

Issue 18 - Winter 2018/19

International Theoretical Organ

RED DAWN

Workers and Oppressed of All Countries, Unite!



Bonapartism? Right-Wing Populism?

Neo-fascism

Autocracy?

Authoritarianism?

**Marxist Leninist Communist Party
Turkey / Kurdistan**



RED DAWN

18

Winter 2018/19

International Theoretical Organ of MLKP

w w w.ml k p - i n f o . o r g
ma i l@ml k p - i n f o . o r g

Contents

Preface.....	4
Neo-Fascism.....	5
Right-Wing Populism: The Theory of Showing Fascism as Moderate.....	12
Is the Regime in Turkey Authoritarian, Autocrat or Fascist?.....	18
Transformation of Fascism in Turkey under AKP.....	25
Popular Militia in the Resistance Against the Palace Fascism, Revolutionary Strategy and Partisan War.....	30
The Dialectic of Breaks and Leaps at the Developmental Thresholds of a Revolutionary.....	32

Preface

Trump, Bolsonaro, Orban, Modi, Erdogan...the list can be continued.

In terms of existential crisis of capitalism, the threat of fascism manifestates itself more and more in the political world arena. A general polarization tendency within the whole ruling order deepens, fascist parties and leaders have been elected into state positions and mobilize their own mass basis. In view of these developments, also theoretical discussions on fascism spark.

In this issue of Red Dawn, we focus on a theoretical analysis on fascism and different conceptualizations on the topic.

The introductory article „Neo-fascism“ gives a general understanding of today's fascism and analyses its historical development. Neo-fascism developed as a result of imperialist globalization. With an analysis of current examples, the article explains fascism in the context of capitalism's existential crisis and describes its specific lines. But fascism does not remain unanswered: growing revolts and the search for freedom pave the way for revolutionary resistance.

The articles „Right-Wing Populism: The Theory of Showing Fascism as Moderate“ and „Is the Regime in Turkey Authoritarian, Autocrat or Fascist?“ criticize the attempts of blurring the reality of fascism with different conceptualizations created in Turkey and the World. From bourgeois liberals to liberal leftists, these theories are presented and prevent a precise understanding of today's fascism and a clear antifascist consciousness.

The article „Transformation of Fascism in Turkey under AKP“ describes the historical development and transformation of the fascist dictatorship under the rule of Erdogan and his party, the AKP in Turkey. The ideological transformation of fascism under Erdogan, which we describe as a political-islamist transformation, together with the establishment of a fascist chieftaincy regime led by the president in his palace, couldn't solve the ongoing regime crisis in Turkey, which is caused by the revolutionary struggle for national freedom, democracy and socialism, the struggle for religious freedoms and freedom of women.

The article „Popular Militia in the Resistance Against the Palace Fascism, Revolutionary Strategy and Partisan War“ was published in the Central Organ of MLKP, Voice of the Party, and describes the understanding of MLKP, to use every means and forms of struggle, its tactic of active defense in the revolutionary struggle against fascism and the role of popular militia.

Finally, we publish an article on „The Dialectic of Breaks and Leaps at the Developmental Tresholds of a Revolutionary“, in which the transition moments in the life of a revolutionary are scrutinized. With this ideological discussion, the importance of analysing, understanding and evaluating transitional periods, which appear in the life, is underlined.

Some articles in this issue were published in Marxist Theory (Marksist Teori) and translated by us.

As revolutionary forces we prepare ourselves for the violent confrontations with fascism.

In this sense, we hope to contribute for a deeper understanding of today's fascism on an international level and to strengthen our joint antifascist struggle!

We look forward to meet again in the next issue!

Neo-Fascism

For some years and with different conceptualizations, the topic of neofascism has been hotly debated by both, bourgeois-liberals and reformist-left circles, as well as revolutionary forces. In fact, when looking at the past decades, we can see that fascist parties and leaders have successively taken positions in many countries, such as presidencies, prime ministries, coalition partnerships or have at least seen serious increases in votes.

In Hungary, the leader of the government party Fidesz, Victor Orban, who has been in power since 2010, has been pursuing a racist and anti-immigrant state policy that gradually eliminates bourgeois civil-democratic rights in order to establish a dictatorial regime. In the racist and fascist lane, Orban is in competition with the Jobbik Party, which was inspired by Hitler.

In India since 2014, the Bharatiya Janata Party has been the sole governing party whose leader Narendra Modi is a fanatical supporter of Hinduism. He is the perpetrator of the massacre in Gujarat in 2002, where numerous Muslims were killed, the carrier of the mission was described with his own words as “burying the secular republic which is an aberration built by foreign powers”.

Donald Trump, roaring loudly „make America great again“, has been insistent to build a wall on the Mexican border against migrants from Latin America and to prevent migrants from the Middle East from entering the United States through a legal bullying, since his entry to the White House in 2016. With a Ku-Klux-Klan jargon, he insults Muslim citizens of the USA by saying „they are the trojan horses among us“. The fact that he does not refrain from affronting women at any chance makes him the almost complete symbol of male reaction on a social and political level.

Jair Bolsonaro, who won the presidential elections in Brazil in October 2018, praises the torturers of the military dictatorship, speaks of „arming the people against gangs and terrorists“, and promises to extend the authority of the police. He codes blacks, academics, dissident journalists and trade unionists, LGBTI+’s as „reds“ and threatens them with a „clean-up, which has never been seen before in the country.“ He is such a misogynist, that he even said about a deputy of parliament „she’s not even worth to be raped“ and such a Nazi admirer, that he is proud of his grandfather’s services in the Hitler army.

After the elections in June 2018, Tayyip Erdogan has been institutionalizing the fascist chieftaincy regime in presidential form. The official ideology of the Turkish bourgeois state has been in a transformation with a fascist, political-islamist quality and its institutional structure is centralized in the palace in form of presidency. The fascist state terror in Turkey, as well as the colonial war of occupation in Kurdistan is mounting up and expanding more and more.

Two other fascist figures: The new dictator of the Philippines, Rodrigo Duterte, who has a history of socialist discourse, but praises himself today with the destruction of gangs without any legal accountability; and Jarosław Kaczyński, the prime-minister of Poland, who draws attention with his efforts to try to develop a direct control of government over the judicial system and to remove the evolution theory from the education curriculum.

Let’s add National Rally (former National Front) in France, AfD in Germany, United Kingdom Independence Party in England, Northern League in Italy, Vox in Spain, Golden Dawn in Greece, Freedom Party in Austria, Vlaams Bloc in Belgium, Freedom Party in the Netherlands, True Finns in Finland, Progress Party in Norway, Svoboda and Right Sector in Ukraine and others to the table. These racist-fascist parties in Europe generally not only increase their electoral votes and enter bourgeois parliaments, they also even participate in coalition governments in some countries.

Racist-fascist parties are now well-recognized actors in the bourgeois political scene. And the fascist leaders look like cloned in some ways.

Historical Development of Fascism

Fascist parties and leaders of our time show some significant similarities with the fascism of the period between the two World Wars. Some of them do not even feel the need to hide their emulation of the Italian and German regimes in the 1930s.

As it is known, fascism came in view as the product of the age of imperialism and the proletarian revolutions.

After the re-division war, the capitalist world found itself in a political turmoil and economic crisis, moreover, it was shaken by the October Revolution and confronted with the development of worker’s movements and communist parties in almost every country in Europe. The traditional bourgeois parties had been politically bankrupt, the bourgeois parliaments had no longer been able to promise any hope and the bourgeois states had been in a hegemony crisis. Germany was under the yoke of the Versailles Agreement, sealing the surrender of Germany in the war, Italy was frustrated due to its exclusion in the division of the war swag. Workers had been suffering in claws of unemployment and poverty, millions of dispossessed and wrecked middle class members, who lost their future in the dark, were in search of a response and way-out. At the scene of ruling classes, on the other hand, there was nationalism, expansionism abroad and escalation of hardening in the regime forms.

These conditions, which pointed out the general crisis of imperialist capitalism, had offered the fascist movements the opportunity to grow fast. In Italy and Germany, the fascists initially represented the interests of the petty bourgeoisie and the middle bourgeoisie in their program. They

increased their political strength by leaning on the middle classes, appealing to the working class and particularly paramilitarizing the lumpen proletariat.

Mussolini's fascist program of 1919 and the 25-point program of the Nazis in 1920 were containing similar social promises: employment safety for workers, increase in wages, protection of small shopkeepers, more taxes for big property owners, price controls, increase in public investments and dissemination of social services. Their political agitation included the hatred against capital owners and their puppets, politicians and targeted to make their own nation prosperous again and to restore the level it deserves in the world.

In the ideological scene, the proletariat, as the revolutionary historical subject, was confronted with the nation, as the fascist historical subject. Accordingly, fascists would ensure national unity and let the fallen nation rise again. The myth of a „fascist revolution“ found correspondence in Mussolini's revival metaphor of the Roman Empire and Hitler's revival of the Holy Roman-Germanic Empire, and their discourses of a „New Italy“ and „New Germany“. The Jews served as a necessary hostile external factor, for the fascist redefinition of nation, thus, for the inclusion of the masses from the lower and middle classes in their own ranks by racist-chauvinist poisoning.

For the fascists, who wanted to overcome the general crisis of capitalism by reviving the glorious past of the nation, the main enemy were the increasingly strengthening communists, who wanted to divide their nation into classes with the goal of overcoming them. Moreover, the communists were the main perpetrator of political chaos and had to be crushed immediately.

