EU. Blair was speaking about "modernizing" Europe in the speech which he made in the European Parliament during his assumption of office. According to Blair, a new social model must be formed -and no doubt, considering the British model- and by the help of this model, *"the competition capacity of EU must be improved"* and EU *"must get rid of some unnecessary legislations, it must decrease bureaucracy, it must support a global Europe, a Europe which is open to the world and which has a competition capacity"*. Continuing, Blair says the main idea: EU must not compete against USA, on the contrary, it must be an *"active actor in foreign policies"* which is a *"good partner"* of USA.

The model suggested by Blair is the model which is in force in G. Britain: The wages are quite low in this country. More than one third of the houses are in the category of those who cannot live on their salary, although they have a job and they work. This means, they are poor. This country is the country with the longest working hours. In this country more than 25 per cent of children exist formally in the category of the poor, which is a high ratio for developed countries. But this country is one of the countries in Europe where business taxes are the lowest and despite this, indirect taxes are the highest.

Blair is not opposed in Continental Europe because of the social model he has suggested. The neoliberal attacks which are on the agenda in Germany and France are being held in order to realise the neoliberalism which Great Britain has been realising since 1980. Continental European countries almost imitate G. Britain in this subject. The

main difference between them is on the foreign policies. Germany and France stand for the development of EU as a political integration and for developing a common foreign policy, in order to be able to compete with USA. Blair stand for the opposite of this: He wants EU to be an "active partner" of USA in foreign policy.

In other words: Blair is preparing the conditions of a discussion on the future of EU. The developments and the attitude of the member countries show that it is the time to give a concrete answer to the question "What kind of a Europe do we want?" We have already mentioned above a few reasons of the present political crisis. Almost each of these reasons is related to the future of EU and for this reason the crisis is caused by the opinions about the future of EU. As a result of this, EU has been divided into two parts on the basis of the opinions about its future:

♦Those who want EU to remain as an economic integration (First of all, Great Britain)

♦Those who want EU to develop as a political union (First of all, Germany-France binary)

The British monopolist capital declares what kind of an EU they want, through the words of Blair: EU must remain as an economic integration, as the partner of the USA. T. Blair has got the direct support of the US imperialism on this subject.

Germany-France binary stands for the development of EU as a political union. German and French monopolist capitals know very well that they fight for world hegemony on their own, that they cannot demand the re-share of the world on their own; and that the political, economic and military potential must be united. Because of all these reasons, they demand that a political union must be realized, because its relevance in the realization of their aspirations is vital.

EU can solve its present financial crisis in the way that it solved its economic and financial crisis before now. But it cannot

solve so easily its political crisis which took place in the context of constitution and which directly make an effect on the future of EU; this crisis is caused by the opinions about the future of EU, the problem "What kind of an EU". There are two ways to solve this crisis:

♦Whether the EU countries can act through the opinion of Great Britain and meanwhile gain the support of USA and in this manner they can decide that EU remains as an economic integration

♦Or they can act through the opinion of Germany-France binary and they take steps to change EU into a political union.

In any case, the development of EU after this crisis will be different from its development until today. Because, as an economic integration, EU has reached the borders of its development. For this reason, EU does not have much possibility to renew itself as an economic integration further. The development from now on means going beyond its present limits. It can only renew itself by taking steps towards achieving political union.

As a conclusion:

The developments in the context of EU show that things are getting serious. It is clear that EU, which was able to solve its problems and expand in the context of the present integration until now, has come to a fork on its road: Whether they will take the steps to achieve the political integration, or EU remains as an economic integration.

Political integration in capitalism means that those who want to integrate inevitably give up their national properties and interests by force and they unite in so-called "common values".

In such unification, "common values" are the values of the strongest.

It is clear that EU has entered a process of facing its own reality.

Is EU a political union or is it possible to establish a "United States of Europe"?

In order to answer this question, it is necessary to establish who and for what is EU.

First of all, EU is the EU of monopolies:

What bourgeoisie understand from freedom is freedom for capital (including the valuable papers). For this reason EU was established to provide the free movement of capital, the monopolies and its growth and expansion means the growth and expansion of the capital, of the monopolies. What we mention here are not the capital and the monopolies which are no longer national but of EU. EU is freedom for capital and the monopolies of the member countries. In this context EU is the EU of capitals and monopolies of the member countries of EU:

According to the data of the year 1999, 68 monopolies which have their centre in EU take place among the 200 biggest monopolies of the world. Including the Swiss monopolies, this number increases to 74. None of them are EU-monopolies; none of them have the identity of being an EU-monopoly. These are national monopolies which have their centres in EU or Switzerland. This is clear: 22 German, 17 French, 10 British, 6 Netherlander, 6 Italian, 3 Spanish, one Luxembourgian and one Swedish monopoly. And this EU is the EU of monopolies. In this context EU is freedom for the national capitals and monopolies on the basis of member countries.

EU means free commodity circulation:

For the realization of free commodity circulation, borders and customs must be abolished. What is mainly mentioned here is the free circulation of monopoly products. For this reason EU is an integration which guarantees the free circulation of monopoly products. Therefore, EU means nothing but the circulation of commodities for the international monopolies; the monopolist capital.

EU means free circulation in services sector: What is mentioned here is the abolition of national borders or national limitations and to provide free bank and insurance activities for the monopolies in this field. For this reason EU is the EU of the monopolist banks; big banks and the insurance firms.

EU is the "free" circulation of citizens:

According to EU, EU citizens can travel without a passport within the EU countries. But when they try to pass the borders for some demonstrations, it is seen that this is not always the case. It is a reality that the freedom of travel is abolished in order to prevent the free movement of demonstrators.

What EU understands from the freedom of travel is the cheap labour force immigration from other countries, which means immigration from the countries where labour is cheap to the countries where the labour force is "expensive". In this context, EU means free circulation of cheap labour force.

In the Communist Manifesto Marx and Engels told: *"By freedom is meant, under the present bourgeois conditions of production, free trade, free selling and buying"*. EU means nothing else but this freedom, for the monopolist capital.

There is no doubt that such an EU cannot be the EU of the workers and the labouring masses. The present EU can only be the EU of the monopolist capital, monopolist bourgeoisie. In this context; it is possible for both classes to establish the "United States of Europe". The discussions on this are not new. But to discuss the subject in the context of "United States of Europe" and to make a correct evaluation, it must not be forgotten that the present EU is yet an economic integration.

Bourgeoisie do not avoid establishing a "United States of Europe" special to them, if it suits their interests. Such as they laid the foundation of today's EU in 1957 with the European Community because they found it suitable for their interests. The history of EU has shown that such an economic integration of this present form can be realized by a gathering of the countries which are interested in this. Such an economic integration has no permanent character. But its members can increase the content of, can extend the life of such integration if they find it suitable for their interests, but it is

impossible for them to develop as a political union; to establish a united state in "peaceful" conditions.

As Lenin has shown in his article, "On the slogan of United States of Europe": "*Of course, temporary agreements are possible between capitalists and between states. In this sense a United States of Europe is possible as an agreement between the European capitalists*".

Lenin explains the reasons of establishing such a state for that time as follows: "... but to what end? Only for the purpose of jointly suppressing socialism in Europe, of jointly protecting colonial booty against Japan and America, who have been badly done out of their share by the present partition of colonies, and the increase of whose might during the last fifty years has been immeasurably more rapid than that of backward and monarchist Europe, now turning senile. Compared with the United States of America, Europe as a whole denotes economic stagnation. On the present economic basis, i.e., under capitalism, a United States of Europe would signify an organisation of reaction to retard America's more rapid development."

Today the reasons of establishing such a state have changed: Germany and France which stand for the development of EU as a political integration does not want this today for the purpose of "jointly suppressing socialism". The objective reasons for such an inclination do not exist at this moment. But they want it because they think that they have been "badly done out of their share by the present partition of colonies", they want it for the purpose of "jointly protecting colonial booty against America"; so they want the development of EU as a political integration to re-share the world with the US imperialism and the other hegemonic forces, to be stronger in competition in order to get the biggest pie in the world markets.

Is such a development possible in peaceful conditions? Can the other members of EU accept the interests of Germany-France

binary and renounce their national identities? More important than that; can Germany and France fuse in a peaceful way, which means, can the German and French leave their identities of being German capital or French capital to represent a certain integrality, can they be the capitals representing a certain will? In any case, it is inevitable to use force for the realization of EU's political union.

Lenin speaks on this issue in his mentioned article:

"A United States of Europe under capitalism is tantamount to an agreement on the partition of colonies. Under capitalism, however, no other basis and no other principle of division are possible except force. (...) Capitalism is private ownership of the means of production, and anarchy in production. To advocate a "just" division of income on such a basis is sheer Proudhonism, stupid philistinism. No division can be effected otherwise than in "proportion to strength", and strength changes with the course of economic development. (...) There is and there can be no other way of testing the real might of a capitalist state than by war. War does not contradict the fundamentals of private property -on the contrary; it is a direct and inevitable outcome of those fundamentals. Under capitalism the smooth economic growth of individual enterprises or individual states is impossible. Under capitalism, there are no other means of restoring the periodically disturbed equilibrium than crises in industry and wars in politics."

EU does not guarantee that the balance of power among its member countries will not change. Neither it has such an objective nor is this possible. Unequal development is essential in capitalist conditions and the inevitable result of this unequal development is that the balance of power between capitalist countries changes continuously. In this context, the present balance of power between the imperialist countries in EU may change tomorrow and there will be no way but force to establish a new balance.

Briefly:

For EU to be a political will, to change into the "United States of Europe", first Germany-France binary must use force against the other members and then they must use force between each other. This is the fact.

Or, as Lenin said: *"from the standpoint of the economic conditions of imperialism - i.e., the export of capital and the division of the world by the "advanced" and "civilised" colonial powers- a United States of Europe, under capitalism, is either impossible or reactionary."*

The fact, objective situation is:

EU is expanding and getting stronger as an economical integration, but the capital remain national within EU.

There has never been even one European monopoly since it was founded. It has a constitution though it has not been accepted by all of its members yet. It has legislations almost in every field. Almost every obstacle in front of the free movement of capital has been thrown out. Internal borders have been abolished. So that, many functions which were under the authority of the national states before are under the authority of Brussels now. But the capitals and the monopolies are still national. The capitals and the monopolies belonging to each country have not left their national identities to fuse as EU-capitals and EU-monopolies. For this reason EU is a union where mother capitals/monopolies remain national, it is an economic integration model.

Due to this characteristic of the EU, its strategists and geo-politicians are face to face with an important question. The question is caused by the relations of base-superior structures; the economic structure and the existence of different political structures-states which correspond to the economic structure. There is a dialectic connection between the base and superior. And according to that: there should be an EU-Capital, EU-economic structure in order to form an EU-superior structure, an EU-state. That is to say; the EU-infra structure, econo-

my must develop an EU-superior structure that corresponds with itself. This is what is missing. In its existing circumstances, there is a merciless competition for the interests of national states in all EU-superior structure, EU institutions. The powerful make others accept them in the competition. Therefore, the EU essentially is in the position of an integration where a tough rivalry is being carried out for the interests of national state, the interests of national capital/monopoly, but continues to exist by maintaining conciliation.

And today EU is seen as a Kautsky-style expectation against the *"aggressive US imperialism"*, the US militarism. But EU does not develop in a Kautsky-style way; in the direction which he had predicted. Competition, unequal development is undermining the present integration

EU is an integration process developing since the European Community was founded as the predecessor of EU. The stage which this development has reached today is its present situation. This situation shows that the foundation of a "United States of Europe" on the basis of capitalist relations can only be possible by using force; by war. No EU country would like to found the "United States of Europe" under the hegemony of France and Germany, becoming French or German.

We should expect France to become German or Germany to become French for EU to change into "United States of Europe" on the basis of France-Germany binary. And this can only be possible by using force which is a direct result of unequal development in capitalism.

All possibilities and the reality of capitalism show that the easiest way for EU to change into "United States of Europe" is war.

The period since its foundation until now shows how exaggerated is the conception that EU is proceeding towards being a political integration.

The expectations which are spread by the reformists and liberals depending on the development of EU until now are also illusions all on their own. It will be useful to clear this point:

Kautsky (Ultra-imperialism): "... Cannot the present imperialist policy be supplanted by a new, ultra-imperialist policy, which will introduce the joint exploitation of the world by internationally united finance capital in place of the mutual rivalries of national finance capitals? Such a new phase of capitalism is at any rate conceivable."



14

Lenin: "...This is because the only conceivable basis under capitalism for the division of spheres of influence, interests, colonies, etc., is a calculation of the strength of those participating, their general economic, financial, military strength, etc. And the strength of these participants in the division does not change to an equal degree, for the even development of different undertakings, trusts, branches of industry, or countries is impossible under capitalism. (...) Therefore, in the realities of the capitalist system, and not in the banal philistine fantasies of English parsons, or of the German "Marxist", Kautsky, "inter-imperialist" or "ultra-imperialist" alliances, no matter what form they may assume, whether of one imperialist coalition against another, or of a

general alliance embracing all the imperialist powers, are inevitably nothing more than a "truce" in periods between wars. Peaceful alliances prepare the ground for wars, and in their turn grow out of wars; the one conditions the other, producing alternating forms of peaceful and non-peaceful struggle on one and the same basis of imperialist connections and relations within world economics and world politics." (Lenin; "Imperialism...", German V. 22, p. 299-301).

According to Kautsky, "such a new phase of capitalism is at any rate conceivable". After this, he was continuing as follows: "Sufficient premises are still lacking to enable us to answer this question."

This did not happen: "Ultra-imperialism" was not able to organize the "joint exploitation of the world" by its "internationally united finance capital". The opposite of this happened as Lenin had predicted; unequal development and competition caused war.

And today EU is seen as a Kautsky-style expectation against the "aggressive US imperialism", the US militarism. But EU does not develop in a Kautsky-style way; in the direction which he had predicted. Competition, unequal development is undermining the present integration.

As a conclusion:

The US imperialism stands on the basis of "national" interests and develops geopolitics for these interests.

Nevertheless, there isn't any EU-imperialism; but there are the imperialist countries of EU; there are the "national" interests competing against each other in the context of EU integration. The difference between them is this one.

The relation between Turkey and EU or, under which conditions can Turkey be a member of EU and under which conditions it cannot?

EU has been divided into two, about Turkey's membership issue: Those who stand for the full membership of Turkey and those who support that it must be a "privileged partner". The main attitude of those

who support its membership is very clearly expressed by the former Foreign Minister of Germany, Fischer:

EU has to reach a certain or indispensable size to be the superpower "responsible" in the world system. Turkey is important in the task of helping EU becoming such a power. The former Foreign Minister of Germany, Fischer is explaining why Turkey must be a member of EU:

"...The unity of Europe has a strategic dimension. Here, a Turkey which is in correspondence with the European standards is as important as the Common Foreign and Security Policy of EU." (J. Fischer, "Berliner Zeitung", February 28, 2004).

Fischer continues as follows: *"We must give shape to globalization politically. It is only possible by acting on the continental scale to control the asymmetric conflicts and to solve them as long as it is possible. Russia, India and of course USA have the necessary size. The problem for us Europeans is: Can we unite until we have a prevailing weight? We must consider the discussions on Turkey in this perspective."*

Fischer, considering the interests of German imperialism, is speaking about the "strategic dimension" which EU should have. He says that EU or Europe should act on a "continental scale" in order to make policy on the world scale. What he says means that it should have the same dimension as USA.

According to the former Foreign Minister of Germany, EU must not be the one which "is subjected to" globalization, but on the contrary, it must be the one which "gives shape" to globalization. In this manner Fischer expresses that the problem which stands before EU is re-sharing the world, capturing the biggest pie in the world markets, competing against the strongest rivals.

According to Fischer, Turkey must help EU to be such a power, to realize its "strategic process". And they do not want that much from Turkey! They only want it to submit its strategic situation to the possible strategic proceedings of EU; those who

want to be "continental-scaled" actors say: Turkey is situated like a bridge between Europe and different "conflict structures"; this means, Turkey is situated on the centre of the triangle consisting of the Balkans, the Middle East and the Caucasus; Turkey is a "bridge" between Europe and the "Islamic world".

EU wants to open out into the Middle East, Caucasus and interiors of Asia through Turkey. It does not want to leave these regions, which are so important that imperialists might fight for them for imperialist plundering and domination, to its rivals such as USA, Russia and China. For this reason it expresses that Turkey is a "model country" for the Middle Eastern countries.

The meaning of these conceptions is: EU wants to interfere in the local, "ethnic problems", "conflict structures" in the mentioned triangle in order to compete against US imperialism for the world hegemony, and just as USA do, it wants to utilize the strategic situation of these regions in the hegemony fight and of course, it wants to control the energy resources in this region. And accepting Turkey as a member, it wants to utilize Turkey which has a certain regional size in order to be able to do all of these.

And about the ones who say that it must only be a "privileged partner". This sector which is mainly represented by the conservative parties also wants the same EU. But these ones emphasize that they must be more careful about giving a role to Turkey in the process of forming such an EU. We can summarize the preoccupations of these elements as follows:

- ♦ It can ruin the limits of the integration capacity of Europe.
- ♦ It is quite big. (Stoiber)
- ♦ It is so arbitrary that it cannot be a tool of the unilateral EU strategies; which means, it may act on its own and cannot be controlled. (Stoiber)
- ♦ It can turn the present balance of forces upside down. (Stoiber)

♦ It is able to impose its own opinions on the European internal and foreign policies. (Stoiber)

♦ It can make alliances with other countries against Germany and France about EU's internal discussions and problems on rivalry.

Both those who want the full membership of Turkey and those who are against speak clearly: Those who want to be effective in the world politics must have geopolitical aspects and must act strategically, and must be able to set the forces which it has towed into action. The meaning of this for EU or Europe is as follows:

EU must be as strong as USA; it must be stronger than all the other states; it must have the power and the capacity to give shape to all the international relations unilaterally.

Today, the world is being re-shared by USA. USA is in a determining position as the hegemonic power. EU's strategists arrive at the following conclusion: We must be at least as strong as USA in order to make it feel our existence and understand that we are a power which must be considered in the re-sharing of the world.

EU approaches the full membership of Turkey on the basis of these opinions. For this reason, according to the German Foreign Minister Fischer, the task of helping EU to have a "*continental dimension in the states system of the 21st century*" which it does not have yet falls upon Turkey. The key role is given to Turkey in the mentioned triangle for EU to realize its interests.

The fear of a Trojan horse:

The fear of France-Germany is concentrated upon whether including Turkey into EU which they have been directing according to their interests will be a danger for them or not; whether Turkey will be a branch of USA in EU or not.

The chief of CSU, Stoiber who is one of the foremost of those who support giving Turkey the status of "privileged partnership" tells that the full membership of Tur-

key will destroy the vision of Europe and in this case Europe will change into a free trade zone which has no political power.

Those who stand for the "privileged partnership" of Turkey (Merkel, Schäuble, Stoiber in Germany and those in Europe who have the same political attitude with this conservative party) are not clear about whether EU will get stronger against USA in the case of Turkey's full membership or not; whether Turkey will play the role of Trojan horse within EU in the name of USA or not; whether USA will try to realize its strategic goals within EU through Turkey or not.

For this reason, those who support "privileged partnership" stand for the strengthened French-German leadership which has influence all over the rest of Europe instead of an EU including Turkey.

Turkish bourgeoisie has been waiting at the door of European Community of that time, then the European Economic Community and now EU, since the first negotiations began in 1963. It was not tired of waiting in the waiting hall for 40 years, and even waiting until Helsinki summit in December 1999 was no problem. Turkish bourgeoisie, who had expressed that they would reconsider the relations if they would not get any result in Helsinki summit, roared and also were put out with them when they met with that waiting tactic again. So EU understood that Turkish bourgeoisie's patience of waiting had come to an end in Helsinki. Being worried about losing Turkey completely, EU overcame this situation by sending its two high-position representative (Solana and Verheugen) to Ankara at midnight. As a result, Helsinki summit opened the way of taking the steps which could give a new quality to EU-Turkey relations. In this manner Turkey's way to enter EU was only opened. Considering the "Progress Report", Turkey was announced as a "democratic" country with some defects. In this manner, a fascist dictatorship was acquitted by "democratic" EU.

The "Progress Report" which is defined as a "recommendation" was approved in the

EU leaders' summit which took place in December 17th, and they gave the date October 3rd, 2005 to Turkey as the date to start negotiations.

It is often declared that full membership of EU for Turkey will not be realized before 2014 even if everything goes alright.

Turkish bourgeoisie carried out all the criterions that EU proposed. In this manner EU declared that Turkey could be its member with its present situation: Thus EU has ignored in one stroke of a pen the torture and massacres in Turkey as state policy despite its emphasis especially on the issue of democratic rights, and closed its eyes to the lynching attempts which recently have increased. According to EU, the dictatorship has removed obstacles against freedom of speech and thinking, and the colonialist fascist dictatorship has taken the necessary steps in settlement of the Kurdish question and, the question only remains for the abolishment of some hitches on implementation. In this manner EU has shown that its attitude to the Kurdish question has no difference from that of the colonialist fascist regime. Such that, following the same way as the banning of the fascist dictatorship, for example Germany has banned the newspaper *Ozgur Politika* which is the voice of the Kurdish patriots and has confiscated all its materials. It is clear that continuity of the colonial status of Kurdistan suits the interests of EU's imperialist countries.

There is nothing that the working class and the labouring masses of our country can expect from EU. The expectations about EU membership that it will bring democracy, that the Kurdish nation will get some national rights can only remain as expectations. If EU were democratic about the rights of the working class and the labouring masses, these rights would not be abolished in the present member countries. If we consider the attacks against the economic and democratic rights of the working class and the labouring masses which they had achieved through struggle; the destruction of the social systems such as retirement

and health: the reactionary, fascistic laws made under the pretext of "terrorism"; the provocation of racism and chauvinism, the reality that they open the way for the fascist parties, as the direct expressions of neoliberal attacks in EU countries, and particularly in the imperialist countries such as Germany, France and England, we can easily understand that believing or supposing that such EU will bring democracy and welfare to Turkey is naked evil or an intent for deception of the working class, the labouring masses and the Kurdish nation in our country.

Our duty is not having such expectations about EU but struggling against it. The ruling classes which find their future in alliance with this or that imperialist power keep on spreading pro-American or pro-European expectations through the mediation of some reformists whom they have used and some so-called writers which they have bought. The struggle against imperialism and its native collaborators must be taken as the struggle against these empty hopes.

In opposition to the expectations which are being spread by the reformists, the government and the capitalist class who stand on the same side about this membership issue, emancipation will not come with EU. Being a EU member will not bring democracy, employment, welfare to Turkey. National and social emancipation in Turkey and Northern Kurdistan can only be achieved through revolution. Therefore, emancipation cannot be achieved through EU but through revolution.

EU membership of Turkey is not related to whether it realizes the Copenhagen political criterions, those political criterions of the EU imperialists or not. This is a deception.

A date (October 3rd, 2005) was given to Turkey for the negotiations for membership but this does not guarantee membership. EU has declared that it can put the negotiations off for any reason. And they are using the refusal of the constitution in some coun-

tries and the Cyprus problem as an excuse for putting the negotiations off. For example, on 11th August 2005 Sabah newspaper writes the following words on this issue:

"Opportunist Chirac

While October the 3rd, the date to start membership negotiation, gets closer, discussions on Turkey have again become an agenda in the European Union (EU). At first, the Prime Minister of France, Dominique de Villepin said 'if Turkey would not recognize one of the EU members then its membership cannot be thought of. Than, in his letter to the Greek leader Papadopuls, the President, Jacques Chirac gave the guaranty 'if Turkey would not recognize the Republic of Cyprus then it will not be able to start to negotiations of full membership'. And, the Prime Minister of Denmark, Anders Fogh defended 'There is a necessity to discuss again Turkey's full membership of EU'.

18

The principal task of the working class within the EU countries is not struggling for "United States of Europe". The working class and the labouring masses are facing the task of struggling against their bourgeoisies.

'They are Using Cyprus'

In the complexity of Turkey's statements, which were made in the last two days, we asked Joost Lagendijk, the Chair of the EU-Turkey Joint Parliamentary Committee. In his interview with Sabah he said "We cannot return from the decision of December 17th" and accused Chirac with opportunism. He said: "When the December 17th decision was taken, all the leaders, whose names are mentioned, were also there, including Chirac. Now he is being opportunistic. This attitude cannot be accepted. Discussion on Turkey is an expected development. Turkey's opponents are putting opportuni-

ties to use. Balkenende, the Prime Minister of Holland, which was the Term-Presidency of EU said the signing of the protocol does not mean recognizing Cyprus. The members of international press have asked this many times. And Balkenende has very clearly and openly repeated that the additional protocol and recognition of Cyprus are two different issues..."

And as a matter of fact, the crisis, which broke out between the EU countries just before the 3rd October on the question of Turkey's membership and the beginning of the negotiations for membership, seems to have been overcome after the Foreign Minister of Austria Ursula Plassnik declared "Our common aim is full membership". She declared this just after EU accepted in the last moment to start the negotiations for full membership with Croatia. They can find another pretext tomorrow. What is important for the foremost imperialist countries of EU, more correctly, for France-Germany binary who direct EU is how mature can Turkey become in being used in EU policies and how independently will it act of the USA.

By such expressions, EU gives the message that they will think about Turkey's membership again, if Turkey takes steps in opposition with EU' interests in regional and world politics and if it insists on taking the side of US imperialism.

The progress of EU-Turkey relations before giving a date for negotiations for membership also shows the dimensions of EU-USA competition on Turkey and the region. EU wants a Turkey which is completely dependent on EU and it will prolong the negotiation process until it makes Turkey completely dependent on EU. And USA will also do its best not to loose such an "ally". US imperialism needs another Trojan horse like England in the EU. It needs this for weakening EU in world politics, for preventing it to have a common foreign policy. For this reason it supports the EU membership of Turkey. EU imperialists also know very well the reason why USA supports the EU membership of Turkey.

Whether Turkey will be a full member of EU or not and the progress of the EU-Turkey relations as a whole depend on the progress of the competition between EU and USA and which side Turkey will take in this process.

The membership adventure of Turkey may last until the rivalry between EU and USA takes its final shape; until a certain situation of alliances, and the dismembering of the strained organizations of alliance such as NATO which was formed in the context of the cold war. It is not difficult to find a reason for prolonging the membership process.

Both USA and EU see that Turkey cannot be excluded in their efforts for influence in the region.

The present relations of EU and USA with Turkey carry the character of being a relation with a power which they cannot exclude, because of their interests. Both centres of imperialist rivalry are trying to gain this power for themselves. The hegemony struggle on Turkey is continuing. But they also know that Turkey is a country with opportunities and dynamics and it is one of the top 20 strong countries of the world in the economic sphere. It is a power with this strength and with military potential; it is a power which has the desire of being imperialist, which takes steps on this direction. Such a power in EU can turn all the balance of forces in EU upside down. As we have mentioned above, this is the cause of the fear of the foremost countries of EU and particularly of Germany.

What is to be done?

In EU countries, the bourgeoisie is attacking the working class and the labouring masses through neoliberal policies which are sometimes realized in different forms but always with the same content; they are reducing the economic and social rights which have been achieved through struggles; they are serving the material wealth of the countries to capital. Such attacks which are on the agenda of almost the entire EU countries make it inevitable

and necessary to organize a common resistance against these attacks. There exist for the working class and the labouring masses in EU the material conditions to organize their national wide struggle in a common manner. Of course what is mentioned here is not a conception of organization and struggle such as European Social Forum. Likewise, we do not support struggling for a "United Socialist States of Europe" as Trotskyites do.

European Social Forum is struggling for reanimating the "state of social welfare" or returning to the period of "state of social welfare", while Trotskyites are aiming to realize their anti-capitalist revolution and to establish a "United Socialist States of Europe" through this social forum or those social movements. But they do not say anything about in what way this revolution can be realized.

The principal task of the working class within the EU countries is not struggling for "United States of Europe". The working class and the labouring masses are facing the task of struggling against their bourgeoisies. The working class, who are nationally politically disorganized, is a captive of defeat before the EU, the Trotskyites promoting the "social state" or "social Europe" and "united states of socialist Europe". The only method of struggle against these counter-revolutionary forces is to organize the working and labouring masses for socialist revolution; and this goes through the organization of the communist forces in each country as a political party. The slogan "the only alternative is socialism" cannot go beyond being an agitation slogan, without the realization of this precondition.

We are face to face with a heartrending situation in the EU countries about the question of the organization of the communists, about communist party question. This must be considered as how to act. But this must not be presented like "what can we do, there is no such party, so we have nothing to do". This would be another type of surrendering. Communist forces must be within the social movements, they must try to

direct the social opposition and to make it revolutionary, wherever they exist. They must try to act together with the progressive, revolutionary sectors, and to influence them for socialist revolution. They can develop relations with the working class and the labouring masses and have a word to say in social opposition only if they act in this way.

The absolute task of the communists in each country is to unite politically and to organize the working class forces. Only after fulfilling this task, there can exist the material conditions of organizing and carrying out the struggle with a socialist perspective on an EU wide scale. ✂

THE ILLUSIONS IN ANTI-IMPERIALIST STRUGGLE, THE MIDDLE EAST AND THE RESISTANCE IN IRAQ

The imperialist aggression and occupation in the Middle East and in Iraq cannot be dealt separate from the USA's and other international monopolies, oil and arm monopolies interests and from the USA's aim to establish the world hegemony through the hegemony on the oil reserves and supply routes.

Imperialism is the primary source of reaction

The rivalry and hegemony war between the imperialist monopolies and forces in the world do not only occur on the basis of economy and politics. It may evolve in military forms according to the strategic targets and the level of dealings. Generally, the attacks, threats, occupations and wars against the new colonies, underdeveloped and dependant countries are reflected as the deployment of democracy and the rescue of the peoples from dictators by the imperialist and liberal ideologists. In the conditions of the imperialist threat, occupation and war, the reformists, revisionists and the leftist forces, which reject the revolutionary path, repeat these slogans as "the collapse of the status quo". Furthermore, there appear to be someone who theorises that the characteristics of imperialism have changed, the centre of reaction is the reminders from the medieval time and religious ideology.

In the Balkans, despite the presence of Serb cruelty and massacres, KLA (Kosovo Liberation Army), the armed forces of the Albanians in Kosovo, has dumped its arms because of the impositions from US and the other imperialists. And thereafter, they stepped back from their position of independence and anti-imperialism. Its collaborationist status, today, can be described as "gradual restoration" or "acquiring some rights towards the presence of a state" under the shadow of the USA. What is more

interesting here is that, the Albanian communists and PLA (Party of Labor of Albania), which pursued a fundamental and honoured ideological and political struggle against the modern revisionist CPSU and CPC (and therefore stood against its economical, political and military consequences), had acknowledged the KLA's collaboration with US for so-called interests of Albanians of Kosovo. However, it is well known to the communists of the world that today's severe conditions, catastrophe and devastation of the country are the consequences of opening the doors of socialist Albania to the foreign capital under the political, economical and military siege.

The "leftists" of Bosnia-Herzegovina defend and legitimate the presence of imperialist occupants in their country. They state that there would not be a need for occupants only if the ethnic and national conflicts end. Thus, the characteristics of imperialism, which is generating source of fascism and racism, and the tie between the regional reactionary forces and the ethnic conflicts, are not wanted to be seen. These class collaboration theories, first of all, show the historical and actual nationalist and chauvinist influence on the revolutionary and progressive parties. There are dramatic examples of these deviations in the Balkans. Secondly, it leads to illusions of seeing the foreign patronage and interference as the solution to national and ethnic conflicts and hatred rather than believing in the peoples' self-potency, activity and struggle.

Of course, here we should persistently point at the resistance in Iraq, which continues with a great will power and heroism despite the unequal army forces and imperialist gangsters' siege, and its regional and international consequences and motivational influence on peoples. In fact, lessons should be taken accordingly when thinking about the post 1956 revisionist "peace theories" grounded on exaggerated "war danger" analysis that prevented communist parties from revolutionary requests.

Some of the European revolutionary and progressive parties are, yet, confining themselves to the generalisations of "developing the class struggle in the country" instead of carrying out their actual political tasks on concrete politics and activities against the imperialist aggression and occupation in Iraq, and therefore, experiencing political spontaneity in a vulgar and conspicuous form.

It is commented that US and British imperialists' occupation of Iraq, the threats against Iran and Syria, and the aggression of GME (the Greater Middle East Project) is an intervention to the reactionary Arab regimes and the status quo of the region. The flagships of this idea are the reformist and liberal parties, NGOs, bourgeois and petit-bourgeois ideologists of the imperialist countries, and the so-called leftist parties and intellectuals of occupied and threatened countries. It was so shameful to see that ICP (Iraqi Communist Party), carrying red flags in the streets, celebrated the occupation, as a result of which Saddam dictatorship was defeated, and took part in the council which was formed by US as the representative of the Shiites. Undoubtedly, instead of fighting against the occupants and calling for resistance, the so-called "leaders of proletariat" will pay the price throughout the history for their action of supporting the occupation.

From the beginning, the traditional Kurdish organisations, KDP (Kurdistan Democratic Party) and PUK (Patriotic Union of Kurdistan), have been the main political and social supporters of the occupation. As the strategic and tactical military

and US political forces they have "successfully" fulfilled their duty diplomatically and regionally. The USA has now been building a major military base in Southern Kurdistan (Iraqi Kurdistan), because they see Southern Kurdistan as their main and most trustworthy ally in the region. The developments indicate an ethnic conflict and hatred between the Kurdish population and Arabs who resist the occupation.