Fascist paramilitary organizations emerged in Italy as Mussolini's Black Shirts, in Germany as Hitler's Storm Troops, or in Romania as Antonescu's Iron Guards. They embarked on attacking the revolutionary worker's movement and communist parties. In addition to these, the betrayal of social democracy to the working class and lateness of communists in building an anti-fascist front made it easier for the fascist movements to win masses and seize power.

The monopoly bourgeoisie felt the need to both satisfy their imperialist hunger, as well as to rebuild the mass basis of their sovereignty, and to suppress the proletarian revolutionary movement by terror. The fascists, with their masses of aggression, had fulfilled the function of the bourgeois state's violent repression, thereby developed organic rela-

tions with the bourgeois class and the state.

As the bourgeois rulers could no longer rule as before, as all other bourgeois parties were getting exhausted and as the bourgeois-democratic state structure could no longer absorb the revolutionary rise, the need for new forms of bourgeois political sovereignty objectively increased. Fascism, which had strengthened as much as to demand political power, on the other hand, was a direct response to this need. In a dilemma between revolutionary chaos and fascist order, the bourgeois classes in Italy and Germany chose to hand the power to fascism. As a result, the bourgeois states had become fascist and fascism had nationalized itself.

In addition to Italy and Germany, the fascist dictatorships between the two world wars institutionalized in various ways and ruled in Bulgaria, Hungary, Austria, Portugal, Spain, Japan, Romania and Croatia.

The fascist regime was more than just a change of governmental body as the bourgeois political executive organ, it appeared through a profound change of the political and judicial structures of the bourgeois state, the legislative and executive relations, the state and party affiliations, even when a constitutional shell was protected. While socialism was the negation of bourgeois democracy outside the existing order, fascism was its negation within the order. Fascism repealed the state structure based on bourgeois-democratic representation in order to save the crippling capitalist system and the bourgeois state whose social and political foundations had fallen into disintegration. The executive was freed from parliamentary control and the state apparatuses were largely centralized, it was centralized so much that the state ended up with an identification with its leader.

The fascists set to begin crushing the struggle of the working class and the oppressed with a merciless counterrevolutionary force, dissolving the entire elements of the bourgeois opposition, and building a racist, chauvinistic ideological hegemony within society. Also in the arena of imperialist competition and war, they took up attaining new colonies and lands of influence with the reorganization of their economic and military forces and facilities.

There was no room for other parties, unions, for social and political organizations apart from the fascist corporate organizations, for press and publications which did not represent the fascist line. From culture to sexuality, from art to pleasures, from education to family, from leisure places to medical institutions and population planning, all elements of social life had to be formed according to fascist ideological norms. A racist, chauvinist, sexist, heterosexist, disciplinarian, aggressive, monist propaganda downpour surrounded the society. Loyalty to the leader was enforced not only in the official political organs of the state, but also in universities, newspapers, art houses or social service institutions, that is, in all structures of socialization.

Where the fascists came to power, the contradictions between their anti-ruling class rhetoric voicing to the lower and middle classes, and their commitment to the interests of the ruling class, which were contrary to the interests of the lower and middle classes, objectively led to a tendency



of decomposing in their mass base. But it was the chauvinistic wind they had blown through imperialist war, the benefits they got by increasing public spending of the state and the wealth transfer from the national communities to which they had committed genocide; what had hampered the decomposition tendencies from occurring with all its consequences. After Hitler came to power in Germany in 1933, the number of unemployed reached up to 6 million. That number being zeroed in 1938 was an indication why the mass support for the bloody power of the Nazis didn't melt away.

Under the extraordinary circumstances of the extreme sharpening of contradictions between the fractions of the ruling class, and between the ruling class and the oppressed classes, it seemed like as if the fascist bourgeois state had gained autonomy from the classes in terms of ideological and political features. Indeed, up to a certain point, this was also necessary to get results with ideological-political interventions in the afore mentioned contradictions. Moreover, with the identification of the lower and middle classes with the fascist state, as well as with the fascist leader, who represented the „national will“, it became easier to turn the state and leader into a cult. Yet, behind the image of autonomy from classes, what lays was the reality, that the fascist state tied thousands of threads with the financial oligarchy, and shaped the capital accumulation model as extremely convenient for the big bourgeoisie and tended to seek new foreign markets and colonization areas for monopoly capital.

For this reason, the Komintern stated in its famous definition associated with Dimitrov, „Fascism is the open terrorist dictatorship of the most reactionary, most chauvinistic and most imperialist elements of finance capital.“ This analysis clearly illustrated the class quality of the fascist dictatorship and its political function within the framework of imperialist capitalism.

The Period Of Military Fascist Coups

After the fascist bloc had suffered a defeat in World War II which had taken the shape of an anti-fascist war, the world split into two enemy camps. The worldwide contradiction that arose between the capitalist and socialist blocs, and was symbolized with the Cold War between the USA and the USSR, had marked the entire subsequent period. While, on the one hand, the people's democracies in Eastern Europe and the Balkans and the revolution in China strengthened the socialist bloc, the national liberation struggles of the colonies achieving their political independence, led to devastating consequences for the capitalist world.

The capitalist bloc united in the orbit of the USA aimed to stop the expansion of the influence-spheres of the USSR and to defeat the danger of a revolutionary and socialist rule in the capitalist countries. The establishment of secret, fascist counterrevolutionary organizations within the bourgeois state apparatuses became a main method for this aim. The fascist cadres of the period between the two world wars, were deployed in the secret services and counter-revolutionary structures of the bourgeois states. In short, the fascist counter-guerrilla called Gladio was structured

as an internal element of the Western European bourgeoisie by the hand of NATO. In the Western imperialist centers which stood against socialism with the bourgeois democracy and the „welfare state“, the financial oligarchy kept its counter-guerrilla as an anti-communist hit force for extraordinary times.

The counter-guerrilla organization in the neocolonies was again organized by the US. This secret fascist structure under the control of imperialism had been the focus of anti-communist work in almost all dependent capitalist countries. Sabotages, assassinations, provocation and disinformation against revolutionary developments were produced in their workbench. The counter-guerrilla headquarters organized paramilitary gangs depending on the location, preparing them as a counterrevolutionary center for possible civil wars.

In the period after World War II, the new fascist dictatorships were typically the work of American-backed fascist military coups, staged by these counter-guerrilla organizations. One by one, in Iran, Brazil, Indonesia, Greece, the Philippines, Chile, Uruguay, Argentina, Turkey, Pakistan and other countries, fascist regimes were founded by military coups. In the neocolony countries, where revolutionary movements along with deep economic and political crises were growing, also meaning that these countries were the weakening links of imperialist chain, military coups rushed to the aid to sustain the US hegemony and bourgeois rule.

Military, fascist powers in the neocolonies, as open terrorist dictatorships of the imperialist oligarchy and collaborative bourgeoisie, began to crush the danger of revolution with all their might. Common features of ruling fascism in these countries were the liquidation of bourgeois-democratic featured political institutions as much as these existed, the extreme centralization of political power functions in the executive, the attempt to brutally crush all revolutionary and democratic forces, the establishment of a nationalist, chauvinist and anti-communist official ideology and thus the legitimization of the fascist state terror through their identification with the „national will“ and the consolidation of anti-Soviet foreign relations.

The first wave of fascism consisted of monopoly capital's reaction to the rise of world proletarian revolution in the central countries of capitalism. This second wave, on the other hand, was an offensive of finance capital in the peripheral countries of capitalism, against the renewed revolutionary rises in an atmosphere of Cold War balance and against the national liberation victories. Both waves of fascism confirmed Lenin, who pointed out that imperialism systematically produces political reaction.

The Political Result Of Existential Crisis

In the early 1990s, following the collapse of the Soviet bloc and the receding of revolutionary danger, the world bourgeoisie were jubilant with its triumph and felt less of a need for fascist counter-guerrilla organizations and fascist military coups. In recent years, fascist military coups and dictatorship following the example of Egypt and Thailand have been increasingly rare, while fascist movements that

come to the fore in the election ballots grow.

This new type of fascism that has come to the forefront in this new historical period, is peculiar to imperialist globalization with all its distinctive features and owes its current development to the existential crisis of capitalism.

The structural congestion occurred during the period of „welfare state“ within the capital accumulation model was put back on track of recovery through neoliberalism. Education and health services, as well as all public services were assigned to the service of capital expansion and state enterprises were exposed to plunder by privatization. Two tendencies in the capital movements have become dominant: investments in cheap labor-force countries and investments in financial transactions. Because this was the only way to increase the low profit rates. As the capital accumulation process gets financialized and the speculative capital played a more dominant role, chronic excess capital was accumulated at one end and chronic excess labor-force was accumulated at another. And both were more and more out of reach of one another.

Construction of a „world factory“ by the world monopolies, the enforced abolition of all kinds of national barriers for the global circulation of capital, the enactment of international laws for the interests of the financial oligarchy and the transformation of capitalism in peripheral countries into an internal phenomenon, ultimately removed the social material ground on which the bourgeois nation-state placed its foothold. As neocolony countries became financial-economic colonies, the working class in Western capitalist countries could no longer benefit the imperialist exploitation. The heavy class devastation in the financial-economic colonies has led to an utmost increase of immigration of laborers to the Western capitalist countries. Imperialist aggression and war in the Middle East, on the other hand, triggered an immense flow of poor Muslim population to Europe.