The PKK, which, for long time, opposed the concept of New World Order, has interpreted the US intervention as "the collapse of status quo" and "democratic colonialism". And their attitude to the war was "neutral" which led them not to participate in any anti-war demonstration and struggle. Moreover, some of the columnists who write to the patriotic press deemed a progressive role to imperialist denying the reactionary characteristic of imperialism.

The new petit-bourgeoisie theorists had said that: *"The progressive and revolutionary role of capitalism against feudalism had interrupted by the October revolution and the presence of socialist block. Capitalist imperialism had begun to play again this historical role since the cold war ended."* Saying so, they have declared the religion, which corresponds to social reaction, and feudal reaction, who also co-operates with imperialism, as the main source of the world reaction. And blatantly, they advocate the "progressiveness" of imperialist globalisation, which is the prime source of imperialist war and colonialism, capitalist barbarism and atrocity, and the demolition of productive forces.

However, Lenin, hundred years ago, clearly manifested the corrosion and political reaction of imperialist capitalism, the economical and political roots of imperialist war, colonialism and occupations: *"From the liberator of nations that capitalism was in the struggle against feudalism, imperialist capitalism has become the greatest oppressor of nations. Formerly progressive, capitalism has become reactionary; it has developed the forces of production to such a degree that mankind is faced with the alter-*

native of going over to Socialism or of suffering years and even decades of armed struggle between the "great powers for the artificial preservation of capitalism by means of colonies, monopolies, privileges and national oppression of every kind." (Lenin, C. W., V. 21, Socialism and War). Lenin's theoretical prudence had been proved several times during the imperialist world wars, imperialist hegemony and competitive dogfights. Some of the countries headed for socialism, after national liberation struggles, for a period of time, they had become independent countries. But, after the defeat of socialism, some of the independent countries had developed relationships with imperialism which led to some sufferings. And today, imperialist capital, with imperialist globalisation attacks, wants to wipe out all economical, political and military obstacles in order to control the sources of the world and maximise its profit.

The imperialist aggression and occupation is a result of the economic laws of capitalism

The imperialist aggression, occupation and war in the Middle East is a necessity of implementing the political and military policies desired by the imperialist capitalism's economic laws and the movements of capital rather than the special policy, desire and tendencies of Bush and Blair bandits.

Capitalism's law of maximum profit, in combination with the conditions of structural crisis of capitalist imperialism in the last quarter of the century, has made inevitable the international organisation of production and the capital for multinational monopolies. Thus the imperialist states, besides protecting their monopolist interests, have started re-designing their own imperialist policies and military strategies in order to gain new spheres of domination.

As comrade Stalin pointed out:

"It is precisely the necessity of securing the maximum profits that drives monopoly capitalism to such risky undertakings as the enslavement and systematic plunder of colonies and other backward countries, the

conversion of a number of independent countries into dependent countries, the organization of new wars - which to the magnates of modern capitalism is the "business" best adapted to the extraction of the maximum profit - and, lastly, attempts to win world economic supremacy." (Joseph Stalin: Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR, The Basic Economic Laws of Modern Capitalism and of Socialism)

This is exactly what is happening today in the Middle East, Afghanistan, Caspian Basin and the Balkans. As Marx said, there is no crime that capitalism will not commit for the maximisation of profit.

The imperialism will use political and military hegemony as a suitable tool and make them inevitable for economic supremacy. In today's conditions where the organisation of the capital and production is internationalised, the imperialist states, imperialist army and navy would not only stay as the repression and governing tools of the financial oligarchy's domination upon the working class and toiling masses of their country. But, at the same time, they will play the role of tool of rivalry for increasing the political yoke on the world's toiling people, safeguarding the supremacy of the multinational monopolist groups on the world capitalist economy and the new spheres of domination.

Due to international organisation of capital and production, today's form of protecting and functionalising the financial-economic supremacy is the development of tighter and stronger political and military hegemony. Contrary to all liberal balloons of lies, in order to implement the monopolist-capitalist economic policies the imperialist states are developing strategies and organisations for the needs of effective supremacy and aggression throughout the world.

Here where it comes the effective role played by the imperialist states for the internationally organised capital to transfer the profit, to freely move in the financial network, to abolish the obstacles preventing

the payment of debts and to realise "structural harmonization".

Of course, the imperialist bandits would try to ensure political and social support through various pretexts and ideological motives, from their own people in the first place and in the world. Intervention in the civil war, implementing peace, economical catastrophe and likewise 'ingenuous' pretexts are some of the motives expressed by US in the concept of militarist aggression and war planned as the role of the NATO in the last ten years for the implementation of the New World Order, which is the meaning of their strategy of world hegemony in the name of imperialists. The whole world witnessed that US and other imperialists based their reasons for war and military occupation on these "white lies" in this period.

24

Consideration of the resistance with Islamic motives outside the anti-imperialist struggle is the first one of the political and ideological illusions occurring on the subject of the anti-imperialist struggle in the world.

Under the conditions of temporary setback of the world revolution, although the intensity of imperialist attacks is a cyclical factor, in essence, the new colonialism has not only intensified during the imperialist globalisation, it is also a reality that the ascending methods of classical colonialism are put in circuit based on economical emancipation. It is an expression of the greater military presence of US and expansion that its military investment and bases have covered a majority of the world's countries in this period. After the completion of the EU's political and military unity a parallel development will be reflected within the military investment and hegemony of the French or German imperialism.

This development is also relied on the monopolistic possession of nuclear and con-

ventional weapons technology which leads to widening gap between the military powers in the imperialist world. Today, the petty-imperialist and new-colonial countries are forced to take shelter in different imperialist centres and provide them military bases behaving differently from what they did in the following years of the second imperialist war, during which time they were taking shelter in the NATO, US war mechanism. The countries of the world are being turned into the military bases of the hegemonic imperialist powers. Undoubtedly, this show of strength is not the arbitrary and individual policies of the imperialist politicians, but it is a reflection of imperialist monopolist groups' financial and economic slavery forcefully carried out against the peoples, and the escalation of militarism for dominating the world.

In the regional imperialist blocks, a slavery political yoke is created on the basis of integration of the new colonial imperialist financial oligarchy (USA-Mexico relations). The EU is the most advanced example of this. If the EU ensures its political unity overcoming the disputes between governments -which is the aim- and realises the obligation for all governments to comply with its constitution, the French and German bourgeoisies will, in reality, be the dominating imperialist states in the union. Thus, the most developed statues of slavery in terms of the politics based on the relations of economic power will eventuate in the EU and that will be an example of new type colonialism. This has been proven sufficiently by the USA's spread of its military basis around the world and its development of the "pre-emptive war" doctrine; the French-German imperialists' urge to develop EU in the form of economic integration as well as in the dimensions of politic and diplomatic integration, and -as a result of this- their initiative to create an EU army.

An example of developing the function of the united imperialist war is the doctrine that gave the NATO the duty of military attacks in every part of the world with any pretext such as uprisings, deployment of

peace, economic crisis and natural disasters. And this doctrine is based on the economic reason mentioned above. This situation has foundations beyond the cyclical reasons such as the collapse of the Soviet Union. This is sufficiently explained in the competition for the world hegemony. US is expanding its military bases worldwide and developing the doctrine of "pre-emptive war", the French-German imperialists are urging to further develop EU through political and diplomatic integration besides the economic integration, and as an inevitable result of that they have attempted to create the EU army.

This international political organisation, which develops in the period of imperialist globalisation based on the economical-financial grounds, appears in the organisation of imperialist states, in the relations of nation states within their hierarchy of political leadership from top down, in the formation of regional imperialist economic unions as one of the main tasks, which will obligatory lead to the formation of imperialist regional political unions, in the display of military bases, in the development of theories about war attacks, new discussions about protectorate colonies, in the occupation of regions which are strategically and economically important and the demonstration of its worldwide strength.

This means that the character of finance capital, together with its nature to realize capitalist exploitation without colonialism in order to defend the maximum surplus and to overtrump their rivals, makes colonialism inevitable. Nowadays this has developed further under international circumstances of capital and production.

Under terms of imperialist globalisation, the contradictions between imperialist bourgeoisie and the neo-colonial peoples became stronger, too. Surplus transfer which is realised in various ways such as the exploitation of cheap labour, the increase of foreign debts, providing the fields of profitable investments for the monopoly capital through privatisations, the continual increase of price differentia-

tion during exchange of commodities, the transformation of socially useful works into commodity, the transfer of surplus through the network of finance capital, etc lead to social misery and destructions in these countries and to the economic slavery of the peoples. On this basis, political and military dependency reach the dimensions of slavery. The protectorate colonialism which was brought forward once again by US and EU imperialists, and the military occupations must be added as well. This covers either strategically important regions with important resources such as oil (Iraq), or countries which are geo-strategically important for the political leadership (Afghanistan) and regions which have not yet been occupied by any hegemonic power (Bosnia and Kosovo), or without any particular reason, the countries that stand in the background or the countries in which the hegemony should be ensured under the pretext of internal conflicts (Haiti and Ivory Coast). It can also take the form of wars on the countries which are out of its political hegemony, as it can be seen in the aggression plans of US, the world imperialist system's dominant power, on North Korea and Cuba.

The imperialist aggression and occupation in the Middle East and in Iraq cannot be dealt separate from the US and other international monopolies, oil and arm monopolies interests and from the USA's aim to establish the world hegemony through the hegemony on the oil reserves and supply routes.

The essence of the imperialist economy is based on the "absolute power" of the trusts, monopolies, unions and giant banks, "the closure of raw material resources", the expulsion of possible rivals, the bloody accumulation, concentration and centralisation of capital. The superstructure of this monopoly capitalism corresponds with political reaction. R. Hilferding said that "*the financial capital will not fight for freedom but for hegemony*". Objective economic laws of imperialist capitalism inevitably leads to militarism, armament, reaction, protectorate colonialism, occupation and

wars. Imperialism will seek for the destruction of political independence, because under conditions of colonialism and dependency "*political annexation will simplify and cheapen economic annexation*". In general imperialism is the denial of democracy. Such that after September 11, it started to come clear after the occupation of the Middle East and Iraq with all of its falseness and hypocrisy without even feeling a need for formalities of bourgeois democracy.

New legal and institutional structures were created in form of organising inner reaction in order to invalidate and weaken the anger and actions of the working class and the labouring masses against the implementation of neo-liberal policies in the imperialist countries. Migrants were considered as the cause of unemployment, economic crisis, criminal incidents, cultural conflicts and even pollution. New reactionary fascist laws were introduced against migrants as well as for the "fight against global terrorism". Local and international organisations were created.

26

We can see what kind of democracy and peace the imperialist powers will bring to the countries they are occupying, when they even do not feel the need for the formality of bourgeois democracy at home. The implementation of a formal bourgeois democracy can only be possible together with social rights and some economical crumbs to the lower classes and stratum. It is very clear that neo-liberal attacks in recent years with the seizure of social and economical rights have led to great social destruction, unemployment and poverty.

Violation of human rights by the imperialist world, at first by US imperialism, put humanity into shaming with pictures that cannot be covered up. The whole world has seen and condemned the pictures of torture in Guantánamo and Abu-Ghraib and the torture scenes during the training of German soldiers on the methods of torture. US has repeatedly proven that it doesn't comply with all international organisations, agreements and treaties.

Imperialism and the world reaction are in a total assault through "anti-terror laws" against the working class and labouring masses in the world, their economical and political organisations, actions and struggles. They are questing to give legalisation and legitimisation to these assaults.

Anti-imperialist resistance front with Islamic motives in Iraq

Consideration of the resistance with Islamic motives outside the anti-imperialist struggle is the first one of the political and ideological illusions occurring on the subject of the anti-imperialist struggle in the world. Identifying the peoples' resistance with the actions of some of the radical Islamic organisations on the civilian targets which caused reactions, avoiding from targeting NATO in the fight against the imperialist war, evading the support and solidarity with the Iraqi people with general, theoretical definitions such as "*developing the struggle in one's country*" are some important examples of blurriness of the consciousness and deviation of action.

A line of an effective and deterrent anti-imperialist struggle makes inevitable the political and ideological struggle against these understandings. And doubtlessly, the success of that, at first, passes from organising the political solidarity and practice.

The struggle, the resistance of the people of Iraq against US-British occupants is aiming to protect their own country, history, culture and oil resources against the aggressors. This is a national uprising, an honourable and just struggle. The forces, who resist as a national-front against the provocations of national and ethnic conflicts by imperialists, have avoided especially from civil wars despite numerous provocations and dirty methods (such as the provocative actions of British soldiers in plain cloths). Not only in the national level, but also in the world, the resistance has prevented imperialist and strategic projects and policies of US, broke its will, and become a source of great moral and confidence for the peoples of the entire world. Therefore, it is a legitimate, progressive and just war.

The resistance in Iraq is not only anti-occupant or anti-USA, but it is, at the same time, anti-imperialist. Because; the imperialist aggression, militarism, barbarity and colonialism today have been concretized or materialised on US. The USA aggression, at first, is in Iraq for the interests of the international oil and weapon monopolies carrying the US mark and, on this meaning, it is "national", but it is also in the Middle East and Iraq for the needs of the imperialist globalisation and the movement of capital and, on this meaning, it is "international". Taking out US from Iraq and its non-debatable defeat is going to be, very clearly, a heavy defeat of the entire imperialist system in the face of the peoples struggle. The covered and indirect support of the imperialist countries, international and regional imperialist organisations can only be explained with this.

Not considering the resistance as anti-imperialist, at the same time, would mean the narrowing of the peoples' anti-imperialist struggling front, not seeing the forms that it could take in connection with the political conditions and the relations of power, and the weaknesses that tend to the conciliation and collaboration. Presence of the forces that are inconsistent, uncertain and tend to conciliate within the Iraqi resistance front would not lower down the historical meaning and importance of the resistance.

Therefore, the resistance in Iraq becomes, not only of every socialist, but also of every democrat's *"welcoming with love the victory which would be gained by the oppressed, dependant, unequal state against the oppressor, slavery, plunderer big 'state'"*, historical and political responsibility; a condition for freedom.

Since the Iraq and Palestine resistance show that US is not the only, absolute and invincible power and will in the world; the USA's imperialist war will gradually went into non-solution and process of defeat in the face of invincible will, growing strength and sanctioning action of the peoples of the Middle East. It has started to suffer from

new Vietnam syndromes. Therefore, besides the new imperialist moves, it continues to apply intense ideological and political distortions, imperialist hypocrisy and demagogies in order to disgrace the anti-occupation resistance in the eyes of the peoples of the world.

Questions have increased

The entire world's questions over the imperialist war are gradually increasing: Why US is plundering the oil, history and culture of the Iraqis? Why it is still in Iraq as their pretexts for going war and occupation are come out to be irrelevant?

In today's historical and political conditions, conducting a struggle in a consistent anti-imperialist line passes from taking clear and unhesitant stand against the imperialist occupation and aggression

In the world, 500 billion of 1 trillion dollars of annual investment on military and armament belongs to the USA. What for is this extraordinary armament? Why there are US troops or military bases in 135 countries?

How the killing of thousands of children in Iraq with marble bombs, the destruction of hospitals, the incidents of torture and rape in Abu-Ghraib and Guantánamo could go along with humanity and human rights?

Why US do not comply with the international treaties, laws and agreements that it has also signed?

While unresolved questions get increase, the front of opposition, reaction and struggle against US and its collaborators also gets grow.

In the face of such circumstances, US imperialists tried but did not succeed to involve in the occupation of Iraq the collaborator states of the region and the imperialist organisations such as the UN, NATO, EU and G-8. It could not establish power and

authority to dominate Iraq through protectorate government that it has formed. It could not prove the presence of chemical weapons and the connection with Al-Qaeda that it has made as the pretext of waging war. The false elections that it led to be organised failed. The reaction against the occupation of Iraq and the war has increased all over the world, at first among the people of US. The American "empire", which could not overcome these quagmire and elements of crisis, is today also failing to stop concentration of crisis by gaining new forms. The crisis over constitution is the new one of these.



28

On the contrary of these developments, the occupant forces are provoking the reaction and conflict against the Muslim peoples by making as pretext the bombing actions in Istanbul, Madrid and recently in London where civilian people have lost their lives. They are trying to disgrace and make ineffective the anti-occupation resistance, and weaken its international support.

It has been brought to clear by hundreds of incidents that imperialist centres of production of creating political, ideological and psychological propaganda and illusion want to lower down the influence and legitimacy of the just resistance by characterising every action and resistance in Iraq with Al-Qaeda, kidnappings for ransom or beheadings and executions whose perpetrators are unknown. Thus they went for other demagogies when their influence of propaganda at the first months of the occupation is reduced.

Madrid and London bombings

The Madrid and London bombings caused the death of innocent civilians. There is no doubt that the selection of buses, trains and undergrounds do not agree with the rules, logics and methods of the just wars, it will also shadow the rightness of oppressed and limit their indirect forces of support. It will provide an instrument of demagoguery to the occupants. Such actions are contrary to the revolutionary values and the understanding of action, and therefore they cannot be accepted.

Here, it is also necessary to point out the differences between the bombing actions that carried out by radical Islamic organisations. While the attacks on the Twin Towers and Pentagon on 11 September aimed at the monopolies, the actions in Istanbul targeted the British capital and embassy. Doubtlessly, the death of civilians and innocent people in those places are very sad. But, at the same time, this situation can be evaluated as a result of the laws and rules of the war. But the bombings in Madrid and London are mainly different; the actions have targeted civilian areas and caused their death. Therefore, it cannot be agreed with, not only the revolutionaries, but also the understanding, values and methods of violence of peoples and oppressed. It, at the same time, will put in hesitancy and distance the indirect substitute forces of support.

At the same period, what is more interesting is that there were no noteworthy agenda or reaction putted in practice in the same imperialist centres for Iraq where dozens of children, women and elderly people are everyday being killed. Yet, everyone who thinks with little bit of humanitarian view would know that the life of a Londoner, an American, a French is not worthier than a life of a Baghdadi, a Palestinian, a Kurd or an Arab. The ones, who narrow, make unbearable the world to the oppressed and exploited millions; causing the destruction and devastation of nature and productive forces, very clearly, themselves will not also be in comfort and easiness. The imperialist capitalism will feel

the fear and anger of the slavery that it produces, the suburbs, immigrants' ghettos, cursed and the vagabonds. There is a famous saying of the Anatolian peoples: "If one will eat and the other one will look, than there will be a doomsday."

Under the conditions of relations of unequal forces and occupation in the Middle East, Palestine and Iraq, the violence against the imperialist aggression and war is legitimate, just and inevitable. This violence of the oppressed is very limited comparing with the war machine and militarism of the occupants, and becomes a tool of legitimate defence in the hands of the ones who suffer from aggression and rape, an inevitable right because of not having any other way then the violence. The ones, who cause this violence, want to keep the destruction, devastation and pains of the war outside their countries, are the occupant and colonial forces. So, naturally, they will be the target of the violence of the oppressed; will live the consequences of the war in their countries.

The killing of more than 100 thousand Iraqis in the Iraq war, the torture and imprisonment of hundred-thousands of Iraqis, the incidents of rape, bombing of hospitals, plundering of museums, having not making the case of investigation the USA's war crimes, genocide repression and brutality, the humiliation of Iraqis, all these very naturally have carried the violence of oppressed, which even involved unlawful and wrong targeted actions, to the centres of imperialist cities.

If imperialist bandits' aggression and occupation would be considered as legitimate; their use of chemical weapons, marble bombs, and bullets with enriched uranium, all which are banned by the international agreements, than the oppressed nation and peoples' defence of their countries, resistance against the occupation is an honourable, just and inevitable struggle. By moving from the unlawful and worn actions of some radical Islamic organisations, the announcement of the Middle Eastern peoples a criminal can never darken the reality.

Unfortunately, the imperialist centres of propaganda continue to create a great illusion by showing the resistance against the occupation as "global terrorism"; the militarist deployment and aggression on the basis of economic and politic interests of monopolies as the "clash of civilisations"; the plunder and brutality as "democracy".

P. Huntington, imperialist ideologist, has divided the world after the "cold war" into civilisations such as the West, India, China, Islam, Slav and etc. And he added that each civilisation has got to learn about living together with others; on the other hand, it would be understandable for the most "civilised west" to carry out violence against the ones who would not agree with this.

By saying "ideology of evil" during the London bombings, T. Blair announced that the cause of violence, in essence, is the "Jihad". However, both the historical facts and the Iraq reality show that the cause is the real problems produced by the imperialist capitalist world.

The imperialist bandits have realized the past wars and occupations of colonization also under the name of "bringing civilisation" to the backward societies. And people have many times experienced that this civilisation means imperialist barbarity, brutality and colonization attack. Also today, despite the striking propagandas of imperialist capital and media, the anti-war attitude in America reaches to 60%, 85% of the people in Britain believe there is a link between the blasts and the occupation of Iraq, and 80% of the people in Turkey stand against the occupation.

So what is happening in Iraq?

It was the old Iraq under the administration of Saddam dictatorship that stood against US and was under sanction between 1991 and 2003. But it was the new Iraq that resisted after the overthrow of Saddam regime and the collapse of the system constructed by him as a result of imperialist occupation. Therefore, various groups and elements of the BAATH regime -who participate in the resistance-, are no more exten-

sions and elements of the constructed ruling regime, but are the forces resisting within the national resistance front for the birth of a new Iraq. The occupant forces are also naming the components of the resistance front as the militants of BAATH party, Islamic insurgents, foreign combatants and socialists. Except a handful of collaborating minority, traditionally collaborator Kurdish organisations, every Iraqi from different ideology, religion and religious sects did take their place in this honourable and legitimate fight. According to the datum of the occupant forces, 24 thousand resisters have lost their life. If we think that the Iraqi resistance continues by growing in spite of these losses, than it would be understood how low the numbers are given about the resisting forces.

Despite that, the numbers given about Iraq provides us some information in terms of the scale and components of the resistance. In the CIA's analyses, it is said that there is a nucleus involving approximately 20 thousand people, there they organise actions and the resistance; and the number of soldiers in the resistance goes from 200 to 250 thousand. Again the Pentagon sources point out that there are 60 daily attacks against the occupiers. And in the records of a research group in USA, Institution of International Politics, they give the monthly average numbers of deaths and wounded during the war: Between March 20th 2003-May 1st 2003 482 people, between May 1st 2003-June 28th 2004 415 people, and from June 28th 2004 to up to now 747 people. According to the official figures, USA has lost 2000 soldiers in the war that was announced as over in May 2003 by Bush, and the number of the wounded is about 15 thousand. These military losses cannot be belittled, because all these are exceedingly shown by the USA's search for 15 thousand soldiers in order to replace with the dead or wounded soldiers and its difficulty to find them, and by the increase of desertions, suicides, drug use and psychological traumas due to immorality among the USA troops in Iraq and Afghanistan.

The Middle Eastern and Iraqi peoples' resistance breaks strategic policies and plans of US, weakens the imperialism and drag them into quagmire. This anti-imperialist struggle and the resistance against the occupation are not being disappeared through the imperialist bourgeoisie's influence and direction of propaganda. Their propagandas are not able to hide the naked realities.

In today's historical and political conditions, conducting a struggle in a consistent anti-imperialist line passes from taking clear and unhesitant stand against the imperialist occupation and aggression. And putting in practice this political task would, at the same time, mean each political currency to grow and develop the class struggle in their countries.

Development of Islamic Movement

Looking into the history of the Islamic movement, it would be seen that it, in some periods, preceded limited and deficient anti-imperialist position.

It can be said that the Islamic movement, in essence, goes along with substitution, collaboration and conciliation with the western imperialists. The progressive roles of the Islamic movement have always been limited in the national movements against the imperialist colonisation and dependency. And the numbers of these Islamic movements in deficient anti-imperialist position are also very limited.

In the beginning of 20th Century, we come across with progressive national movements with Islamic motives such as the Afghan emirates who struggled with Islamic ideology against the British occupation and Seyh Said, a Kurdish leader, who rose up against the Turkish state. However, in the same historical period, many of the Islamic currencies, in time, become the collaborators of imperialism through conciliation tendency, like Serekat Islam in Indonesia. This organisation, which was anti-colonial together with communists in the beginning of 20th Century, become the criminal partner of attacks and massacres

against communists and the people under the conditions of the fascist regime of Suharto.

In the era of imperialism and proletarian revolutions, the traditional Islamic institutions and political movements went along with imperialism in collaborator and conciliatory line.

The USA who had seized control of the imperialist world after imperialist World War II, which was a war for the re-sharing of the world, founded and developed Islamic organisations and movements with their strategy of the "green line" during the time of the Cold War which US lead against the danger of communism, the socialist countries and people. They used these forces against the bourgeois-democratic Sukarno-government, the communists in Indonesia and for the downfall of Z. Ali Bhutto through a military fascistic coup in Pakistan. And the Britains have often misused the Islamic movements in India.

During the time of the "Green Line" US, the Saudi-Arabian American oil monopolies and the imperialist intelligence agencies who founded and fostered the development of the Islamic movements in the Arabic countries, in the Muslim countries belonging to the SU, in Turkey, Afghanistan, Pakistan and South Asia. The Islamic organisations struggled actively and together with the fascist Turkish regime against the revolutionary forces at the same time when a strong anti-imperialist wave against US and their 6th armada came up in the 1960s in Turkey. The Islamic movements became the key source of ideological reactionary in fascist military coups and the social basis of the political leadership. Later, they continued to fight against the revolutionary movement together with Turkish nationalism and based on their fascist character.

The fascist and USA-orientated shah regime was brought down by a rebellion under the political and ideological leadership of the Islamic movement and the Islamic Republic of Iran was founded. Iran became the financial, political and ideologi-

cal centre of an international Islamic movement in the Middle East and around the Islamic world.

After its first year, the Islamic Republic of Iran started a total physical destruction war against the progressive and revolutionary forces. Today there is still a reactionary dictatorship who has declared war against the revolutionary movement and the Kurdish national movement by its counterrevolutionary practices and its policies.

In the last quarter of the 20th century the National Liberation Front Mora in the Philippines and the People's Fighter in Iran followed the anti-imperialist line. Nowadays, the Palestinian organisations Hamas and Islamic Jihad, who show a deep trend towards reconciliation, and the Hezbollah in Lebanon, are ideologically seen reactionary, but politically seen anti-imperialist, even if deficient. Although they are ideologically seen to be anti-communist and have actually religious roots, they do not tend to attack revolutionary forces under the prevailing circumstances.

After 1998 Al-Qaeda started to lead some of the pan-Islamist organisations who were fighting for the withdrawal of the American soldiers from the Muslim countries and US from the Holy Land. These organisations organized armed attacks on US forces; mainly, CIA forces, military objections in Saudi-Arabia, Sudan, Yemen and Egypt. Although the politic pan-Islamist Islamic organisations have a pan-Islamic reac-



tionary attitude against the US aggression and the occupation, are they politically to be identified as enemies of the USA.

The worldwide decrease of the revolutionary wave, the weakening of the revolutionary and communist movements in the Muslim countries, the ongoing occupation of Palestine and the Islamic-ideological influence of the Islamic Republic of Iran in the region lead to an accumulation of anger against the imperialist aggression and the occupation and made them join the ranks of these Islamic currencies that filled the political and ideological gap which occurred.

A united anti-imperialist intervention and struggle on a regional level will also advance the anti-imperialist struggle both in each different country and on the international arena.

32

Nowadays there is no other alternative in Iraq expect the armed struggle against the occupation. The BAATH nationalists, the radical-Islamic forces and the patriotic, socialist and progressive forces continue to show us with their brave actions that the USA can be beaten.

Doubtlessly is the enmity to the USA and Great Britain a deficient anti-imperialist enmity. Imperialist occupation and aggression, barbarianism and cruelty are shown concretely by the USA. The occupation is one concrete reflectance. However, the resisting forces in Iraq have not been supported financially and military by other imperialist forces in their struggle against the American-British occupation. The biggest support and solidarity came only from the people who are against war on Iraq and the revolutionary forces.

MLCP considers the USA and the other imperialist collaborating political Islamic movements in Turkey, in the region and other countries as the main enemy of the revolution and the struggle. She fights

against those Islamic forces that attack continuously the revolutionary and communist movement and is of the opinion that the pan-Islamic currencies are strategically seen, no anti-imperialist forces.

For these currencies, non-Muslim people in the region and all over the world are enemies, too. This is why they do not hesitate to attack civil people and they are open for national and religious conflicts.

The USA's attack strategy under the new international circumstances and the insufficient engagement of the revolutionary and communist movement against the imperialist aggression and occupation resulted in the orientation of Muslim people on religion and nationalist, traditional ideology and politics. This will and the demands caused that some bourgeois and petty bourgeois currencies took an Islam-based attitude towards the USA and imperialism, particularly towards the occupation. The outcomes of this current political and ideological hegemony of the Islamic movement have shown themselves in the theoretical and political line of the communist and revolutionary parties.

The revolutionary parties and anti-imperialist forces should, from an objective point of view, not hesitate to form temporary alliances with the deficient anti-imperialist Islamic currencies which will strengthen the struggle and will be a big slap in the face of the USA and imperialism and which will not have revolutionaries as well as people as their target.

Certainly are they alert to stay politically awake and faithful to their principals because the pan-Islamic ideology dreams of the past, is reactionary and the pre-capitalist dominant class ideology. She is used today as well to guarantee the leadership of capitalism and to mislead and weaken the masses of people.

Under the imperialist globalization conditions, contradictions for profit between the US and EU imperialists on the one side and the bourgeois parties, who want to save their own reactionary interests, and the mil-

itary gangs in the neo-colonialist countries on the other side can sometimes result in violence. These groups, who are said to be nationalists, form a bourgeois opposition in order to defend their current political status and their political dominance. The imperialist forces use violence against these governments, who are in their way of realizing their new plans and their new political structures, and show that they can bring down governments with coups and provoke wars, threats and reactionary mass movements. These kinds of attacks which started with the punishment of Noriega changed into wars against Taliban, Saddam, Aristide and Milosevic. With reactionary mass events in Georgia and the Ukraine the same targets were tried to be realized and the next on the list are the Mullahs in Iran and the Syrian government on the list.

The working class, the people and their revolutionary parties should not take side in the conflict between the reactionary degenerated bourgeois opposition and the imperialist aggression; in the contrary they should follow an independent revolutionary line and especially under the conditions of occupation concentrate on the fight against imperialist aggression. Additionally, we should consider that one part of the Baath movement might end their resistance under circumstances of a possible reconciling, although it supports the bourgeois nationalist Baath movement nowadays.

More will power and more struggle for solidarity with the peoples of Iraq and the Middle East

The Brazilian declaration, made in the summer of 2005 by Arabian and Latin American countries, states a protest against US and British imperialists' world hegemonic war and the occupation of Iraq.

The anti-imperialist wave, led by F. Castro and Chavez in Latin America, is growing. The USA's influence on its "back yard" is in a period of being dissolved and weakened.

The Shanghai Organisation, which Russia, China and some Central Asian

countries take part in, is a sign which shows that they will stand with force against the US strategies and politics for building its dominance in the World as well as in the Middle East.

Uzbekistan wants USA to abandon the military bases which it built in the country.

But against all these developments, the US imperialists' various strategic and tactical moves continue. These moves can be seen in its increased concentration on diplomacy, politics and the military over Iraq and the Greater Middle Eastern Project. It can especially be seen in the new relationships it is trying to forge with Turkey. The Middle East is an area where US has experienced more than one crisis. By observing the course of the relationship between Europe and Turkey, it is also gaining the conditions for getting what it wants. The US President Bush's new Security Counsel Stephen Hadley made his first contact abroad with Turkey. He held important meetings with Turkish Prime Minister R. Erdogan and General Chief of the Staff H. Ozkok. The 'war on terror', Iraq, Syria, Iran, Israel-Palestine and the Lebanon crisis, which are subjects on the Hadley's agenda, are also on the agenda of Turkey. The US-Turkey contradictions, the competition over the oil and supply routes (with Russia, the EU, China, Iran and the US), and the Israel-Palestine and Kurdish problems are all weighing down on Turkey.

President Bush's *"1 March has passed, let's leave it to the historians"* statement points to the US' need for Turkey for the Greater Middle Eastern Project, its strategic direction and politics.

After the civilian and military imperialist war staffs meeting on the "war against terror, Iraq and Afghanistan" in US, meetings with Turkey increased. CIA president Porter Goss says: *"Until now, we had relied on allied secret service partnerships for operations outside the US and the gathering of intelligence. From now on, we are going to carry out operations with our own staff only. We are going to carry out missions under*

very different guises. We are going to be in areas where noone would ever dream of".

Recently, two US generals, General James Jones and John Abeyzaid, held meetings on "security problems" during the visit to Turkey. They attended the official opening ceremony of the "Centre for Perfection in Anti-terrorism" (TMMM), which was decided to be formed as a result of the NATO meetings in Istanbul in June 2004. The TMMM, which is posed as the centre for anti-terrorism in the Greater Middle Eastern Project, is actually going to be the US centre for training and military in the Middle East against the anti-imperialist forces. The war on terrorism, international terrorism, kidnapping, holding hostage, fighting against suicide bombings, categories of terrorism, intervening in social incidents, etc., are activities to be studied there.

The US' influential interference in the decision to start negotiations between Turkey and the EU on 3rd October, is interesting.

34

The direction of these political developments gives clues of the "strategic partnership" between the US, Israel and Turkey, and of the "strategic partnerships" between the US, Israeli, Iraqi and Kurdish political parties. The threats to Lebanon and Syria are being carried out directly and over the states of the region.

After the referendum over the constitution in Iraq, the US, which is being dragged into a period of defeat in the Middle East and Iraq, will continue to prepare and try manoeuvres and policies to bring new military and political assaults.