Social rights of workers were trimmed and wages were lowered. Subcontracting, disorganization and precarization have largely spread and unemployment has grown like an avalanche. The capital shifting to cheap labor-force countries has led workers in the capitalist centers to face the dilemma of decline in wages or unemployment. The expropriation of small property owners and pushing them into the ranks of the proletariat have gained momentum. The abyss between rich and poor has grown rapidly and many times more. As the practice of „welfare state“ became history, the contradictions between capital and labor, as well as between the state and the people have intensified.

The great financial-economic crisis of 2008, on the contrary, was an expression of the existential crisis of capitalism. It becomes obvious that capital has completely lost the ability to develop the productive forces, thus turned into an absolute shackle against social progress. Thus, workers and laborers, including those in the capitalist metropolises, can no longer expect any future hope in the capitalist order. According to a survey conducted in 2015 in Europe, the vast majority of families no longer believe that their children will live in a better world. The percentage of non-be-

lievers in this survey was 85% in France, 68% in England and 58% in Germany. What we see here is the reaching to the end of this entire social formation, with its economic, political, ideological and ecological dimensions.

When toiling people, whose working and living conditions have rapidly deteriorated, who have fallen into the swirl of unemployment and poverty, find in front of themselves, the traditional bourgeois parties, whose programs and rhetoric are getting to be the same, they started to react more against the current bourgeois political order. An extraordinary erosion of faith has occurred both against the mainstream bourgeois parties harnessed by neoliberalism, and against the bourgeois democratic parliaments, whose main premises are formed by these bourgeois parties. The bourgeois rule has more and more lost the ability to produce consent and to refresh its hegemony, with the liberal-democratic norms of its time and with the essential ideological variants, in regard of the working people. All of this has brought an escalation of political polarization in the society.

In many of the capitalist countries, the new fascist movements have experienced a course of accelerating growth since the 2008 depression until today. As we see in the picture drawn above, this is not coincidental at all.

On the one side of the coin, there was already the reality of bourgeois states, whose bourgeois-democratic laws are being trimmed and which are increasingly shifting to authoritarian forms of rule, as a result of sharpening class contradictions and political contradictions, as well as the raging aggravation of inter-imperialist competition. Passing to the state of emergency under the government of Socialist Party in France, consolidation of the strictly centralized and repressive rule of Putin, paving the way of a lifelong presidency for Xi Jinping in China are different reflections of this reality.

On the other side of the coin, there stands the massacre attacks of ISIS against the people in the US and the EU. While ISIS attacks caused anxiety and hostility against Muslim migrants, at the same time, the mass basis of ISIS gained an enormous extensiveness within the poor Muslims masses, who suffer from the imperialist plunder wars in the Middle East or from social exclusion in the imperialist centers.

It was not difficult for a blind consciousness to spread, which accuses the migrants to be the reason for the loss of life standards of the previous period, in the Western capitalist countries, among the working class, which was subjected to an ideological collapse after the collapse of the Soviet bloc, and was disintegrated in its organizing capacity as a result the neoliberal policies of capital. The responsibility of the decline in wages, job losses, the worsening of living conditions, the rising insecurity due to street mobs were all put on the poor migrants. Almost everywhere and day by day, people started to feel insecure in different aspects; the loss of jobs and social security has incited an economic insecurity, the bourgeois parliamentary representation crisis has incited a political insecurity and the ISIS aggression or mafia violence has incited a physical insecurity. This mass-psychology of insecurity became the ground for

the reactionary longing for the protection of a strong nation-state.

All in all, neofascist parties and movements find the opportunity to strengthen fast on this social ground on which they move.

Lines of Neofascism

Naturally and inevitably, fascism shapes itself according to social and political traditions, historical and cultural influences, as well as to the specific structural characteristics of the lower and middle classes, dominant social and political conflict points, even more, according to the changes in the technological structure of the capital accumulation model, to specific class-related or politic power relations of a certain period and the existing relationship hierarchy of the state systems. Moreover, this formation is a phase in itself, a state of becoming, it also shows fundamental differences between phases of ruling and before ruling. Therefore, today's fascist movements and leaders can not be exact copies of fascism in 1930s or 1970s, nor can they be identical with each other today. Characteristic factors, such as the motif of national revival, expansionism, nationalism, biological racism, militarism, anti-communism, culture of leadership cult, anti-democratic discourse, one-party regimes, party-state modeling, paramilitary organization, corporatism, misogyny, heterosexism, homophobia or disgust with intellectuals, therefore, can't appear in a particular fascist movement all together. The fascist quality of the movement is determined by the general direction of its ideological texture, political goals and functions, as well as its practical mode of existence.

Just like fascism in Italy and Germany initially had included in its program generally the interests of the middle and petty bourgeois, which had been pushed into destruction and uncertainty due to the crisis of capitalism and had influenced the masses of the working class in the period between the two world wars; today's fascism either leans on the dispossessed middle classes and the unemployed strata of working class or at least tries to make demagogic bonds with various demands of these classes. The political agitation against the privileges of monopoly capital, the degeneration of traditional bourgeois politicians and the fallacies of intellectuals are quite similar in the words of the past and current fascist leaders.

Anti-communism is also a structural ideological and political feature of neofascism. But today, hostility to migrants in combination with racism is more prominent. The fascists target migrants as responsible for poverty and misery and as „parasites that absorb the blood of the nation“, or target various national and religious communities as „enemies of the nation“. They channel the accumulated anger as a result of the social decay of the capitalist neoliberal policies, towards migrants or oppressed national and religious communities, thus pulling this anger out of agenda of the class conflict at one swoop.

Reactionary nationalism stemming from the middle classes is a reaction to the politics of imperialist globalization. New fascist parties do not openly defend the politics of „welfare state“ period. But what they defend, such as the



strengthening of the nation state once again, nationalist protectionist economic policies, and opposition to EU, corresponds to the political tendencies of those sections of the middle classes contradicting with imperialist globalization. Depending on these defense, their promises to increase investment and employment in the country can be tempting among the working class and the poor. The fascists manage to assemble those who have lost their class status and even their dignity and their dreams in a racist and nation-statist political rank with the aim to regain what they lost. When you see the simultaneity of the usurpation of the achievements of the working class in „welfare state“ period and the „national“ meltdown of the nation-state, when the traditional bourgeois parties turned into almost copies of one another and lost their „national“ features, there is nothing surprising here that the reaction to these creates a longing for revival of the nation-state. It is no coincidence that Le Pen receives many votes in the impoverishment areas of France where the industry was moved, the employment hit the bottom, or that in the same sort of areas of England more approval for the Brexit has followed.

Hitler and Mussolini had voiced the desire for the old in a deeply shaken bourgeois society, pledged to revive the nation, and prescribed racism and chauvinism at the top of their recipe of a „fascist revolution“. Now it is Trump and Modi who, with all their racist-chauvinist arguments, are casting the flag of a return to the strong nation-state and clinging to past reactionary values and traditions. The supremacy of the German „Aryans“ or the Italian „vanguards of civilization“, the supremacy of white evangelic Americans or the Hindus from upper castes; history and countries change, surely so is the forms of racism. Yesterday, it was Jews and gypsies who were marginalized, today it is the Afro-Americans, Muslims or Latin Americans.

Today the emphasizes of the fascists are nation, leader, state, flag, language as a solution against the encirclement of domestic and foreign enemies and their threats. What they mark as enemy is sometimes the stigmatized western world, sometimes the international capital and imperialism, which are emptied from its true content, in general, it is migrants or various national and religious communities,

often homosexuals or atheists, thus these are rendered as pillar for a new „national identity“ construction. As a legitimization conception of fascism, the “national will” fill its content with the rhetoric opposing to “traitors”, “terrorists”, “separatists”, “foreign focal points and their extensions”.

Fascism remains the spearhead of patriarchy. On the ideological ground, womanhood described through „motherhood“ and „partnership“, together with masculinity identified with credibility and strength; on the rhetorical ground, the reckless use of patriarchal language depreciates women; on the political ground, the attempts to abolish acquired legal rights of women, starting with the right of abortion and the provocation of masculine violence against women are all historically and currently characteristic elements of fascism. How much is the resemblance between Mussolini, who said „war belongs to men, motherhood to women“ and Erdogan who is constantly sermonizing women for even more births!

There are also fascist movements, such as Golden Dawn in Greece, or Right Sector in Ukraine, which initially base on increasing their political activity on the streets, but also others, such as National Rally in France or the Party of Freedom in Austria, which prioritizes the electoral successes. In any case, neo-fascism tends to permeate both the street, and the ballot, as well as the daily life just as in its historical experiences, from which it is inspired. The fact that fascist paramilitary gangs do not yet patrol the streets does not prove that these will not spread and strengthen depending on the hardening of political struggles.

In countries where capitalist development is comparatively still at a low level and religion still has a strong social and political influence, while the modern, more secular bourgeois ideologies are losing influence, whereas fascism advances more by basing on a political-religious ground. The fascist lines of Erdogan leaning on Islam and Modi leaning on Hinduism, for example, recall the fascisms of the time between the two wars, in terms of both their aggression and massacrer feature, as well as their monism and claim to revive the „old“. Political-islamist organizations such as ISIS, Taliban, Al-Qaeda and Boko Haram, both with their mass experience and the ruling practices in the areas under their control, point out the fact that political Islam will interlock with fascism in the East in general. The anger and hatred of the poor and those who had to leave their homes against the rich and the states of the rich, against imperialism and its plundering wars, are turned into a rancor against the “nonbelievers” through the fascist organizations.