The dynamics of anti-imperialist struggle and its possibilities are growing in the world. To bring these to the fore, and to get it moving in an organised way, is the historical and political responsibility of all anti-

war, anti-imperialist, progressive, revolutionary and communist parties. Therefore, the duty to bring the results of anti-imperialist and anti-occupation platforms and conferences to concrete actions and practices cannot be delayed any longer.

MLCP believes in the need for an international coordination or an international relationship to develop a common political will and action among the anti-imperialist centres and platforms in the world and in various regions. In these terms, a united anti-imperialist intervention and struggle on a regional level will also advance the anti-imperialist struggle both in each different country and on the international arena. This will also create the possibilities and conditions for revolutionary and communist parties to become politically, ideologically and organisationally closer upon the real relations on the road to the world communist movement's international unification.

The US' and other imperialist forces' aggression and the results of the occupation on the Middle East and Iraq, in their naked and striking form, had reflected on the imperialist metropolises as well. And once more it proved that *"the people who oppress another people cannot be free too"*. And so, today, the fate of the working class and toilers in imperialist countries and the working class and toilers in undeveloped countries, and the fate of oppressed nations and peoples, is shared even more. Therefore, the solidarity of the working class, toilers and oppressed of the world with the peoples of the Middle East, and the sharing together of their struggle, will also mean that they fight for their own freedom and their future.

More will power and more struggle for solidarity with the peoples of Iraq and the Middle East! ✚

THE NEVER-ENDING SYMPHONY CYPRUS QUESTION AND MARXIST ATTITUDE

In the geopolitical concepts and rivalry for the re-division of the world, Cyprus is one of the key areas up for re-alignment. Although the island played a crucial role in imperialists' quest for world hegemony, its complete re-division was not achieved during the 20th century. However it is now being put on the dinner table of the 'imperialist wolfs' at the beginning of 21st century.

In 1974, using the excuse of internal developments within the island and a massacre of Turkish Cypriots, the Turkish bourgeois state staged a military landing and occupied the northern region of the island. This created a situation that continues until today. In practice the island has been divided into two: the Greek community in the South and the Turkish community in the North. The Turkish and Greek communities therefore come to the process of re-alignment with an entire generation having grown up under different economic and political conditions.

The Turkish and Greek bourgeois states and the ruling Turkish and Greek forces that act as their extensions in Cyprus have constantly used the Cyprus question in their internal and external policies for many years. Both sides have proclaimed Cyprus a "national" question that cannot be abandoned and in which no concession can be granted. Through the policies they have implemented, the Turkish and Greek bourgeois states and their proxies in Cyprus paved the way, not towards communal existence but towards separation and diverse formation; they tried to estrange the two communities from one another. This policy, which brought mutual enmity to the Turkish and Greek communities, is in the interests of the imperialist forces who are competing with each other and of the chauvinist Greek and Turkish ruling classes.

The Turkish and Greek states and their extensions in Cyprus have played this game for decades. In the mean time, although it

has been interrupted in some periods, relations between the two communities have continued. Despite sometimes being left in the background, the Cyprus question has continued to be an important international matter.

Turkey and Greece pull the strings of their puppets in the island and then try to tie these to a post that they perceive to be strong. The posts that are available are the EU or the USA. Therefore it cannot be expected that the political "landlords" in Cyprus would mouth anything other than the words of the Turkish and Greek bourgeoisies. And in turn, the Turkish and Greek bourgeoisie; i.e. the "nation wide actors", are taking their cue from the EU and USA, the international actors.

In the period of existence of the Soviet Union, US imperialism acted by considering the Soviet factor in the Cyprus question and mostly it would throw its weight behind the Turkish bourgeoisie due to the Greek side's threat to become close to the USSR. The aim of US imperialism was to keep the USSR at a distance from the Cyprus question. Later, in the period of 1989/1991, the revisionist bloc collapsed and the USSR disintegrated. Since the beginning of 1990s, the EU has therefore substituted for it in active relationship to the Cyprus question.

Between 1974 and 1990, there were two main international actors who were trying to solve or not solve the Cyprus question in accordance with their own interests: the USA and USSR. And since 1990, there are

two main international actors who are trying to solve or not to solve the same question in accordance with their own interests: the USA and EU. In both periods, the UN has been active, as supervisory force acting in the interests of the US.

Both centres of rivalry have almost competed with each other in order to solve the Cyprus question according to their own interests. Until now this competition has not produced any result except to keep the Cyprus question imprisoned within a non-solution.



36

At its meeting on 17 September 1990, the EU Council of Ministers dealt with the membership application of the Greek Cypriot side as if there had not been a problem that continued for years between the two communities in the island. This was the first time that the EU acted as a meddler in the Cyprus question in its own self-interest. Since that date, the history of talks on the Cyprus question has been the history of competition in the Mediterranean region between the EU and USA.

In its report of 15 July 1997 headed "Agenda 2000", the EU accorded Cyprus the status of candidate member, and at the Luxembourg Summit in December 1997 it included it in the process of enlargement. Thus Cyprus was involved in the full membership talks which began on 31 March 1998. The decision to "prepare Turkey for partnership" was taken at the same meeting.

In the period when this report from the EU was announced, there was a new coalition government in power in Turkey, consisting of ANAP (Motherland Party), DSP (Democratic Left Party) and DYP (True Path

Party). This government was swollen with Turkish chauvinism, and went beyond the usual rhetorical statements of support to emphasise the strategic importance of Cyprus and insist that Cyprus is indispensable to Turkey.

In reprisal for the decision taken by the EU, the new government decided to start the process of consolidating with Cyprus. But it used the concept of "special relation" instead of talking about 'consolidation', due to intense international reaction.

The EU held its Helsinki Summit on 10 December 1999. At the meeting, the EU gave the status of candidate member to Turkey after "dramatic" midnight Helsinki-Ankara talks. At the same meeting, it was said that the decision on Cyprus's EU membership would be taken in 2002. In fact at the Copenhagen Summit (12-13 December 2002), it was announced that Cyprus was going to be made full member on 1 May 2004 together with other 9 candidate members.

The situation has changed since Turkey's EU membership came onto the agenda; since it was accepted as a candidate member at the Helsinki Summit and since 3 October 2005. Although the decision to begin membership negotiations on 3 October 2005 was taken, the EU is not in hurry to make Turkey a member. Although Turkey recognising Cyprus was not an issue in the meeting where the decision to start negotiations for full membership was taken, it is impossible to believe that this question will not appear on the agenda during the process of full membership. The negotiations are going to be tough also because of the Cyprus question. That is to say that it is an open-ended process. But it is also very clear that the Turkish bourgeoisie will seek to profit from the process of negotiations, with the support of the US. Therefore it cannot be expected that the Turkish bourgeoisie will easily desist from the "ownership of right". There will therefore be an attempt to impose the Annan Plan on the agenda in consideration of that possibility. In Cyprus this plan led to a reshuffling of the cards and the creation of new policies.

The Annan Plan is a plan for an imperialist solution. It does not consider the interests of the island's people, it is prepared in line with the interests of imperialist forces and collaborationist administrations and envisages a federal structure in the island based on their interests. The Annan Plan is an imperialist solution that expresses a compromise between the USA and EU.

The plan was prepared in consideration of the interests of the USA, EU and, based on these, of Turkey and Greece. The plan embodies the rivalry between the USA and EU on the island and in the region; the balance of power between them and the demands of the guarantor states who divided the island into two. The plan does not touch the British military bases, legitimises the "right of ownership" of Turkey and Greece over the island, and ensures that the EU will gain influence in Southern Cyprus and Greece, and the USA in Northern Cyprus and Turkey. This is the other reason why the US is talking about support for the "development of the north" after the referenda. That is to say that, within the framework of the Annan Plan, US imperialism is not going to lose very much of its influence over the island through Cyprus' membership of the EU. US imperialism will still wield authority by using the British bases in the island and by benefiting from Turkey's continuing rights of guarantorship. At the same time, it is going to have the opportunity to realise its imperialist policies in the island and the region through those countries that side with the USA on international policies despite their EU membership.

A referendum was held on 24 April 2004. The result was very interesting: While the Turkish side of Cyprus said "yes" to the plan with 64.9% of the vote, 75.8% of the Greek side said "no". The turnout was 84.35% in the North and 96.53% in the South, which is an indicator of peoples' interest in the referendum. It is clear that the people on both sides are interested in the realisation of a certain solution instead of dissolution. But the result was rather different from the expectations of the hegemonic forces.

What were the parties seeking for, what were they expecting and what did they achieve?

Greece built up its policy of annexation of the island in line with the strategy of Cyprus's entrance to the EU while Turkey's fell outside of the EU. This policy of Greece was also supported because the membership of the whole undivided island, and thus its removal from US influence, served the interests of the prominent imperialist countries of the EU such as Germany and France.

In short, US imperialism and EU had taken out a mortgage on the future of the Cyprus people, so they were left obliged to make compromises in order to use the island in line with their imperialist interests. The Annan Plan was the expression of this compromising.

37

The other result of Turkey's military landing in Cyprus in 1974 and its occupation of the northern side of island was to strike a heavy blow against Enosis (annexation of Cyprus) and to force Greece to desist from this strategy. After a period of lack of clarity in which it was avoiding war with Turkey and emphasising its membership of the EU, Greece spoke publicly described the same strategy as the strategy of the EU; thus the Cyprus strategy of Greece and the EU has become collective. As K. Simitis, then Greek Prime Minister, said: "Guarantorship in island is not compulsory". That is to say that the EU's domination in Cyprus means "peaceful" realisation of the Enosis strategy. Since that day, Greece has used the EU in order to practice its Cyprus strategy.

Thus, Greece wanted to gulp down Cyprus by using the EU umbrella. But the referendum results showed that it cannot realise easily this plan.

In contrast with Greece's plan to annex the whole island, Turkey has since the

beginning tried to render valid its "taksim" (division) plan. Despite some disagreements from time to time, the USA has always supported this policy of the Turkish bourgeoisie. For what is important for US imperialism is not to let the EU snatch the whole of Cyprus.

The realisation and results of the referendum foreseen by the Annan Plan show that Turkey has gained some successes and opportunities in the sphere of diplomacy on the basis of its taksim (division) policy. Turkey continues to repeat and strengthen its view that the Turkish Cypriot side must be recognised as a state; meanwhile the US and EU statements on the lifting of embargo against the Turkish side and the opening of representation point towards the course of the process.

Most importantly, in reaction to the Turkish bourgeois state's chauvinist orientation and the settling of the Turkish population on the island, the majority of the people on the Turkish Cypriot side have shown their desire for a united Cyprus and the wish to enter the EU as a united Cyprus. This objectively represented an objection, a voice against dissolution and against the status quo. As stated by the Socialist Party of Cyprus (Central Committee of Socialist Party of Cyprus-March 2004): *"The referendum is not only going to be about the 'yes/no' of the Annan Plan. The attitude 'yes to referendum and yes in the referendum' through putting weight on the process with an overwhelming majority of people's will, in fact, means 'No to status quo, no to the regime that tries to uphold the status quo'".* And the Greek Cypriot people in the south

of island also did not give the expected response, again as a result of chauvinist orientation. Thus, in the referendum results, while the Turkish Cypriot side objectively expressed its opposition to chauvinist policies in relation to a united Cyprus and to taksim (division), the Greek Cypriot side did not raise any objection to the status quo.

The Greek side rejected the Annan Plan. But the referendum has become a turning point in relation to plans and policies about Cyprus; although only a few years have passed, it is being understood that the post-referendum period is not going to be the same as the pre-referendum period. There is no doubt that both sides' attitudes have not changed, and it has therefore become clear that these attitudes cannot be expressed through the old policies. The referendum has therefore created the material conditions for the new policies.

In short, US imperialism and EU had taken out a mortgage on the future of the Cyprus peoples, so they were left obliged to make compromises in order to use the island in line with their imperialist interests. The Annan Plan was the expression of this compromising. The people of Cyprus were forced to say "yes" or "no" to this imperialist imposition. This imperialist plan did not involve the question how the people of Cyprus wanted to unite, use their right to self-determination or found a united Cyprus. On the contrary, the plan balanced the interests of US and EU imperialism, and foresaw the adoption of those interests by the people of Cyprus. This imperialist "peace" attempt based on the Annan Plan did not lead to any result. But the new situation; "no" from the Greek side and "yes" from the Turkish side shows the rivalry on Cyprus is going to continue under new conditions.

What makes Cyprus important and what is the place of Cyprus in inter-imperialist contradictions?

In all periods of the history, Cyprus has been important because of its strategic position. And the current stormy situation over Cyprus island also arises from this strategic



position. The history of the last few decades - the dissolution produced under the name of solution or the imposed imperialist solution - shows that the hegemonic powers want to shape the island according to their interests. In the so-called solutions to the problem in this period, more correctly its non-solution until certain compromises can be reached; the ball is passed from UN, under the rule of US imperialism, to the EU and from the EU to the UN. And each time Greece and Turkey who want to be the one whose word is law in the island, have tried to put forward their policies of "annexation" and "division" in whichever way is appropriate to the conditions of the day.

Let's look at the parties first:

The balance of power has changed after the disintegration of the revisionist bloc, and we see there are two imperialist camps competing with each other in Cyprus. The US and Britain head one of these camps; Turkey and the Turkish Cypriot side are also on this side. The second camp is formed by the EU. This camp is led by Germany and France, who form the hegemonic power within the EU; and beside them there is Greece and Greek Cypriot side. This polarisation has also shown effects on the people of Cyprus and so the people of Cyprus are divided into two as Turkish and Greek communities.

US imperialism is today the main actor designing the future of the island. It also has on its side the historical, political and strategic achievements of British imperialism in the island. Because it knows that alone it cannot possess Cyprus, it struggles with the EU to re-share the island on the basis of its alliance with Britain and Turkey. Thus the Cyprus island will be turned into a protectorate of the USA indirectly and the EU directly. The influence of Turkey and Greece over Cyprus can only be talked about in relation to these protectorates.

The strategic importance of Cyprus for the USA can be understood completely only when considered in the context of US imperialism's geopolitics for world hegemony:

♦Cyprus is in the Southwest leg of the USA's Eurasia geopolitics.

♦Cyprus is important for control of the Mediterranean region.

♦Cyprus occupies a very important place in the USA's "Greater Middle East Project".

♦Cyprus is important for the security of Israel, the US gendarmerie in the Middle East.

♦Cyprus is important for the control of the route that conveys the Middle East (Iraq) and Caspian Basin oil to the world markets and the shipment point (Ceyhan, Iskenderun Gulf)

While there are dozens of urgent problems in the world, we cannot explain such a degree of interest in Cyprus from rival centres of imperialism like the USA and the EU by their quest for peace. Nor can this interest be explained by the underground riches of Cyprus. The island does not have such riches. What makes Cyprus important is the significant role that it could play within the openings of imperialist powers who want to re-share the world; it's the strategic position of Cyprus Island. The island has always been important for this reason.

The Turkish bourgeoisie, especially since the collapse of the revisionist bloc, no longer considers Cyprus as only a "national" problem. It, at the same time, considers Cyprus with a strategic perspective; it continually emphasises the importance of the island for Turkey's regional interests and security. The Turkish bourgeoisie thinks geopolitically.

In the near future, the Turkish bourgeoisie computes that the oil and natural gas of the Caucasus, Central Asia and Caspian Basin will come to Iskenderun Gulf (Ceyhan) through pipes and will be dispatched from here to the world markets. The Baku-Ceyhan pipeline has been opened and the Iraqi oil still flows here. Cyprus is in an indispensable position for the control of this strategic region. On 6 April 1998, Ismail Cem, who was the Foreign Minister of Turkey in that period, stated: *"The East Mediterranean will be the most strategic region in the years of 2005-2010; therefore we will never desist from the position in relation to Cyprus, which controls the*

region, for the national security and national interests of Turkey". He announced to the world that Turkey was ready to pay the price.

Trying to be a regional power, the Turkish regime's dreams of hegemony "from the Adriatic to the Great Wall of China", and of a "Greater Turkey" in union with the Central Asian Turkish Republics have fell into hot water. Later it also had to stay away from the Mosul-Kirkuk petroleum. However it definitely will not drop Cyprus without gaining some concessions in order to export its strategic importance.

As regards the Germany-France binary, who are in the dominant position in the EU, Cyprus is in the position of an indispensable base for these imperialist countries to reach the Middle East.

40

This is the principle understanding of the Turkish bourgeoisie; it is an understanding that has become a state policy. We, of course, also know about how in new-colonial imperialist servant Turkey these state policies and the hot "red lines" that are considered as the cause of war, can disappear and become indistinct due to the balance of power. In the future, it will be no surprise to see Turkey withdraw from its policies on Cyprus in return for some concessions during the process of negotiations with the EU.

In its competition with the US over Cyprus and Mediterranean region, the EU appears to be committed on the subject of the hegemony of all Cyprus. The sole dimension to this commitment is the geopolitical importance the island holds. The EU is not capable of creating a geopolitical foreign policy - which is the expression of "national" will, political totality - because it is not an integrated political entity. It is not in a situation of developing a "national" will and continues to exist by balancing the rivalry between the EU's imperialist countries.