The ideological-political line pursued by neo-fascism and the program it upholds before it takes the power usually do not coincide with the interests of the world monopolies. National-protectionist measures, financial controls, restrictions on capital exports, public investments to increase employment are not aligned with the neoliberal economic policies of the financial oligarchy. Even, as the monopoly capital is in search of wringing the working class and the laborers dry, fascist leaders are preaching to regulate the exploitation of the labor force by capitalism. In some financial-economic colonies, fascist rulers, such as Duterte,

Erdogan, or Modi easily dares to follow policies unfitting with imperialism under international political conditions, in which the imperialist hegemony of the USA weakens.

Apart from the countries where revolutionary or reformist left is seriously rising, neo-fascist parties and movements are neither invited to power by the financial oligarchy, nor are they directly led by them. The bourgeoisie getting united in France in order to prevent Le Pen from taking the head of the bourgeois state, or many monopoly bosses and senior bourgeois politicians in the US mentioning about the resistance against Trump, have such a meaning.

Nevertheless, fascist parties and leaders, whether voluntarily or not, fulfill the policies of imperialist globalization in those countries where they are in power. Because they have no other choice. Orban, Modi or Bolsonaro are the typical examples of this. Compensation methods like state’s infrastructure investments, social assistance or even „charity“ organizations, can not prevent the tendency of dismemberment within their mass base, due to the discrepancy between their rhetorics against the ruling class and the current politics in favor of these ruling classes. Moreover, fascist powers especially in the financial-economic colonies are constantly bumping into the contradiction between their ideological and political discourse speaking to masses and their mediocrity in power, since they have neither economic freedom of movement to meet the workers’ demands nor have they military and economic capacity to expand. In this context, even Trump, who is in a much more advantageous situation, tries to continue playing the impossible game in the field of tension between two opposing poles, representing the interests of one part of the monopolistic bourgeoisie and addressing the lower and middle classes.

Beyond all these, neo-fascism offers capital a two-dimensional actual political possibility. One is that fascist parties ideologically and politically hold the sections of laboring masses within the limits of capitalism, the sections which back these parties and still are reactionary to the policies of financial oligarchy. And two is that they become the „scapegoats“ of the bourgeoisie, causing the other part of these masses to support bourgeois-liberal institutions against the „fascist danger“. In other words, if one opposes neo-fascism without turning against neoliberalism as well, that is, if one hopes to stop fascism while leapfrogging over capitalism, one ends up with the reconstruction of the bourgeois class sovereignty. The most glaring examples of this are the attitudes which support Clinton against Trump or Macron against Le Pen.

Fascism, Civil War, Revolution

It is true to note that neo-fascist parties and movements in general are not yet directly oriented by the financial oligarchies, however it is equally true to anticipate that if the communist parties and the rise of revolutionary struggles of the working class and the oppressed grow up to a point where they will threaten the foundations of the bourgeois order, these neo-fascist parties and movements will be given functions as the anti-communist hit force and the open terrorist dictatorship of the financial oligarchy.

A current example from Brazil: The American capital monopolies and collaborative bourgeoisies of Brazil could not even endure the left-wing reformist Workers' Party, trying to implement both neoliberal policies in favor of the interests of capital and some social projects in favor of the interests of laborers. But above all, they got frustrated with the alliance of Brazil under the leadership of the Workers' Party with Cuba and Venezuela. Thus they applied a two-stage type of coup and managed to put president Dilma Rousseff and Lula da Silva out of action first and then to carry a reckless fascist like Bolsonaro to the presidency seat. A complete supporter of a fascist dictatorship, Bolsonaro has already shown that he will clean up the remnants of the Workers' Party and be a nonpareil figure to fulfill neoliberal policies.

During the days in October 2018, when Mexico suffered a 17.9% drop in shares and the bond interests hit the ceiling due to Mexico's new president, social democrat Lopez Obrador's statements distant to neoliberal policies, the new fascist president of Brazil, Bolsonaro's words about his intention for the complete annihilation of the left led the share certificates in Brazil to increase 19.4% and hearing this, the financial markets were almost jubilantly celebrating.

The example of Brazil clearly explains us that even just a reformist left-wing alternative of power is sufficient for the financial oligarchy to introduce fascism, that the fascist movement is ready for such a political power task regarding the interests of the financial oligarchy, and that increasingly violent contradictions between revolution and counterrevolution will narrow the gap between financial oligarchy and neo-fascism.

Let's take a last look at the discussion of fascism from a different perspective: If the political polarization tendency strengthens in society due to the existential crisis of capitalism and if one of these poles produces neo-fascism, then the other pole consists of the growing anti-capitalist and anti-fascist movements. So not only a „neo-fascist wind“ blows in the world, at the same time, an „anti-fascist wind“ is also blowing.

Bernie Sanders, who stood out against Trump during the US presidential election and won enormous popular support by defending the demands of the working class and

leaning on socialist values, but was put out of rank at the bourgeois backstage of the Democratic Party. Jeremy Corbyn, who upholds socialist arguments in England, where reactionary nationalist reflections of the Brexit decision continues, and who is likely to win prime minister seat in the next election with the growing and enthusiastic support of the working class, but this time, who still stay in position since the bourgeois backstage of the Labor Party cannot pull the carpet under his feet. The popular and democratic parties and leaders from large parts of Latin America including from Venezuela to Ecuador, from Bolivia to Uruguay and from Paraguay to Honduras during the 2000s. And much more important than all these reformist left-wing developments, which are resulted from the political fusion of the working class and the oppressed, are, of course, the mass uprisings which express themselves in the Arab people's uprisings in the Middle East and North Africa, the Rojava Revolution, the Indignados in Spain and the Occupy Movement in the US, the Gezi-June Uprising in Turkey, the wave of yellow vests in France; all of which are fermenting another big rising and representing the no longer controllable search of workers and the oppressed.

It became extremely difficult for the rule of the monopolistic bourgeoisie to produce social consent and it cannot protect its ideological hegemony. For the laboring people, there is no objective base of hope for a free and dignified future within the capitalist order. Workers and oppressed are turning their faces to ideological and political breaks with the capitalist order, which has been gradually losing the maneuvering ability with in-order reforms. They are searching ways in the series of uprisings. But politically all the short cuts are consumed. Let's look at Venezuela, Greece or Brazil; what we see is how fast the efforts for social peaceful progress through reforms reach its limits and are crushed, and how quickly conditions for civil wars and their forces mature.

Revolts ultimately open the door for civil wars. And, without a doubt, civil war will be the scene for the utmost violent confrontation of fascist and revolutionary forces.



Right-Wing Populism: The Theory of Showing Fascism as Moderate

The rise of neo-fascist movements has naturally intensified theoretical discussions and analyses on fascism.

What really matters is the focus on developing a practical anti-fascist struggle and mobilizing working class and the oppressed masses. Nevertheless, analyses and theoretical premises on fascism, but moreover, works on revealing the methods and ways that enables fascism to transform masses into militants of an enemy system against their essential interests, are definitely crucial with respect to illuminate the path of the anti-fascist practice.

One part of these analyses and premises are going around theoretical discussions about the definition of fascism, analyzing its political and class content. In this regard, debates on whether it is authoritarianism or fascism, have now extended to those questioning whether it is right-wing populism or fascism. In this context, “populism” has been transformed into a cluttered concept as a result of referring several movements in an uncompromising conflict, such as from the revolutionary democratic populist movements, to the reformist populists, the demagogue parliamentary leaders, and of course, to the fascist ones.

“Left-Wing and Right-Wing Populism”:

Is it a Needless Theory Anymore?

The theory of populism was mostly developed during the post-World War process in the ,50’s and ,60’s by liberal writers. In his book “Political Man” written in 1960, Libsed critically used the notion of populism in terms of “populist extremism” of both left and right movements posing risk and danger to the liberal parliamentary regime. His characterization was implying also the capability to create a mass movement through popular rhetorics.

After the ,60’s, the need to re-raise this notion had stemmed from the interests of the world monopolies particular to the period of the neoliberal economic policies. In this regard, it is no coincidence that the theory of “left-wing and right-wing populism” was re-introduced in the early ,80’s, as the neoliberal economic aggression had started to be intensified.¹

In today’s conditions, where production and surplus value can be realized in a world-wide extend rather than being limited within national borders, production is moving to the cheap labor areas mainly by the world monopolies, as a method of maximizing profit by reducing the labor costs, as well as of controlling the world production. Therefore, the necessity for the world monopolies to make concessions to the struggles of the working class within national borders has substantially been eliminated. Again in a similar way, this fact has brought an uncompromising

attitude against the rural petty bourgeoisie, together with the intensification of a brutal corporate/company agriculture.

The ideological meaning of these developments found itself in the discourse “there’s no need for populism anymore”.

This ideological aggression led by Reagan and Thatcher in the political arena, had spread over the world in waves, throughout the ,90’s, including not only the conservative parties but also the social democratic politicians as well. In this regard, Blair’s uncompromising line against workers and the people became dominant policy of the world social democracy in terms of non-populism.

Before, the aids of the world monopolies endowing from their enormous surpluses was sufficient to be the primary concession policy of the world bourgeoisie. Besides, since the reflection of this policy was extending to the charities and religious organizations, it was also creating an ideological dependence for the poor sections of the working class to the “endower” bourgeoisie together with its institutions.

Thus, the understanding of “left-wing and right-wing populism” had been used as an ideological mean to restrain the struggle of the working class.

In this regard, just as how Hannah Arendt’s totalitarianism theory proclaims that fascism and proletarian dictatorship are the two extreme twins of the evil, this new theory, which places “left-wing and right-wing populism” on the same pattern as Arendt and applies to such varied figures as Hitler, Roosevelt, Mao Zedong, Putin, Chávez, Le Pen, Bernie Sanders, and Trump², serves for the same purpose: Capitalism is the end of history, the ideal political regime is the liberal bourgeois democracy and “left-wing and right-wing populism” are dangerous!

“Right-Wing Populism” to Substitute Fascism

While describing neo-fascist movements, the bourgeois ideologues and monopoly corporate media have substituted the notion of fascism with others which actually rasp the public enemy character of fascism: “post-truth period”, “illiberalism”, “authoritarianism”, “autocratism”, “the rightist alternative” or “right-wing populism”.

All these concepts do share a common characteristic feature of protecting fascist movements, whether in the government or far from it, with an attack of the historical anti-fascist consciousness, also when these concepts are used by antifascists as well.

It is also seen that liberal democratic movements and even the revolutionary democratic ones are substituting “right-wing populism” with two categories: fascism and

1 See “Populism”, Margaret Canovan, Junction Books, 1981

2 John Bellamy Foster, “This is not Populism”, www.monthlyreview.org

fascism of the new period.

Liberal commentators are characterizing both neo-fascist movements and governments as “right-wing populists”; just as how the historians Federico Finchelstein and Pablo Piccato wrote in Washington Post op-ed on Trump’s presidency: “Racism and charismatic leadership bring Trump close to the fascist equation but he might be better described as post-fascist, which is to say populist.... Modern populism arose from the defeat of fascism, [and] as a novel post-fascist attempt to bring back the fascist experience to the democratic path, creating in turn an authoritarian form of democracy.”³

Roger Griffin’s views can be a good example, to see the liberal democratic approach: “Dealing with the analysis of fascism ... I propose to use the term ,populist ultra-nationalism.”⁴ According to him, the Russian Narodniks cannot be described as populist due to their failure of bringing broad masses into the movement, however, he proposes to use populism instead of fascism just because it is able to mobilize the people, even on the basis of ultra-nationalism.

Among left-wing liberal democrats, Ahmet İnsel, Turkish writer from Birikim magazine, adopts the theory of populism on the basis of Laclau’s populism theory, Poluntzas’ limitation of fascism to Nazism and Italian fascism, as well as Arendt’s conception of totalitarianism. “Political discourses which claim to speak on behalf of the people and the nation against what they call as elites, which hold the monopoly of the representation of the people and nation, are the characteristics of populist political attempts. Besides, they are its distinctive sign.”⁵ “(Then) what the people supports becomes a populist authoritarianism.”⁶

The concept of populism is embraced also by some Marxists. Among them, Cenk Saraçoğlu, a self-claimed Marxist writer, who goes further and reaches to theorize the notion of right-wing populism: “As the responsible of the failure of their claims to be realized even in a symbolic sense, these movements were pointing out the central bourgeois political elites, the international financial monopolies and the international organizations, the European Union in particular. These right-wing populist movements which attempt to build and represent the people on the basis of the antagonism towards these aforementioned responsables ...” Saraçoğlu includes an extend from Erdogan to Trump, Modi and rising neo-fascist movements in his theory of right-wing populism. According to him, these political movements in the developed capitalist countries are not strong enough to demolish existing



bourgeois institutions, however, such a probability is quite strong in backward countries. In agreement with Toscano’s view, he points out that fascism differs from the right-wing populist movements with regard to “its ability to establish a special kind of connection between past, present and future and its counter-revolutionary destructiveness.” Thus, fascist parties, powers and governments which lack in terms of presenting these two characteristics theoretically go under the realm of right-wing populism.⁷

Ümit Akçay on the other hand, a Turkish scholar in Berlin School of Economics and Law, emphasizes that analysis equating right-wing populism with left-wing populism must be welcomed with suspicion, however, he does not see a problem to describe fascist movements as the “extreme right” of the “rising right-wing populism”.⁸

Since these views and ,theories’ come after the “left-wing and right-wing populism” discourse of the neoliberal aggression, finding both populisms as needless anymore, all of them play the role of underrating fascist movements. Thus, they help to set an ideological barrier before the historical anti-fascist consciousness to be directed towards neo-fascist movements and governments.

Populism cannot be Reduced to the Populist Demagogy of Fascism

Then what we mean by populism? Populism is the characteristic of the movements emerging in different historical conditions as the voice of the widest oppressed and exploited classes by linking their common interests. It is the ideology of currents advocating the class interests of half villain or petty-property owner peasantry in societies where peasantry is dominant and the common interests of the working class together with the rural-urban petty-bourgeois sections in relatively developed capitalist countries in a way that the former is subjected to the interests of the second mentioned.

The origin of the notion of populism dates back to the peasant movement known as “Grangers” and Greenbackers emerged in the US during the 1870-1890 period. However, the Russian Narodniks and their successor the Socialist Revolutionaries had been the most determined

⁷ Sağ Popülizm ve Faşizm Üzerine Yöntemsel Bir Tartışma: Küresel Örüntüler ve Ulusal Özgüllükleri Birlikte Anlamak, Cenk Saraçoğlu, ankara.akademia.edu

⁸ Popülizm, Faşist Sağ ve Liberaller, Ümit Akçay, Gazete Duvar, 27.09.17

³ John Bellamy Foster, “This is not Populism”, www.monthlyreview.org

⁴ Faşizmin Doğası, Roger Griffin, İletişim publishers, 2014, p.75

⁵ Populizmler Dünyası, Ahmet İnsel, Radikal newspaper, 19.08.2014

⁶ Türkiye: Rastlantısal Demokrasi, Keyfi Otoriterizm, Mağdurlar Manzumesi, Ahmet İnsel röportajı, bianet.org, 02.07.18

and consistent representatives of populism. Representing the semi-proletarian peasants as a result of the effect of proletariat's struggle for socialism, the Left Socialist Revolutionaries were forming the left-wing of populism, however, the right-wing Socialist Revolutionaries, who had reconciled with the bourgeoisie after the February Revolution, were also populists as well. Narodniks and the Socialist Revolutionaries were the representatives and the political vanguards of peasants emancipation, not only in economic, but also in "social" and political sense.

III. Bonaparte had gained the support of the reactionary peasants and even of the lumpen proletariat by means of populist demagogy, however, this didn't make him a populist. Rising from the basis of this support, he became the head of the state and then the emperor, but just as the 20 years under his rule proved, he had been the most determined state authority in terms of applying economic interests of the bourgeoisie. Furthermore, he was totally against the class interests of the urban and rural little bourgeoisie. His regime was a dictatorship and in this respect, he was not a populist at all but an enemy of the people.

The Nazi fascism was agitating 'socialism' and subordinating it to the goal of rising German people which was counted as the superior race and nation. Indeed, the German nation and race at that time signified ruling bourgeoisie. The aim of rising the German nation and make it dominant in the world would render the developing German capitalism and monopolies to become dominant over the world capitalism. In this regard, the discourses of Nazi fascism such as socialism, defending the interests of small business owners against big stores, corporatism or improvement of workers' living conditions with a national unity, were all subordinated by this great goal. Towards this, Nazism not only wanted to keep masses away from a revolutionary quest, but more, it strove for destroying the working class and its communist vanguards through the mobilized masses by its demagogy.

Thus, Nazism and Italian fascism, not only during their rule but also before, had directed their violent attacks primarily to the communists, just as what was residing at the top of their programmatic and strategic goals: "We are the only force that can destroy Bolshevism"

What's more, unlike traditional conservatives and religious movements, Nazism and Italian fascism were emphasizing the goal of "revolution" and "a new order". If this demagogic aim of fascism were considered alone and isolated from its other fundamental goals, then fascism would have been in a hegemony struggle with the communist movement rather than adopting it as the major enemy. However, fascism undertook destroying the communist danger both in national and international extend as a central duty which had historically proved the entire goal of fascism: to suppress the obstacles against capitalism and monopolies in order to save them from the political crisis.

The populist demagogy of fascism as if it sides with the people or some statements supporting the struggles of workers and the oppressed is a blatant fraud with regard to the function of deceiving masses for the sake of estab-

lishing open terrorist dictatorship of the capitalist class. Fascism applies to this trick also to show its difference from the parliamentary bourgeois politics, as well as to liquidate the parliament and non-fascist bourgeois institutions.

Of course it is normal for fascism to use this demagogy in order to get the support of the petty bourgeoisie, to make them feel that fascism would bring them to power. In this respect, fascism may support some demands and actions of the petty bourgeoisie or from time to time, it may practice the class collaboration of the social democracy in the name of corporatism. However, since they are all subordinated by the purpose of reinforcing the domination of the capitalist class, that such tricks do not make fascism populist.

Asserting fascism as "ideologically right-wing, but populist in the sense of siding with the people" because of this demagogy means that fascism, in some extend or other, has common characteristics with the reformist populist movements. This is nothing else than an invented theory of the liberals, the defenders of the bourgeois democracy, which denies the fact that fascism is the open terrorist dictatorship, as it is historically proved so. In addition to what historical experiences of fascism has revealed, also the very limited populist demagogy of today's neo-fascist movements and political leaders do not deserve a rewarding approach by describing them with the notion of "right-wing populism".

This populist demagogy of today's fascist movements is anyhow limited to the impression as if they side with the people and would protect workers rights through holding nationalist economic policies against the rules of the imperialist globalization, as well as through the anti-immigrant hostility.

However, as the uncompromising defenders of neoliberalism, the mainstream right-wing conservatives and the social democratic parties of the bourgeoisie have been so much integrated with the finance capital that the efforts of neo-fascism presenting a popular image, voicing -and cheekily abusing- a bunch of actual demands of the people become sufficient for them to easily gain the public acceptance, votes and the participation of workers, as well as to be characterized as "right-wing populism" by a variety of ideological and political movements from left to right.