Therefore, we can only call the EU's commitment to Cyprus an ostensible "geopolitical commitment". By dominating Cyprus, the EU also plans to be a power in the Middle East.

There is no other explanation for the EU's interest in making the island with so many problems a member. Because there is nothing that Cyprus will add to the EU other than its strategic position. Cyprus is a dagger that the EU plans to use to stab the USA's "Greater Middle Eastern Project".

As regards the Germany-France binary, who are in the dominant position in the EU, Cyprus is in the position of an indispensable base for these imperialist countries to reach the Middle East. The island joining the EU moves the border of the EU 500 km further east from Crete; thus the EU is in a position to control the whole Mediterranean. Such an expansion runs counter to the interests of the US imperialism.

For all these reasons neither US imperialism nor the EU as a whole cannot keep out of Cyprus.

The hegemonic struggle conducted in the recent past between US imperialism and Soviet social imperialism in the Mediterranean and its surroundings today has been replaced with a competition between the centres of rivalry such as the USA and EU. In connection with the relativity and shifting of the balance of power between the centres of rivalry, there are few possibilities for an imperialist solution to the Cyprus question:

- ♦The balance of powers between the imperialist countries in Cyprus will not change to any meaningful degree and dissolution in Cyprus will remain the solution as it is today.

- ♦US imperialism will accept defeat in the face of the EU in the region and the Turkish bourgeoisie will join with the EU. In such a situation US imperialism would lose its influence in the region, at least in Turkey that its realisation and indirectly the Turkish Cypriot side. This is a very unlikely possibility.

♦The contradiction between US imperialism and the EU will sharpen and the EU, by taking a step back, will leave Cyprus. Taking into consideration the Greek Cypriot side's membership of the EU, this is again a possibility but its likelihood is rather low for today. It is however a possibility that would be realisable if the contradictions between the USA and EU were to gain the dimensions of an inter-imperialist war.

♦In a situation where talks end with no outcome, the de facto division of Cyprus will be approved de jure. Thus, the USA and the EU will share the island as a joint sphere of influence. This is a possibility that can be realised any time by the USA and EU.

♦During the negotiations for EU membership, Turkey will be conditioned to recognise Southern Cyprus as Cyprus; developments show a slight tendency towards this. In this situation there would be two alternatives for the Turkish bourgeoisie: a) It will accept the EU's imposition and subjugate Cyprus's strategic importance for Turkey and its being a "national" cause to EU interests. This will show that Turkey has distanced itself from the US and begun to act according to the EU interests. Certain parties of the Turkish bourgeoisie may preach that stepping back from Cyprus in order to gain access to the EU is the right step for Turkey's national interests. For example, this is the position of the organisation of the Turkish bourgeoisie, TUSIAD (Association of Turkish Industrialists and Businessmen). Following Turkey's candidate-membership of the EU, TUSIAD has abandoned the official viewpoint on Cyprus and taken the attitude that there should be a solution that is appropriate to the policies of the EU, as it believes that the EU has gained strategic importance in the world capitalist system. TUSIAD considers Cyprus as an impediment to the process of membership of the EU. b) In the face of imposition of the recognition of Cyprus during the membership negotiations, Turkey would set forth its opinion in scathing terms: announce that it desists from becoming a member and the division of Cyprus will be a reality. The

army and the bourgeois circles sharing this viewpoint will not desist from Cyprus easily: As we mentioned above, they will not desist basically for two reasons; 1) Because it is a "national" cause. 2) Because of its strategic importance for the interests of the bourgeoisie thinking geopolitically.

The geo-politician fascist Muzzaffer Ozbag, who considers Cyprus as part of the geography of Turkey, explains in the following words the geo-strategic importance of Turkey and so of Cyprus:

"From the birth of the inter-state community and the establishment of international relations until our day, the geography of Turkey - involving the Petty-Asia Peninsula, Thrace, the Turkish canyons and the Cyprus island, the Aegean islands, which are the extensions of Anatolia - has been one of the world's most prominent and even the most important point of focus in the geopolitical and geo-strategic plans. The geo-political importance of the geography of Turkey is being made constant by its special ability to be a bridge, door and lock to the movements and entrances-exits of the east-west, north-south and by its central position in the inland sea basins in the crossroad region of these continents and in this... huge block of earth that is formed by Asia, Europe and Africa, described as the "Ancient World" by historians and the "world island" by geopoliticians. The possibility of directing and controlling the laws of nature, inter-continental transportation and commercial, military and political activity compel any force - that has got interests on the regional, continental and universal scale or follows a politic of superiority- to be interested in the geography of Turkey.

It is very clear that a Cyprus based on the formation of two separate states by two peoples - whose common subsistence today has become impossible - will form a serious threat to Turkey and peace in the hands of a power that is hostile and a stranger to the region, and a state that would be outsourcing for its imperialist boss." (Article "the Vital Importance of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus for the Security of

Turkey", from his compilation "Upon the Geopolitics of Turkey and the Turkish world", ASAM Publications, 22, Ankara, 2001, Page 365-370-371).

When declaring the attitude of the General Staff of the Army on the Cyprus question, General Hilmi Ozkok said: "*The process of imprisoning Turks in Anatolia will be almost completed through a Cyprus settlement that threatens the security of Turkey and does not ensure its security needs.*" There is no difference between this understanding and the understanding created in ASAM about the strategic importance of Cyprus. This viewpoint is also the viewpoint of the Army and the bourgeoisie.

The Annan Plan has not been accepted, but the discussions about the results of the referendum and various developments show that the Cyprus question has now entered a new phase. After the referendum the US and EU did not keep the promises of "help" that they had given the Turkish Cypriot side. Turkey's effort to achieve the recognition of the Turkish Cypriot side as an "independent" state, the final forcing of Turkey to recognise Southern Cyprus in connection with its membership to the EU and visits of some delegates from the US to Northern Cyprus was followed by the visits of some businessmen from Azerbaijan. A private airline company from this country then began the first direct flights to Northern Cyprus.

Turkey's situation in comparison to the pre-referendum past is much more difficult and also much easier. That is to say the consideration and perspective of the questions is going to define the alternative.

First Alternative:

Firstly, Turkey is not in a position to go for EU membership whatever it costs. This would mean accepting the position of the EU and Greece on the subject of Cyprus. Such submission would lead to an endless stream of other impositions. Moreover, it will be shown that the Turkish bourgeoisie's attitude towards Turkish communities and states outside the borders of Turkey is not sincere. In a situation of such submission,

the communities will think, "those who are selling Cyprus will sell us easily". Consequently the bourgeoisie will be seen as an unreliable guardian of the Turkish "national" cause. It is difficult to envisage a bourgeoisie that is eager to ride its horse from the Adriatic coasts to the Great Wall of China will make such a concession.

Secondly, the contradictions between the US and EU sharpen gradually. The possibility of periodical détente cannot prevent the gradual deepening of the contradictory process. Therefore, the US will not easily allow Turkey to surrender to the EU on the subject of Cyprus in order to become a member. For, in such a situation, the US would be giving Cyprus to the EU. But US imperialism will not accept this without a fight due to the importance of Cyprus to its geo-politics.

Second Alternative:

Due to the importance of Cyprus as we mentioned above, the Turkish bourgeoisie will resist the EU by risking an end to the membership process. This is a stake-all gambit. In this situation the EU's influence on Turkey will be weakened and its extension through Turkey to the Middle East will be a dream. It should not be forgotten that in the case of such a step by the Turkish bourgeoisie US imperialism would play an important role. In order to keep the EU away from the region, the US will continue to encourage Turkey as it has until now. Possibly it may also give it some crumbs.

It does not matter from what perspective or alternative it is considered, the question hangs upon the course of rivalry; the balance of power between the US and EU. Therefore, Turkey's situation is rather difficult in comparison with the past.

What should be the Marxist attitude to the solution of the Cyprus question?

In a small island with a population of just 700.000, the world's best-known leading imperialist bandit countries are fighting and kicking each other, whilst declaring that all this is for the future of the Cypriot people, so they can live in peace. Part of their deception involves threatening the people of island.

They are trying to force them to accept the Annan Plan by saying, *"this is the last chance"*. They are creating an atmosphere that the "Republic of United Cyprus" will be founded through the Annan Plan. They are establishing a republic via a plan that has been prepared without asking and taking into consideration the viewpoints of the Turkish and Greek people, the real owners of the island!

In Page 3 of the plan, it says: *"The Hellenic Republic, the Republic of Turkey, and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland hereby agree with this Comprehensive Settlement of the Cyprus Problem, and commit themselves to sign together with Cyprus the appended Treaty on matters related to the new state of affairs in Cyprus, which shall be registered as an international treaty in accordance with Article 102 of the Charter of the United Nations."*

This is how those who say they will bring peace to the island explain that the people of Cyprus cannot decide their own future.

The Annan Plan upset the Turkish and Greek status quo, which was valid till then, and forced these countries to reconsider their strategies about Cyprus. Until that day, the compromise as a non-compromise, the solution as a non-solution had continued. Together with this plan, a new opportunity for "peace" was presented as different to those of the past. The will of the people of Cyprus was not required for this "peace". The future of Cyprus was related to the balance of power between those who are fighting for hegemony in the island under the name of "peace" and "united Cyprus". As happened in the past, the present "peace" contained the signatures of Greece, Turkey and Great Britain. The United Nations, European Union and the US are also grinning out from under the signatures.

The Cyprus island has always been occupied, dominated and bought and sold by the hegemonic forces of each period as the geographic horizons of mankind widened and the plundering and hegemony spread out. Such that it was rented by the Ottomans and

later declared as an independent republic by exterior powers. Cyprus has been governed by whichever powers dominate the Eastern Mediterranean but not by the Cypriots. The Cypriot people have never been consulted within these developments. Throughout history, the Cypriot people have been deprived of their right to self-determination. And now again the Cypriots are excluded as a whole in the new search for "peace".

The Cyprus problem is not a problem between the people of the island. The ones who make Cyprus a problem are Turkey, Greece and the imperialist powers who want to dominate Cyprus together with their domestic collaborators.

The working class and labourer masses on both sides of the island are far from generating a solution as the product of their own will and from forming an organisation with this purpose. The bourgeois hegemony in both parts, the chauvinism and enmity - which has been fed, provoked and always kept alive- have played a determining role in the creation of this situation. The people of Cyprus in both regions have not until now come up with any option beyond those contained in this or that form of bourgeois option. Therefore they have been forced this or that way, but continually run after and obey bourgeois options.

The EU is the popular option of the last period. There is a huge belief that the EU could solve all the problems and bring peace and welfare to the island.

High living standards of the Greek side play an important role for the Turkish side in considering EU as a saviour. There was also a big influence of this situation when the Turkish side said "yes" to the Annan Plan. As a matter of fact, there is nothing to be surprised at, that one of the powers responsible for putting the island into this situation is now being considered as the saviour.

It is impossible to reach a stable solution on the Cyprus question under the conditions of imperialist occupation and rivalry. No solution as a result of imperialist politics could provide a real peace in Cyprus. Cyprus may achieve an improved standard of living under the hegemony of the US and the EU imperialism and this may continue for a while, but together with the changes of the power balance between the imperialist centres of rivalry, someone may "scratch" Cyprus again and the collisions which have supposedly disappeared may start again.

The Cypriots, i.e. the native people of the island, are the ones who will bring a permanent solution to the Cyprus question. Therefore, for the creation of the material conditions for the real solution, Turkey and Greece have to pull all their military forces out of the island, and Great Britain, USA and EU have to totally withdraw from the island. Only under these conditions can the people of the island find the possibility of freely determining their future.

44

The Cyprus problem is not a problem between the people of the island. The ones who make Cyprus a problem are Turkey, Greece and the imperialist powers who want to dominate Cyprus together with their domestic collaborators. These are the problems due to the rivalry between them. These powers are the main ones responsible for making the Cyprus situation into a collision between the people.

The Socialist Party of Cyprus has placed following understanding in its programme: *"The organisation of relations between Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots in peaceful solidarity is impossible in a continuing situation of on the one hand, conflicts between the major imperialist powers for their interests, and on the other the hegemony of the bourgeoisie and the politics of safeguarding in our island the interests of the big and regional powers upon this hegemony, in the conditions where the regional and local bourgeoisies' conflicts for interest have been inter-related. The solution of the Cyprus question is impossible".* Imperialism and the Turkish and Greek bourgeoisies and

their extensions in Cyprus have made impossible the democratic solution of the Cyprus question in today's conditions. Cyprus is de facto divided into two both geographically and politically, and both peoples in the island are being made to be estranged from each other. Both peoples are separated from each other with reactionary, national chauvinist barriers. This is a decisive obstacle before them to develop a common will. And this is the greatest obstacle to the "United Cyprus".

MLCP supports every activity that serves the unity and freedom of the Cypriot people. It supports the demands for ending the occupation for a united and independent Cyprus, withdrawing of all the military forces in Cyprus, closing down of the bases, ending the guarantees of Turkey, Greece and Britain etc, and upholds them as its own demands.

United and Democratic Cyprus means the common future of the Turkish and Cypriot people. However this is the issue of a revolution. United and Independent Cyprus could be obtained with the formation of a socialist Cyprus. Only then the freedom, equality and brotherhood of the people would be realised on the basis of peoples' voluntary unity. The real solution in Cyprus would be the creation of the Cypriot peoples' own will and activity.

The question of revolution in Cyprus raises difficulties due to the strategic characteristic position of the island, the question of power, the efforts of imperialist powers to choke revolution in Cyprus, the participation of the Turkish and Greek bourgeoisies in this, and the lack of a strong socialist country or countries. International solidarity and struggle within the Cyprus revolution, therefore, is compulsory. So the idea, which the Socialist Party of Cyprus has also given a place in its programme- *"to conduct a consistent struggle within international solidarity together with the workers of Turkey, Greece and Britain and all the world labourer movement for the immediate fulfilment of our desire for peace"* points out the internationalist, historical and political tasks. ♪

THE COURSE AND EXPERIENCES OF WORKING CLASS STRUGGLE IN TURKEY AND NORTHERN KURDISTAN

Struggle against privatisation conducted in all big enterprises that suffered from the privatisation attack through active resistances and actions. When we look at the course of the struggle, it is being observed that there is an increase both in the number of workers participating in the actions and also a militant-tendency in the form of actions.

The neo-liberal attacks continuing on the working class and labouring masses in the whole world under the conditions of imperialist globalisation are also continuing with spreading into time and increasingly in Turkey and Northern Kurdistan. The concrete frame of attack such as privatisation, outsourcing, disunionization, flexible work, freezing of the wages and redundancies, are drawn by the imperialist institutions like the IMF and World Bank, and bring into life by the fascist dictatorship, the local collaborator of the monopolist capital. The letter of intention, which was presented even in July 2005 to the IMF by the government and adopted, was foreseeing the sacking of 18 thousand workers from their works in public sector.

The fascist dictatorship wants to give a legal frame and legitimacy to these attacks through many regulations that it has introduced; tries to repress, prevent the actions and resistance of the working class through these fascist-reactionary regulations, organisations, militarism and state terror. In the statements of the Prime Minister Erdogan, saying *"It is my duty to market all Turkey"*, and Unakitan, the Finance Minister, saying *"We are going to sell all of them whether they make profit or detriment"*, it can be seen clearly that AKP government with Islamic motives is under the service of the imperialist and collaborator capital. Also confessing that half of the privatised enterprises are closed down, Unakitan thus expresses that he imprisoned workers to unemployment, poverty and hunger.

KITs are on the Target of Privatisation

For the last few years, the selling as a gift of the state enterprises to the imperialist and

collaborator monopolies is standing in the centre of attacks against the working class. KITs (State Economic Enterprises), which were created after the foundation of the Republic of Turkey (especially in 1930s') and are a sphere of employment that cannot be minimised, were for many years on the target of privatisation. KITs, which are active in the big and key sectors such as the petroleum, chemical, paper, tobacco, telecom, docks and tea, are closed down or sold one by one to the imperialist and collaborator monopolies with the lies, *"KITs are not making profit"*, of governments of the capital and war. On one way or the other, the fascist regime has prevented the development of a united and sanctioning class movement from the below by spreading into time the wave of privatisation and unorganisation attacks, bringing enterprises into the agenda singularly, making reconciliation or temporary proposals of solution. The AKP government had also announced that it is going to privatised about 41 big public enterprises in 2003. And the privatisation attack continued to process.

Each privatisation attack has, before anything else, brought together with itself massive redundancies. The monopolies, which bought the state enterprises, started their work at first by reducing the number of workers. And the following attacks were conducted in the forms of disunionisation, disorganisation, freezing or lowering of wages, setting of the working hours in accordance with the interests of the bosses under the name of flexible work, increasing the working hours, circle of quality and etc.

Turkish bourgeois governments have always implemented the privatisation attacks

together with reactionary laws. The head of these laws is the "New Working Law-Number 1857", known as the "slavery law" in the public opinion, and the "Reform for Personal Regime and Public Management Law", the name of the attack against the public labourers. All these attacks of governments were making obligatory the united actions of the working class and the public labourers movement and development of a united struggle against the attacks. The way of repulsing the attacks were possible by the working class to use its power coming from the production applying the weapon of "General Strike, General Resistance" supported also by the other labouring sections. However, the weakness of the working class's organisation both in political sense and in the trade unions, the reformist, traitorous and, even in some places, reactionary characteristics and stance of the union administrations, and the pacifist line of the petty bourgeois reformist and bureaucratic currency that surrounded the head of public labourers movement have prevented the slogan, "General Strike, General Resistance" to become a slogan of resistance.

Examples of Resistance against the Privatisation Attack

Struggle against privatisation conducted in all big enterprises that suffered from the privatisation attack through active resistances and actions. When we look at the course of the struggle, it is being observed that there is an increase both in the number of workers participating in the actions and also a militant-tendency in the form of actions. The workers -who at the beginning tried to repulse the attacks via marches, meetings, leaving work for short period or daily strikes-carried the struggle to a new momentum through the occupation of workplace for indefinite period by the workers from SEKA (Cellulose and Paper Factories) enterprise, and have shown the way to be followed against the privatisation to the working class.

TEKEL (Tobacco and Tobacco Products, Salt and Alcohol Enterprises) and PETKIM (Petrochemistry Holding) workers have given the message of resistance through their struggle against privatisation in the year of

2003, and came forefront. While PETKIM workers occupied the factory in order to prevent the sell of their workplaces, the TEKEL workers have applied different methods of struggle including not letting collaborator monopolist purchasers enter into the factory. In the face of TEKEL workers' struggle, the government took back steps even that they were temporary, and postponed the sell of workplace for some period.

The privatisation terror continued by gaining speed throughout the year of 2004. TEKEL, PETKIM, TUPRAS (Turkish Petroleum Refineries Corporation), Sumerbank, Telekom, Turkish Airlines and Eki Krom (Chromium Enterprises) have represented the main places under the target of privatisation. While the singular strike and resistances of the working class became widespread, the use of new tools and forms of struggle such as the general strikes of the labourers in public and health sector, the decision of general strike against the liquidation of SSK (Social Security Authority), leaving of work by workers against the NATO Summit, breaking of the chain of Abide-i Hurriyet on May Day, new experiences on organising the workers without-insurances, blocking of motorways have become the struggles that advanced the determination of the working class in struggle.

Whilst the year of 2004 started with the strike in Sisecam (Glass, Cement, Ceramic and Soil Enterprises) of 5 thousand workers organised in Kristal-Is (Glass, Cement, Ceramic and Soil Industries Workers' Union of Turkey), later it has continued with the government's banning of both this strike and the decision of strike taken by Lastik-Is (Tire Industries Workers' Union) in Goodyear, Pirelli and Brisa factories. The strike decision of Petrol-Is (Petroleum, Chemical and Rubber Workers Union of Turkey) in SASA, Dupontsa and Toros Manure Chemical Industry factories faced with the bosses' lockouts. Despite the workers' demand for de facto legitimate struggle, the union bureaucracy could not overcome the circle of prohibition and bowed their heads to those prohibitions. The workers' reaction also did not overcome the union bureaucracy's circle of traitorousness.

In the struggle against privatisation, the Sumerbank workers' struggle also come fore-front together with the struggle of the workers in Izmir Aliaga. But the Sumerbank workers could not prevent the privatisation of their workplaces towards the end of 2004. As a result, it is possible to say that, in the year of 2004, the resistances of the working class were singular, partite and sectional.

SEKA Resistance Has Shown the Way

SEKA workers have warned the government by various actions towards the end of 2004. But, when the government refused to change its decision to close SEKA, on 19 January 2005, the workers occupied for indefinite period the workplace. The action of the workers, who stopped production and occupied the workplace, was important in terms of showing the way to the class and putting in panic the bourgeoisie. SEKA was a spark of fight against the neo-liberal attacks and privatisation. MLCP tried to organise support and solidarity with SEKA under the slogan: "Everywhere is SEKA, Resistance in everywhere". Having seeing the importance of the action, the revolutionary and communist forces run to the side of the SEKA resistance. They set tents in front of the factory and conducted an intense work to get the support of the people in Izmit, the town where SEKA is situated. A "Solidarity Platform with SEKA Workers" was set up in Istanbul under the leadership of communist workers. The platform, involving unions also, have organised many actions. The influence of the action in SEKA went beyond the borders of the town in a short time and spread into the entire country. On the 18th of February, the police attacked the action, but could not break the resistance. After the police attack, the solidarity with the resistance did not limit itself with statements or visits; it took the form of supporting actions in practice.

The SEKA resistance led the workers, who in other enterprises are struggling against the privatisation or closure of their workplaces, to unite their struggles with the solidarity to the SEKA resistance and to organise actions going beyond the union lords.

For a long time, the TEKEL workers had also wanted to organise much more effective

actions in order to repulse the privatisation attack. But, somehow, the unions were not taking the decision for much more effective actions. The workers, therefore, have many times raided the union bureaus and made pressure on the union to take decision for actions. Through spark spread out by the SEKA, they went beyond the union lords and organised actions by taking the streets throughout the country. They organised demonstrations by blocking the roads. They blocked the Prime Minister's way. They replied the police attacks by clashing with them.



The toilers from education sector combined their struggle against the banning of EGITIM-SEN (Education-Union) with the struggle for solidarity with SEKA.

Throughout March, the finance labourers have organised two strikes and actions of slowing down the work against outsourcing and personnel with contracts.

The dockyard and council workers have left their works in order to support the SEKA resistance.

Numerous solidarity and support actions were organised throughout the country. There were messages of support and solidarity even from outside the country.

Trough the influence of the solidarity built around it, the SEKA resistance turned into a resistance that targets the state. The state stood against SEKA with its government, courts, municipals, police, gendarme and media. That is to say, the SEKA workers, who did not want to lose their work, found the state against them. Thus the workers got both to know the government, its party AKP, the

state and the IMF. The resistance politicised the workers. When politicised, the workers showed a much more determined and militant stance. They continued with the resistance by making necessary preparations in order to safeguard their resistance against the possible attacks. Yet they began to see that they are resisting not just for themselves. The workers saw who their friend is and who their enemy. They have tested them with their own experiences. In practice, they saw that the state and its institutions, which they are trusted, were their enemy and the instruments of the power of the capital.

Different sections of the working class, who suffered from the attacks of the bourgeoisie, have shown their reactions through various tools and methods of struggle. They organised giant, magnificent resistances. Through actions such as meetings, rallies, demonstrations, leaving their works, blocking roads, occupying the buildings of political parties and marching towards Ankara, the capital city, they tried to defend their rights, jobs and workplaces. Although they were singular, especially the occupation of workplaces and strikes, which went beyond the union bureaucracy and represented an advanced method of struggle, entered into the agenda of the class, and time to time led government to experience tough moments.

On the other hand, the unionists tried to limit the anger that developed against the state by directing it towards the government. They only criticised the government and its policies in their statements. Later, the resistance is ended due to an agreement made between the union lords and the governments. The reached-agreement, as a result, was on the direction of closure of SEKA.

Seydisehir Resisted Together with all the People of the Town

Privatisation of the Seydisehir Eti Aluminium Factory, which is situated in Konya-Seydisehir and involves about 1500 workers, become the field of months-long great resistances. By participation of their families, the Seydisehir workers have turned the town into an area of action. Seydisehir followed SEKA. One of the other characteristics of Seydisehir is the defending of the action by

all the people, whether they are workers, labourers and small shopkeepers. The workers, who did not allow the capitalists, purchasers to enter into the factory in each time when they heard that they are coming, began to act in commitment to defend their workplaces when they heard that their factory was sold to the CE-KA (Construction, Machinery, Mining Corporation). The workers welcomed the representatives of CE-KA, who came to the factory on 29 July, with stones, sticks and slogan: "*Seydisehir is going to be a grave to CE-KA*". Due to the workers' anger, which battered a jeep and 3 cars belong to CE-KA, the representatives of CE-KA were taken out of the factory only under the police security. Despite leading capital into mortal fear, the militant resistance of the Seydisehir worker was ended through an agreement made in Ankara by the headquarters of Celik-Is (Steel-Union). Only 200 of the workers accepted to continue to work in CE-KA. While 200 of the rest of the workers become pensioners, the others have left the factory by taking their compensations without accepting to work as slaves. As the SEKA resistance, the Seydisehir resistance has also functioned as a school and led workers to know better the government and the state.

The Next One was Erdemir

On 3 October 2005, Erdemir (Eregli Iron and Steel Factories Corporation) have been sold, together with all of its enterprises, to the OYAK (Armed Forces Pension Fund), one of the five biggest monopolies of Turkey. By purchasing Erdemir, OYAK has seized the monopoly of Turkey's steel industry. As being the 18th biggest flat-iron producer of the world, the biggest of Turkey, Erdemir is an enterprise that trenchers the appetites of the capital and monopolies show great interest. The workers have organised many actions against the privatisation of Erdemir. The Erdemir workers, who followed the footsteps of SEKA and Seydisehir workers, did not allow the directors of the monopolist firm, who wanted to see the factory, to enter into the factory by not leaving the factory and through blocking the roads.

But, unfortunately, the workers could not go beyond the class collaborator fascist

administrators of Turk Metal-Is (Metal, Steel, Ammunition, Machinery, Metal Products, Automobile Assembly and Allied Workers Union of Turkey). Turk Metal-Is tried to avoid from the workers' anger by organising some actions. Through the slogan, "Erdemir cannot be sold to foreigners", they propagated that Erdemir can be sold to native collaborator holdings rather than foreigner capitalists. Thus both it has played the role of a star in calming down the anger of the workers against the selling of their workplaces and weakening their struggle, and showed that it collaborates with the government and OYAK. During awarding of their workplaces to OYAK, the Erdemir workers organised protest action in front of the Headquarters of the Privatisation Administration. The workers, who came to Ankara by 10 busses, cried out their anger over the selling of Erdemir.

In Turkey, the army, upon OYAK, has got a great economic force within the state, and strengthens its place on the power also with this economic monopoly, besides with political instruments. By 743 million annual profit, OYAK is proud with itself by being in the forefront in Turkey in terms of profitability. As in all the fascist dictatorships, the army, while raining fascist cruelty on the working class and labourers, on the other hand, it steals the labour and work of the working class through OYAK.

TUPRAS

In TUPRAS, which is the biggest firms of Turkey and tried to be privatised, the workers showed that they are not going to accept the privatisation of their workplace and, therefore, are going to resist by going strike in the same day with workers from Izmir Aliaga, Kirikkale, Kocaeli and Batman refineries and in Yarimca petrol-chemical enterprise. On 2 September, the workers went on strike by using their power coming from the production and stopped the transportation of fuel-oil and fuel-oil products. There are about 9 imperialist and collaborator monopolies who want to buy TUPRAS, and this shows that the privatisation attack is a many sided attack and how TUPRAS feeds the appetites. The workers, who come across directly with the privatisation attack, also feel

and experience the necessity of the class solidarity. One of the good examples of this was shown by the CAYKUR (General Directorate of Tea Establishments), PETKIM and TEKEL workers who run along to the TUPRAS workers on strike. Leaving their work, the CAYKUR workers, who were also the target of the privatisation attack, marched to the side of TUPRAS workers in Kirikkale. The PETKIM and Telekom workers were also with the resistant workers in Izmir-Aliaga. All these solidarity actions showed the way to all victims of privatisation as well as being a source of moral and motivation to them.

Resistances in the dockyards

The AKP government want to close down the Istanbul Haydarpaşa dockyard and to award the Izmir Alsancak, Iskenderun, Samsun, Bandirma, Izmit Derince and Mersin dockyards to the native or foreign capitalists. The Mersin dockyard, which has got strategic importance for the Middle East and where the USA makes its military and weapon deployment, has been sold for 36 years. The Mersin dockyard workers, who oppose the privatisation, began to resist by opening tents from 13 July. And on 11 August, the Mersin dockyard workers left their work for 24 hours, while the Iskenderun, Haydarpaşa, Izmir and other dockyard workers left for 8 hours. Many unions and organisations, including Tekstil-Sen (Textile-Union), Istanbul Worker's League and EKB (Union of Labourer Women), have organised visits to support the workers.

TELEKOM

While struggling to prevent the selling of Telekom, which is in the frame of privatisation, the workers, on the other hand, have taken the decision to strike as their collective agreements entered into impasse. Through their actions, the Telekom workers said that they will not allow purchasers into the Telekom as following the footsteps of Seydisehir workers. And after the decision to sell in November, the workers went on to strike for indefinite period and occupied the workplace. The Telekom workers, having being suffered from the police attack, showed that they will resist in commitment.

A resistance in Northern Kurdistan

About 700 workers in Akyil Textile factory in the city of Amed in Northern Kurdistan have started to resist as a result of not getting their wages and the lack of payment of their insurance premiums. The resistance, which bears the characteristic of being the first massive worker action that was realised in Amed after the 12 September 1980 military fascist coup, ended in success and, therefore, it will heighten the working class struggle in Kurdistan. Having being witnessed to the TEKEL workers' struggle last year against the selling of TEKEL, Northern Kurdistan has this year also met with the workers' determinant struggle against the privatisation in Akyil textile factory and Batman oil refinery. The actions in Kurdistan, where the working class struggle steers comparatively low, carry the consciousness and motivation of struggling against privatisation, hunger, poverty and unemployment. Amed branch of the Socialist Platform of the Oppressed (ESP) showed that they are together with the Akyil workers through their actions.

50

Communists, knowing that a nation which oppresses other nation cannot be free, said that the freedom of the working class of Turkey and taking the real class consciousness to the class can only be possible by defending the Kurdish national and democratic rights and by struggling for them. They also underlined that a working class which does not fight for the political demands of other classes and social stratus neither can fight for their own demands, and leaned their revolutionary activity and practice to this idea.

The Level of the Working Class organised in the Unions

The working class, which reached to an important level of organisation in the unions in 1970s', today is quite unorganised as a result of the disunionisation attack. The level of the organised working class in the unions was about 2.5 million in the years of 70s'. By the 12 September 1980 military fascist coup, the organisational level of unions dropped, liquidated for important portion due to the banning of unions -at first, DISK (Confederation of Revolutionary Workers' Unions) where revolutionary and progressive work-

ers were organised- and so the unionist activities. The unionist organisation began to grow again only by the second half of 80s'. But it again come face to face with the disunionisation attack of the state in 97s' and, as a result of the attack, it went down to the lowest level in our day. According to the data received from DIE (State Statistic Institution), there are about 23 million people employed in Turkey and Northern Kurdistan and more than half of them are unregistered. About 9.5 million of them are paid workers and about 2 million are working with daily-fee. The unregistered workers are working without all forms of secured work, without insurances and unions. The number of organised workers in the unions is about 700 thousand. But an important portion of these are the workers working in the public enterprises which are face to face with privatisation attack and some of them already privatised. Privatisation and outsourcing is always pulling down the level of organisation in the public sector.

The public labourers have de facto created their unions and its umbrella organisation, KESK (Confederation of the Public Labourers' Unions), through a tough struggle that they conducted on the streets in the years of 90s'. However, similar situation is being observed here in this front also. The petty bourgeois reformist sections, which surrounded the heads of the unions created via heavy prices paid by the public labourers, are far from practicing a struggling line in the face of the bourgeoisies' political, ideological and organisational attacks. As it happened in the industrial action throughout the country on 27 April 2005, they are trying to ease the voices heightening from the base and the base pressure, and come out of the situation through some actions organised time to time and in certain calendared-days. But all these actions do not go beyond protesting and reach to the result-achieving level. Today the number of the organised public labourers in the unions is also about 700 thousand. Considering the organisation level of the working class, it can be seen that the public labourers are relatively organised. However, the privatisation and outsourcing attack is also lowering the organisation level of public labourers.

Today, as it was yesterday, bringing consciousness to, organising and raising the class against the neo-liberal attacks is standing before us as a burning task. And the unions, the tools of organising the working class against these attacks, are blocking the resisting workers' struggle rather than repulsing those attacks. What we mean here is of course the union management that acts with the understanding of union bureaucracy and yellow unionism. The unionist line, which is far from the understanding of class unionism, is doing unionism for wages, conducting fight to get-protect their seats instead of fighting bourgeoisie and its attacks. When this combines with the bourgeoisie's many sided attacks, including disunionisation and disorganisation, puts before the working class a two-sided task: Both to struggle against the unionist bureaucracy and the bourgeoisie.

There is no doubt that there are unions struggling on the basis of class unionism in the industrial branches such as textile, dockyard and leather. In Turkey, where the textile industry is developed, workers are working in a way without being organised, unionised and with lack of every form of work-guaranty in small or large thousands of workplaces and factories. The daily working-hours are much higher than 8 hours. Having being formed on the basis of class unionism in this branch of industry, the Tekstil-Sen started to organise workers in many workplaces since its foundation, recorded modest but valuable progresses.