Creating a Mass Movement does not Make Fascism Populist

The major factor which ideologically dazzles the petit bourgeois liberal democrats, leading them to reach the theory of "right-wing populism", is the success of the neo-fascist movements, parties and governments to become a mass movement. In this regard, while fascism is becoming a mass movement again in a similar way as in the period between two World Wars, it is at the same time revealing its own political character: nationalist, anti-communist and hostile towards migrant workers. In order to influence the masses, it sometimes advocates the demands of those become impoverished under the actual conditions of the imperialist globalization period, along with spreading the

imagination, that they would re-gain their high wages by means of a strong nation-state, domestic protectionism, and chauvinist aggression against immigrants. Thus, it becomes able to have a popular support rapidly or to create a reactionary mass movement among the petty bourgeoisie, unemployed or the backward-conscious sections of the workers and the lumpen proletariat. This is what the current practice of neo-fascist movements in Europe or parties becoming fascist after seizing power in governments reveal.

However, those who are dazzled by this mass support are choosing to characterize these movements as populist, rather than considering them according to their political quality and goals.

“The fascist dictatorship” says Togliatti, “endeavors to possess a mass movement by organizing the bourgeoisie and petty bourgeoisie” and follows: “When is this movement among the petty bourgeoisie transformed into a unified movement? Not at the beginning, but at the end of 1920. It is transformed when a new factor intervenes; when the most reactionary forces of the bourgeoisie intervene as an organizing factor. Fascism had been growing before, but had not yet become the fundamental element.”

In the cases of both Italy and Germany, fascism was the movement that put a new form of class dictatorship into practice under extraordinary conditions, after bourgeoisie became not satisfied with the passive support of a section of the people towards suppressing the movement of revolutionary classes and their vanguards. Based on this historical fact, fascism is the open terrorist movement and the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, which mobilizes a section of the society towards its operation of suppressing the revolutionary forces, transforming both the form of the regime and the organization of the attacking tools according to this operation.

“Right-Wing Populism” Instead of Fascism, on the Basis of Laclau’s “Populism” Theory

Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe are the post-Marxist theorists of the “radical democracy” and “populism”

which were on the rise among the world left movements by the '90's. Laclau emphasizes that creating hegemony among the people is very decisive for establishing strong movements marching towards power. In this regard, left movements must mobilize the people by advocating their equivalent demands, no matter what they are. Asserting this as the “logic of political struggle”, even more, as the very politics itself, he brings forward his understanding of “construction of a people”.

In fact, by evaluating the classes as equivalent, Laclau trivializes the class distinction among people, meaning that the working class is no longer the basic class of the emancipation struggle from exploitation, but equivalent as others. In this context, he formulates the perspective of populism and proposes a worldwide struggle for radical democracy.

On the other hand, moving from the perspective that populism is the logic of political struggle, or even, politics itself, he considers right movements, as populists as well, according to their capability to influence and organize people against elites, those who are in power. Hence, the populist revolutionary movements and mass-based fascistoid parties, but also, communist movements and fascist movements are all go under the same category of populism. Furthermore populism is reduced to win the people through political rhetorics, tearing it away from its material class basis. For example Erdogan and his party, the Justice and Development Party (AKP), are counted to the populist category, together with the leftist populist movements in Latin America. So, the fundamental difference between these movement in terms of their material class interests, political functions and goals are all pushed away. Yet more, he isolates the notion of “populism” from its material class basis and reduces it to gain people’s support by political discourse.

We have to admit that Laclau does not want to disappear the distinction between populisms of the dominant class and the populism of the oppressed class, however, that does not hide the truth that his theory essentially obscures both the political and class distinctions.



Apart from their nationalist, aggressive, patriarchal and homophobic existence, although these neo-fascist movements and parties, which become fascists as they come to power in governments, seem to be on the peoples' side with their discourses against neoliberal ruthlessness, corruption and decaying of the bourgeoisie, at the end of the day, they all take the opportunity of integrating with the capital oligarchy in the deep crisis conditions and become the bourgeoisie's open terrorist organizations and governments.

For instance, both the Fidezs party of Hungary's prime minister Orban and the coalition parties of Austria, the Austrian People's Party (ÖVP) and the far-right Freedom Party of Austria (FPÖ) did not step back from escalating neoliberal aggression, enacting slavery laws against working class. In Germany, the Alternative for Germany (AfD) is increasingly growing its mass base by means of nationalism, strong nation state and anti-immigrant policies. It is open to question whether AfD would quickly transform all former institutions or not if they come to power in government in the future, however, it is indisputable that they would follow the economic policies of the German monopolies. The same is true also for Le Pen's National Rally (NR).

Characterizing these movements from Fidezs to Jobbik, Lega Nord and other neo-fascist parties and movements of Europe not as fascist but right-wing populist, is the product of a blind analysis which dismiss the political function and quality of those movements, evaluating them according only to their feature of influencing and organizing people.

In the case of the fascist dictator Erdogan, the story is as follows: Even in the first period of the AKP government, Erdogan and his party were in an organizational unity with the political-islamist sections of the middle-sized bourgeoisie, being the part and the representative of it. After they liquidated the domination of the Turkish army's generals in the political power with the backing of the US and EU, of the capital oligarchy, it decided on adopting fascism in order to maintain its power as the representative of the growing bourgeoisie claiming the struggle for regional dominance. Thus it sharply followed the policies of suppressing the Kurdistan revolution and possible popular uprisings like Gezi, as well as escalating expansionist war and establishing subordinated powers in the region. In this direction, Erdogan has sometimes been fiercely supported by the capital oligarchy as a reward for his success to apply the neoliberal aggression of the bourgeoisie through most raving methods, other times, he has come to bow to the different capital cliques by threats. And now, he is establishing the monistic fascist power, the "fascist chieftaincy regime", which is approved – or being supported for now - by the capital oligarchy, under the conditions where bourgeois parties are unable to influence the people.

This kind of a movement cannot be characterized as populist just because it has reached to success by means of discourses mobilizing people around itself against the eli-

tes, or has replaced the political influence and power of the Turkish army with its own 'civil' clique. Characterizing neo-fascist movements and parties according to their discourses and style amounts to a dangerous reward to them.

After all, those neo-fascist movements of today rely either on the reactionary tendencies of the people such as nationalism, immigrant hostility, homophobia, patriarchal culture, anti-democratic reaction against the hypocrisy and corruption of liberal democracy, or on the delusion that those early happy days of the "welfare state" can be reached again through the shield of nationalism. This is the way how they appeal to the people's feelings, how they grow their masses.

What is essential for these movements and parties, which hold the right-wing reactionary line but also claim some of the demands against the impoverishment of laborers under neo-liberal attacks, is the terrorist aggression against populist, progressive, revolutionary and communist forces. This political character and function makes them fascist.

Rather than its "construction of the people" in a political sense through advocating or in some cases, practicing some equivalent demands as Laclau claims, the determining factor for fascism to establish hegemony among the people has always been its nationalist demagoguery, strong reaction to the parliamentary decaying and its claim to make country overcome its crisis.

Since it obscures this political and class character of fascism, the approach of Laclau, or even of the "leftists" adopting the theory of "right-wing populism" is both groundless and decayed. It is a liberal perspective that bases itself on the success of gaining the people or creating a mass movement, whereas the political character and function of the movements are all subordinated. Moreover this theory feeds on the idea that limits fascism to its first form of historical emergence. In this respect it remains static and lacks the ability to analyse fascism under different political, social, cultural, national and historical conditions.

The Theory of the Static Understanding of Fascism

So far we have underlined how bourgeoisie needs to show fascism as moderate by limiting it to the forms of Hitler and Mussolini fascisms. This point of view is also not less common among the international revolutionary, Marxist and anti-fascist movements which are far from comprehending the fact that fascist regimes of the bourgeoisie can take different forms on the basis of different national



and cultural characteristics of each given country under different historical and material political conditions. As a result of a static analysis, which focus on lacking characteristics compare to the fascist regimes of Italy and Germany, this viewpoint characterizes fascist movements as “military”, “authoritarian”, “autocratic”, as well as “right-wing populist”.

Along with his theory of fascism that asserts the paradigm of palingenesis (re-birth of the nation) as its decisive feature, R. Griffin, a British scholar, who has published a large number of books on fascism, also sets the theory of right-wing populism as a by-product. Thus, he rewards historical fascism and neo-fascism with “right-wing populism”, contributing to show the notion and the practice of fascism as moderate in the eyes of the masses.

Same theoretical and political line is adopted among the self-claimed Marxists which is also pioneered by Polunzas in the 70's with his narrow analysis of fascism caged within Nazism and Italian fascism, even though he does not advocate the theory of right-wing populism.

Similarly, Cenk Saraçoğlu appears with right-wing populism theory by referring Albert Toscano as another version of Griffin's. Saraçoğlu explains fascism by its two distinctive characteristics: creating an imaginary myth of future by referring the legacy of past empires, and demolishing today's bourgeois institutions. In this way, he limits fascism to Nazism and Italian fascism which results in constructing a theory that gathers those fascist movements extend from the European neo-fascists to Erdogan (yet, he concedes that Erdogan has started to become fascist) under the category of right-wing populism. He adds that these movements could only be described as protofascist: another type of a theoretical attitude that moderates fascism.

However, by restricting fascism to the first two forms of its historical emergence as the fundamental element of his right-wing populism theory, Saraçoğlu actually acts improperly with the political experiences of that referred period.

During the rise of fascism in the period between the two world wars, there had also been other fascist parties and governments with the capability to create mass movements in varying degrees. For example, in Hungary, the retired marshal Horthy took the lead after a joint invitation from the bourgeois parties under conditions of political crisis. In Austria, Dollfuss transformed to be a fascist as he came to the power in the government. Although he owned a mass support, Dollfuss remained weak to organize paramilitary gangs and remained far behind pro-Nazi fascist forces. Franco on the other hand, brought a fascist movement to the power of which the military putschist character was on the fore.

It is necessary to analyse these such differences among movements in terms of specifying the requirements of the struggle against various forms of fascism. However, characterizing fascist movements in varying forms as right-wing populist and escalating this point of view to a theoretical level is contradictory to the fascist experiences of that period.

Throughout decades, fascism has been and still presenting itself in diverse forms such as the American backed fascist juntas, parliamentary or paramilitary fascist movements, or even, some small fascist ecologist groups. In this regard, dismissing how this mistaken view among the left damages the anti-fascist struggle becomes nothing other than failing to grasp the need of the bourgeoisie to develop fascist movements under actual crisis conditions.

The existential crisis of capitalism is dragging mainstream bourgeois parties into ideological and political bankruptcy, breaking the masses from their influence towards both the right and the left poles. In such conditions, bourgeoisie does not remain satisfied with holding neo-fascists in reserve as opposition movements and steers for rising fascism in some countries as a result of the requirement for neo-fascist movements and parties to block the masses' tendency towards a revolutionary alternative. In this regard, neo-fascist parties are required to be in the government coalitions in terms of supplying mass support for the states to be consolidated by fascist laws. Taking the Lega Nord in the coalition by the Five Star Movement, whose ideological and political line is absolutely unclear and inconsistent, can be counted as an actual and notable example.

Another consequence of the crisis and the dissolve of the traditional bourgeois representatives is that new emerging bourgeois parties clings more to the fascist demagoguery in order to strengthen their mass support so that they contribute to the transformation of the regimes into fascist ones. As its capacity to create consent through making concessions, economic ones in particular, has almost been abolished as a result of the existential crisis of capitalism, bourgeoisie seeks finding solutions in rising fascist parties in governments such as Fidesz in Hungary, Bolsonaro in Brasil or Erdogan in Turkey.

The need for more centralized and fascistoid governments in the context of imperialist aggression and war tendency, is the other dimension of this picture. The Trump administration in the US, the presidency of Chi Jin Ping, which has gained a permanent character in China or the Putin administration functioning for realizing the imperialist war potential, they are all fascistoid administrations arise from the necessity to preserve ascendancy, market and resources through imperialist aggression.

Characterizing all these fascistization processes in varied forms with the notion of “right-wing populism” just because of the movement's mass support or differences with the Nazi or Italian forms of fascism, is not only a wrong approach due to the lack of political and class content, it leads democratic and revolutionary forces to stay unarmed against fascism developing by the bourgeoisie.

Fascism takes different forms particular to different historical and social conditions, under extraordinary conditions in which deep systematical crises occur or in front of the danger of revolution, where the bourgeoisie can no longer rule as before. However the fundamental characteristic of fascism, that is, to be the open terrorist movement and dictatorship, shared by all of them.

Is the Regime in Turkey Authoritarian, Autocrat or Fascist?

Liberal leftists had defined the election victory of Erdogan and AKP in 2002 as a “silent revolution” and the process of them to rise to a dominant force in the power as kind of “a bourgeois democratic revolution”. The 2002 elections were evaluated as a silent revolution in many articles of these liberals’ magazines. They still hold onto their claim even today with their emphasis such as “the limits of the democratic character of AKP have been mentioned many times, but it was also said that what has been happening is a bourgeois democratic revolution. The pressure of the forces of the old regime pushes AKP to function as an icebreaker in terms of democratization.”

The authors of such verbal charlatanry have been working effectively for decades to provide ideological basis for many currents from left liberals to liberal-tended petty bourgeois socialism. And they don’t even consider a self-criticism of their role in diversifying the mass support of the Erdogan fascism with their consoling and adulation to AKP and Erdogan. As they continue their non-self-critic hypocrisy, today they don’t support Erdogan fascism and expose it at least verbally unlike the Ergenekon¹ clique.

However, to be clear on their position, this time in their analyses and definitions, they produce theories on how not to define Erdogan and his “palace government” as fascist. And they are ambitious again. Being ambitious despite backing on the wrong horse every time is another paradox and this is a legacy to liberal leftists from bourgeois liberals who were given permission to build up an ideological hegemony over the last quarter century.

From liberals, to liberal leftists and petty bourgeois socialists, the qualification of the theory of these circles on Erdogan dictatorship is “authoritarianism”! While they assertively argue why the regime is authoritarian but not fascist, they realize that this is insufficient in defining the truth, thus, they keep the authoritarianism description, but also add “autocrat” this time. They do all of these in order not to define the Erdogan dictatorship as fascist.

1 Ergenekon was claimed to be the name of the organization constituting high-ranked generals inside the Turkish army, ex-intelligence officials, Kemalist-chauvinist-racist writers/intellectuals and others, who planned a military coup d’etat against AKP. AKP started a counter process and arrested many affiliated people. Later, after AKP changed its course as a result of the inner state power clashes as it drifted away from the liberals especially, many of the arrestees were released in return of their support to AKP.

Authoritarianism Without Class and Political Content

As Dimitrov’s famous description cited from the decision of 13th Plenum of the Executive Committee of Komintern on this matter suggests, fascism is “the open terrorist dictatorship of the most reactionary, most chauvinistic and most imperialist elements of finance capital.”²

Fascism has an high-level absolute authoritarian character, and subsumes this feature. But, not all authoritarian powers are fascists.

For instance, the powers after revolutionary victories have to be authoritarian to suppress the defeated reactionary and imperialist forces. As Engels emphasized “a revolution is certainly the most authoritarian thing there is; it is the act whereby one part of the population imposes its will upon the other part by means of rifles, bayonets and cannon — authoritarian means, if such there be at all.”³ However, this authoritativeness politically stands at the opposite pole of fascism and also it is antagonist respect to the class content.

While the revolutionary power politically demonstrates a high level of authoritativeness towards bourgeoisie and its allies, it provides and expresses the widest democracy for the working class and its allies, laborers and the oppressed. Moreover, it mobilizes them for the political power. Similarly, while the revolutionary power, as its class orientation suggests, dispossesses the bourgeoisie and thus presents the highest authoritativeness, it gets the working class and the oppressed to be ruler of the economical and social life, and the owner of the collective property. Here, the conclusion to be drawn is that, an “authoritarianism” description lack of political and class content does not remark the feature of the power. It only remarks the rigorous and determined domination of a power over the targeted classes.

It is true that the regime symbolized with Erdogan and his palace bares a high-level absolute authoritativeness, however this authoritarianism qualification cannot explain the political and class feature of this regime and is not enough to characterize it.

The “authoritarianism” theorists both in Turkey and around the world circumscribe the fact that neoliberalism causes governments in many countries around the world to move towards fascism in the stage of imperialist globalization, only with the development of authoritarianism. According to their claim, today we are

2 Georgi Dimitrov, *Selected Works* Sofia Press, Sofia, Volume 2, 1972 (www.marxists.org)

3 *Marx-Engels Reader*, New York: W. W. Norton and Co., second edition, 1978 (first edition, 1972), pp 730-733 (www.marxists.org)

witnessing social reactions against the neoliberal globalization waves of precarization, irregularization and disestablishment and manipulation of these towards a new authoritarian capitalism model.

Thus, they invent a theory which would obscure the fact that bourgeoisies in different countries have shifted or been shifting towards fascism. These theorists clearly play role in regenerating theories of bourgeois liberals who are directly bound up with imperialist bourgeoisies and diffusing these theories slighting fascism into the petty-bourgeois leftists.

Yet, the escalation on the direction towards “authoritarianism” in the capitalist imperialist world, where the neoliberal capitalist aggression remains running on, bares a fascistic feature. This unfoldment has started with instances of state of emergency and similar laws and bans while still being within the limits of bourgeois democracy, and not yet reached a full-fledged fascism in these countries. But this does not change the fascist feature of this unfoldment.

Bourgeoisies were forced to present a shift towards bourgeois democracy in Latin America countries and some other neocolonies at the beginning of 90’s, but they did this in accordance with the tactic to moderate the growing mass movements and under the conjuncture in which an imminent communist revolutionary threat was no longer around. As they keep applying neoliberal and structural adaptation programs, these countries have experienced a financial-economical colonization process with developing imperialist globalization. On the political scene, meanwhile, they have increased the tone of reactionary politics. This regression from bourgeois democracy named as “authoritarian governments” was actually a fascist development.

Besides, apart from Venezuela and Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, the regimes which are described as authoritarian by bourgeois liberals, are the fascist regimes of the parties which are shifted to or flourished and carried to power by the bourgeoisie either against the existent revolutionary danger of the developing struggles or against the potential revolutionary threats.

Uribe-Santos-Duque in Colombia, royalist coups in Thailand, USA-backed military coup in Honduras, oligarchy’s attempts and movements for a fascist coup in Venezuela, presidential regimes of Temer and Bolsonaro in Brazil, the regime committing genocide against Tamil people in Sri Lanka, Mursi and Sisi dictatorships in Egypt, the power of Fidesz-KDNP alliance and its leader Orban and the Jobbik Party growing in the opposition in Hungary, Modi government in India, etc. are the examples of bourgeois powers and movements in transition process towards fascism in this period in the financial-economical colonies.