Besides Tekstil-Sen, Limter-Is (Port, Dock and Vessel Construction-Restoration Workers' Union), Nakliyat-Is (Transportation Workers' Union) and Deri-Is (Shoe Industry, Leather and Leather Product Workers Union of Turkey) also do not consider the struggle only limited with the struggle for workers' economic-democratic rights. It is the task of the period to grow unions acting on the line of class unionism such as Tekstil-Sen, Limter-Is and Deri-Is, and to create similar unions.

The struggle conducted by Limter-Is and its protest demonstrations with mass participation of workers against the hard working conditions and the killings while working bring dockyard bosses face to face with tough

and fearful moments.

The work carried out in the textile and leather branch of industry in order to organise workers in the unions very often replied by throw out of workers, who have organised in the union, to the street by the bosses. But the determinant stance of the unions meets with the workers' defence of their workplaces, and de facto resistances develop in front of the workplaces. The resistance of the leather workers in Ileri and Birsenler factories in Corlu against the redundancy because of organising in the union, the resistance of

The resistances have entered into a militant line like occupation of workplaces, blocking roads, clashing with the police, which all of them give the signal of going beyond the borders of routine and traditional protesting.

the Gonen leather workers, the resistances of Polaris, Evita, Dalkiran and Anil Textile that were led by Tekstil-Sen in 2004 and ended with some achievements, the resistance of the Eris Textile workers against their sacking from their works because of being organised in the Tekstil-Sen in Izmir, the resistances took place in Serna Seral, Desan Weaving, Texture Sock and Antalya Rivienna Inter Textile are some examples of these resistances. While some of these resistances, which spread into long period, resulted with achievement of workers to return to their work, in general, resistances made workers to gain experiences in the struggle. Having being suffered from the police and gendarme attacks, many of these resistances cause new sparks of consciousness in terms of showing workers the necessity and importance of bringing together these singular actions and turning them into a great force.

Some results which should be taken from resistances

Above-mentioned resistances (of course there are many other resistances we could not mention) points out a development and

changing in the methods of struggle of the working class and the tools of struggle that it has been using. Although strikes and resistances are in most of the time conducted in the form of singular and local resistances, it has been seen that they make the capital and the government to have tough and stressful moments when they are especially supported by the other strata of the working class and the people. The resistances have entered into a militant line like occupation of workplaces, blocking roads, clashing with the police, which all of them give the signal of going beyond the borders of routine and traditional protesting. Especially the occupation of workplaces has developed the consciousness and spirit of united action, organisation and fight among the workers. The occupation of factories is a challenge against the state's privatisation attacks and so against the state, militarism and the regime parties. The workers have experienced the obligation and practice of uniting, organising and struggling against the bourgeoisie on the basis of their objective class interests, with their real class state of belonging and instinct, and without considering the difference of political tendency, religion, language, region and sex.

However, as it is seen in SEKA, Seydisehir, Erdemir and other resistances, the militant struggle in combination with the lack of a revolutionary leadership does not enough for the class to succeed. Although they have delayed the neo-liberal attacks and represent a school for politicisation of workers, such form of singular resistances could not ensure repulsing the neo-liberal attacks as a whole.

On the other hand, approaching the problem only within the frames of economic struggle and not seeing that the privatisation, at the same time, is an ideological and political attack of the capital, blocks the development of a struggle gaining rights. This is also what happened in SEKA, Pasabahce (Glass and Ceramic sector) and Seydisehir. Because unions limit the struggle with the economic demands, the capital's united attack is not being repulsed. When the conciliatory and traitorous attitude of the union bureaucracy is added to this, the resistances always share the same faith and end with defeat.

In the face of capital's united aggression, the organisation of the united stance of the working class is still continuing as being a burning task. In order to break resistances, the capital mobilises its forces in all. But on the working class front, the resistances are left singular in general. The workers, who in most of the time do not come across directly with attacks, show no interest to the resistances continuing in other workplaces. This situation weakens the local resistances and leads them to come face to face with the defeat. Yet, the workers resisting in the factories such as SEKA, Seydisehir and Erdemir were resisting against the privatisation on the name of whole class, and the anger exploded there was the anger of whole class.

Although the resistances we mentioned have not resulted with the achievements that are equivalent with the struggling practices of the workers, there are important experiences that these resistances led the working class to gain. Each resistances advanced by taking the heritage of the one before. Whilst Seydisehir marched from the footsteps of SEKA, the Erdemir and Mersin dockyard workers have followed the footsteps of Seydisehir. The workers have apprehended the necessity of the united struggle. They have understood the importance of getting the support of families, other workers and the people in order to win. Each of the resistances became the rehearsal of a "General Strike, General Resistance" in the local area. Once more they have tested in practice the historical and social role of the working class. The working class have activated, dragged other social classes and strata, i.e. women, youth, small-shop owners.

These resistances become the new struggling schools of the working class. The resister workers have shown in practice to their class brothers and sisters that they have to go beyond them because it is possible. They revealed that the privatisation, which is a political attack, can only be repulsed by a struggle with political content.

The families of workers have played an important role in the resistances. Workers' families, women and children did not leave alone their spouses or mothers-fathers, they

stood together against all type of attacks. Beside workers, the families have also seen the enemy face of the state against the workers and labourers; they apprehended in the struggle that the existing AKP government, which come to the power through great promises to the workers and labourers, is the friend of the capital, but the enemy of the labour and workers. As it happened in Seydisehir, the workers have collectively resigned from the regime parties and AKP.

Women in the Resistances

The women, whether they are workers or wives of the workers, have always taken part within and the forefront of the resistances that developed against the privatisation and other neo-liberal attacks. While the workers have resisted inside the factory when they occupied the SEKA, the women were in a competition in outside to grow the resistance. The efforts of the women have got determining place in defence of the Seydisehir resistance by the people of Seydisehir. The women, who run to the resistance by taking their children with them, have worked and are still working with heart and soul to spread the voice of the resistance to everywhere and to grow the support. It was the women who designed supporting actions in front of the factories with demonstrations, blocking of roads and meetings, and resisted against the police attacks.

The people's and small shopkeepers' support, which was partially created, has come to clear rather evidential in the Seydisehir resistance. The people of Seydisehir have owned the resistance and supported it by joining in the actions. The support of the people and the small shopkeepers gave strength and moral to the workers.

Despite of being valuable achievements, sample works and methods of struggle, the platforms established by vanguard workers and some unions in order to defend the resistance were not effective in mobilisation of the class whose organisational level is already very low and under the influence of the reformist and reactionary union lords that cannot be minimised.

The resistances mainly started as the spontaneous actions of workers facing with loos-

ing their workplaces, but reached to a point going beyond the unionist frames in the sector where they held. This situation both worried the state and the union lords. The attitudes of various union branches who sided with workers were tried to be broken by their headquarters.

As it happened in SEKA, the revolutionary parties and organisations were not able to make active intervention to the resistances with some exceptions. This situation, once more revealed the weakness the revolutionary parties' and organisations' ties with the class.

But the Marxist Leninist Communists have shown an important practice in setting relations with the resistances, defending and spreading out them. They come forefront both in the worker assemblies at the beginning of the year and making workers to discuss the struggle against privatisation, or through the tents that they opened in order to grow and generalise the spark lighted in SEKA and to be a barricade against the state's attacks, and to spread out the Resistance into the city of Izmit.

The rounds of unionist traitorousness have played the determining role in finishing the resistances. The task of the communist vanguard is to lead the workers to ensure its unity of the class-will by breaking the surroundings of the unionist traitorousness, and to enlighten their way.

Approach to the Class Movement and Some Experiences

In its 3rd Congress organised in 2002, MLCP has evaluated its ties with the class and work within the class with a critical eye and took concrete decisions. As a result of these decisions, it has entered into an intense effort in order to develop its ties with the working class, to enlighten the working class against neo-liberal attacks, to increase the consciousness of united and organised struggle and to fulfil the mission of being the vanguard party of the class. It conducted a practice also in the sphere of work among the class to bring into life the parole, "Let's Go to the Masses" that aims to develop ties with the working class and labouring masses.

It has putted forward the "demand...'*Let's Defend Our Workplaces against the Privatisation Terror*', which is the most massed and systematic way of redundancy, in order to stand against the seizure of hard-achieved rights of the working class and the awarding of enterprises to the internal and external monopolies accompanied with the ideological attack: 'the private property is almighty and unique', 'the state property and social property is bad'". And it organised activities under perspective of mobilising the vanguard workers and the unions to repulse the attacks such as privatisation, disunionisation, redundancies and slavery wages. In order to repulse the attacks faced by the working class and to let them overcome the situation that they are in, it acted under perspective of conducting struggle by leaning on to its own forces and together with undertakings to develop base initiatives such as the Workers' Mass Meetings, the Labour Platform and the Platform of Union Branches, and bring together in various platforms the unions or their branches.

54

It is the task of the Marxist Leninist Communists to enlighten, to organise and to pull into struggle the working class with a socialist perspective against the capital's neo-liberal attacks by the activation of its own forces. Here are some of the examples of their works that they carried out in that direction:

In 2003, there have been a concentrated enlightening activity was carried out under the name of "Flag March" in order to enlighten workers against the slavery laws and privatisations. The activity, which was started in Istanbul in workers' catchments, factories and neighbourhoods, in a short period spread into other cities. The vanguard workers from ESP (Socialist Platform of the Oppressed) organised a widespread agitation and propaganda work against the slavery laws and the neo-liberal attacks thereby talking with workers and labourers, distributing leaflets, putting up posters and collecting petitions in front of the factories, workers' catchments, dockyards, train stations, café shops and houses. The enlightening campaign, which was carried out in commitment despite to the attempts of state prohibitions

such as threats, attacks, detention and torture, provided communists to mobilise their own forces and to improve their self-confidence.

Throughout the year of 2004, in which division and disorganisation of the working class continued, the overall attacks of the capital continued with speed against the working class and the rights gained through struggle by the working class. On the other hand, the actions and reaction of the class on these attacks were divided, singular and were far from solidarity, politics and militancy. MLCP, which took the intervention within this situation into its agenda, decided to organise workers' assemblies in certain cities in order to debate on the problems and the ways of solutions together with vanguard workers, at first, and the workers as a whole. In the leaflets produced for assemblies, the aims were formulated as follows: "*The assemblies are aiming at opening the ways of developing a common initiative and will in the working class base. The assemblies are aiming at developing a search for solution of the problems by bringing together the organised and unorganised workers, the unionised and non-unionised workers, the insured and uninsured workers, public labourers, women working at home or as a cleaner and the unemployed. The assemblies are being organised in order to overcome unionist divisions, to increase the class solidarity and to develop the workers' initiative against the capital's attacks. The assemblies are aiming at uniting the singular workers, workplaces, and the struggle of workers and labourers, to open the way for the working class to act in the frames of a united, common programme of struggle against the capital.*"

The preparatory work for the assemblies with concrete agendas carried out through local and regional meetings. By involving workers and labourers in the preparatory works, the organisers followed a perspective to workers to own the assembly right from the preparatory works. The assemblies were organised in January 2005. Hundreds of workers, who came together in assemblies, discussed commonly the problems they face and the proposals for the solution. It was the

turn of workers in the assemblies, which were supported by attendance of many unions and organisations. The ones who were always quite-kept in silence, listeners went on to the podium, spoke and discussed about their problems.

In the assemblies, where the workers working in the branch of industries such as textile, metal, oil-chemical, transportation, dockyards, leather, service and food came together and discussed on what should be done in order to bring into open and strengthen the common will of all workers and labourers with insurance or not, unionised or not, it was underlined that the repulse of the attacks can only be possible by political stance, united will and militant struggle of the working class. For this, it was said, it is necessary to go forward by taking the de facto and legitimate struggle as the main, and the united and militant workers movement and a united popular resistance as it happened in Bolivia, Argentina, Brazil and South Korea can be sample.

Having been taken the defence of workplaces against the privatisation and the solidarity with continuing struggles in the workplaces targeted by privatisation as the task, the assemblies showed that it is the foremost duty of every worker to develop class solidarity, the break of individualism and estrangement can only be possible by action and the necessity of increasing the tools for the class solidarity and to come together in different branches of industry on local and regional levels without making a separation between insured and uninsured workers, between workers who have organised in the unions and unorganised ones, between workers, public labourers and unemployed workers.

It was said that the union bureaucracy divides and breaks the working class, and this division can be overcome by common organisation and class solidarity. It was noted that it is necessary to bring into open the grassroot initiative against the dividing efforts of the union lords and bureaucrats, and in order to do that the unification at the base must be strengthened by uniting in the common platforms of struggle through

developing the collective movement of the struggling workers and the struggling unions.

It was said that overcoming of unionist crisis would be possible by organising workers from factory to factory, workplace to workplace because the unionist bureaucracy cannot do this. The workers were called to struggle in order to save unions from the ideological hegemony of the bourgeoisie, the union lords, and to make the class unionism dominant.

MLCP, which took the intervention within this situation into its agenda, decided to organise workers' assemblies in certain cities in order to debate on the problems and the ways of solutions together with vanguard workers, at first, and the workers as a whole.

In the assemblies, where the decision of founding Worker's Leagues in the regions and catchments was taken, it was expressed that the Worker's Leagues are the unions of action of the struggling workers and are the common will created by organised and unorganised, insured and uninsured workers, public labourers and unemployed workers.

And emphasising of the formation of associations of unemployed and workers, and the creation of forms of organisations -that develop the workers solidarity with the unemployed- in order to organise the fight for unity of social solidarity and support in the spheres of living of workers and unemployed, was paying attention to the common problems and the struggle of working and not working sections due to lack of employment of the class.

In the assemblies, it was noted that the attacks of the imperialist monopolies have an international characteristic, therefore, the working class should also organise with more strength its international unity and solidarity against capitalism. A proletarian

internationalist stance was shown by saluting the German workers and unemployed struggle against Hartz IV, the strike actions of South Korean and Italian workers and the struggles of the working class and labourers in Bolivia, Argentina, Ecuador, Brazil and Russia. It was stressed that the agendas and demands of international workers' movement are gradually combined, in connection with that, the opportunities of the regional solidarity and regional struggle of the working class has been increased, therefore, there is a need for observation of opportunities of solidarity and development of concrete relations between the working class of Turkey, the Middle East, Balkans and Caucasus.

The Worker's Assemblies have not only become the discussion places, they ended with series of concrete decisions for action and struggle on the subjects that were mentioned above and regarding the actual political struggle. Followings are some of the decisions that have been taken at the assemblies: to take concrete actions against the privatisation, to work for 8 March and 1st May to be paid holidays, to organise campaigns against uninsured and non-unionised working, to organise Worker's Leagues in the neighbourhoods and catchments, to create opportunities in order to organise unemployed workers and to form associations where it's possible, to defend and support all resistances against the capital's attacks, to organise a campaign against getting tax from the minimum wage. Taking into account that the workers and labourers do not know their rights, it was decided to organise meetings under the name of "We are Learning Our Rights" and education activities explaining the class interests of the workers, and to fight against the cultural degeneration.

The workers, who organised meetings after the assemblies in order to bring into life the decisions, have founded Worker's Leagues in the neighbourhoods and regions

as it was the necessity of the decisions. The assemblies represented a modest contribution in the struggle of the working class through achieving the Worker's Leagues and activating a section of the class even though it was a small step. The results of the assemblies have become a pushing force in developing solidarity with many resistances, at first with SEKA and Seydisehir, which developed after January, in increasing the struggle against privatisation and in the struggle for other problems of the class.

The campaign, which was started at the beginning of summer of 2005 by Tekstil-Sen and Worker's League under the heading "We want to work 35 hours a week with insurance and to organise in unions" provides the workers to develop the consciousness of getting organised and having rights such as insurance and social security.

The light carried to the textile sector by the Tekstil-Sen spreads speedily. Tens of workers getting consciousness, organised and thrown out from the workplace are developing obstinate and deterrent resistances under the leadership of Tekstil-Sen. Some of these resistances are ending in successes and, therefore, give strength and morale to other sections of the working class.

There is no doubt that the resistances we mentioned above, took results from and explained some experiences does not mean the working class has overcome the attacks that it faces. But the development and militancy in overcoming the problems and in the line of struggle will speed up the class's march forward.

MLCP, with the consciousness and responsibility of being the working class party, will continue until crowning with victory its efforts to enlighten, organise and lead the working class to fight along the perspective of revolution and socialism. ✊



**MARXIST LENINIST COMMUNIST PARTY
TURKEY / NORTH KURDISTAN**

“...MLCP believes in the need for an international coordination or an international relationship to develop a common political will and action among the anti-imperialist centres and platforms in the world and in various regions. In these terms, a united anti-imperialist intervention and struggle on a regional level will also advance the anti-imperialist struggle both in each different country and on the international arena. This will also create the possibilities and conditions for revolutionary and communist parties to become politically, ideologically and organisationally closer upon the real relations on the road to the world communist movement’s international unification.”