Whereas at the centers of imperialist world, fascist features of Trump, state-of-emergency’s application in France and fascist legislations in European countries, coalition government of SPÖ and fascist FPÖ, two-times government partnership of Lega Nord in Italy are some

developments towards fascism.

In the imperialist countries which are distant and rival to US dominance, bourgeois powers are also unfolding in the fascistic path. Domestic fascist policies of Putin’s power, constitutional change to allow Xi Jinping to be the head of the state permanently, theocratic fascist power of Mullah regime in Iran, fascist enforcement of Duterte emerging from the left in Philippines, genocidal fascism of military politic-islamist dictatorship of Bashir in Sudan can be given as examples.

Moreover, neo-fascist movements in Europe are gaining strength and mass base through binding masses to themselves with a reactionary xenophobic theme.

But the essential point to emphasize here is the fact that neoliberalism, by mounting bourgeois reaction alongside, has put the bourgeois and imperialist powers in the process of fascist transformation.

In this process, tones and development degrees of fascism are widely different from each other. Compared to the speed of worldwide fascist transformation in the 1930’s, we see a slower shift. One can of course touch on these differences. But, limiting the issue with the “authoritarianism” definition by denying the fascist transformation process of bourgeois and imperialist powers has no good other than giving damage to the antifascist struggle as well as negating the experiences of political history in imperialist period.

Extraordinary Regime Forms Under Extraordinary Conditions

“Authoritarianism” theorists certainly admit that bourgeoisie shifts from bourgeois democracy to extraordinary regime forms to suppress the growing struggles of working-class and the oppressed under the circumstances of political crisis and sometimes along with the circumstances of economical crisis. But they just say that “authoritarian” regimes are among these extraordinary forms.

Among these extraordinary regimes, they count military, bonapartist, “totalitarian”, “autocrat” and fascist regimes.

Since the “authoritarianism” theorists restrict the fascist qualification only to Hitler and Mussolini fascism, they avoid qualifying the regimes, which don’t share one or more features of these two fascisms, as fascist due to their imperfection from Hitler-Mussolini examples.

For instance, despite they give place to military fascist dictatorships in neocolonized countries led by USA within the extraordinary regime forms of bourgeoisie, they don’t describe them as fascisms and suffice themselves with military dictatorship qualification.

Because, according to them, yes, there is no parliamentary election in this type of regime as well; there is the dictator and an open terrorist dictatorship. But, in the military dictatorships, there is no one-fascist party, which actively mobilizes the masses, which rises to government first and then turns into an intermediary functioning as “connection/link” between the state or-

gans and the dictator. What else, there is no police-army hierarchy. Instead, there is an army-police hierarchy in the military dictatorships. These differences stop us the qualification of military dictatorships as fascism!

According to this logic, the features of the open terrorist dictatorship regimes to suppress the revolutionary struggle of working class and the oppressed, the shift of regimes towards open terrorist dictatorship have no importance, but the hierarchy between the power organs of the regime does.

Another critical point here to discuss is the party link. As the modern ruling class, bourgeoisie cares about organization of parties as the representatives of various cliques in order to drag masses along for the social support. The role of the party in fascism is, of course, to mobilize masses actively and aggressively, rather than to pull them close to the regime in a passive way. In the extraordinary and revolutionary periods, bourgeoisie drives forward its fascist parties and if there is none such, it builds one. However, if fascist parties are especially incapable of deceiving and mobilizing masses, militarist apparatuses of bourgeoisie take over the executive power directly and embark on a suppression move against the revolutionary threat.

Especially during the moments of revolutions, generals come to the fore, run for the power and stage a coup d'état to suppress revolutions more harshly. Kornilov in 1917 in Russia, the Kapp coup in German revolution are some examples. But particularly, military fascist coups staged by US imperialism to defeat revolutionary struggles in neocolonies after the II World War are more common examples. USA-backed military coups in Latin America or military coups in countries from Indonesia to Turkey, as the extraordinary regime forms emerged under extraordinary conditions, were the solutions as the "last" and "effective" remedies of military representatives of bourgeoisies and USA, when bourgeois parties were not enough to govern under these conditions or not enough to suppress the revolutionary threats. And they were not designed as momentary or temporary regimes. They lasted either until they achieved their goal of suppress and of transition to a new order with new legislative framework (in Latin America and Turkey) or until they collapsed (Indonesia).

These regimes didn't have political parties at first, because military coups had taken place due to the inability of bourgeois parties to govern the counter-revolution under extraordinary conditions. Later, some also founded political parties. (Franco united the fascist Falange Party and "Comunion Tradicionalista" organizations and in a way, made use of it as a party of the nationalist-conservative-royalist front. In Indonesia, putschist General Suharto founded Golkar after he took the power.)

Whatever the difference between them, military coups all aimed at suppressing the revolutionary threat, the class and revolutionary movement, attacked to realize this. They established the open terrorist dictatorship of bourgeoisie.

This main purpose and function of military dictatorships has the same feature of classic Hitler, Mussolini fascisms, and this is what determines a fascist power. While Lenin was mentioning Mussolini fascism although from a far distance, he gave the example of Black Hundreds, which the tsardom organized as a means against the revolutionary development through the hands of police chiefs, as a prototype of fascism. Paramilitary organizations, fascist groups and their attacks used by the tsardom were fascistic methods. And there was no fascist party between tsardom and these organizations.

Military fascist regimes have been a regime form when bourgeoisie, imperialism and their political parties couldn't handle and crush the revolutionary struggle. Even though fascist parties and organizations played role in fascist transformation of key positions of the civil bureaucracy, rather than being a link between the fascist boss and the state, they organized mass support for fascism. The army both in the case of Franco fascism (the case of military coup where the fascist party had relatively more functions) and in the case of US-backed military fascist regimes after the 2nd imperialist re-division war undertook more prominent role than these parties and the police.

However, the interesting side of the issue related with Erdogan and AKP is this: the regimes counted in the "authoritarian" category had mass political parties too and the typical example of it is Erdogan and AKP. Coming from a political-islamist background together with having the youth and trade union organizations other than the party itself, the AKP and its leader carry this feature of classic fascist regimes. It doesn't make a qualitative difference that Erdogan cannot mobilize his mass support as actively as Hitler and Mussolini, despite his yearning and efforts towards this.

Japan had experienced a transition to fascism in the power led by the Emperor Hirohito. Japan needed fascism to suppress the opposition inside, but also rather to grab "deserved" colonies as a new emerging imperialist power. Despite setting on civil gangs, Japanese fascism was based on directly the army and police rather than a party link, and motivated the mass support towards a fascist inclination by highlighting these apparatuses.

Yet, these theorists already do not recognize any other fascism other than Hitler and Mussolini regimes and do not want to recognize. They even hardly and randomly admit that Franco regime is not a typical one but still a fascist regime. In the Franco regime, despite the existence of the fascist party, since the founding victory of the regime was gained by the fascist generals, the party took place not only below Franco, but even below the army in hierarchy of the regime.

Well then, the fascist regimes have differences depending on the conditions in which they were built, on the sectors which the building forces are coming from, on the differences in the balance of power, on the national, political and cultural local features. Despite these differences, under extraordinary circumstances such as po-



litical crisis or revolutionary threat, when being unable to govern with the previous regime forms, bourgeoisies shift to a regime form which adopts an open terrorist dictatorship as a main feature. And this is fascism.

The differences between fascist regimes in various countries and times have a significance in terms of struggle, but this does not change the fact that these regimes are fascist.

Elections Under Fascism

“Authoritarianism” theorists put forth the argument of “the existence of elections” in order not to admit the fascist feature of the new regime being built under the leadership of Erdogan.

Well, on the other hand, there was no election in the military fascist dictatorships which they call as “authoritarian”. But this time, they don’t qualify them as fascist because of the absence of party link or because of insufficient mobilization of masses for ideological and physical attacks when there is such a party link.

To save their theory and describe Erdogan or similar regimes as other than fascism, even though Erdogan has a party link, mass support and has managed to set on masses ideologically and physically, they put forward the argument that “there cannot be elections under fascism”.

Not only Mussolini and Hitler, but also their novices Dollfuss (Austria) and Horthy (Hungary) were the leaders, one of which came to power by elections and other appointed as prime minister by the parliament. Different than the priors, the latter ones shifted to fascism while they were governing. There was no such radical demagogic aims like “new order”, “revolution” or “national socialism” as in the prior ones. As the conservative anticommunist minister from the government parties (Dollfuss) and the leader with a military origin brought to top by the alliance of bourgeois parties (Horthy) seized the power and established a fascist regime. Then they banned political parties and liquidated elections.

Dollfus banned the communist party. Due to competition of Austria with Germany (over the unity of Germans), he shut down the Nazi Party before the Social Democrat Party. After a few months of civil war with the social democrats and communists, he then shut down the Social Democrat Party. Dollfuss was assassinated by the Nazi Party and with the German occupation in 1939, the German sided fascism had completely become sovereign in Austria. Whereas Horthy stayed in power due to his strong alliance with Hitler until the Soviet army entered Austria and defeated Hitler’s army.

Tsar Boris (Bulgaria) carried out his coup d’état in 1923, liquidating the bourgeois parliamentary system established through the uprising of the soldiers, who were actually peasantry youth put on uniforms, at the end of 1st imperialist re-division war and overthrowing the Farmers’ Union and its leader Stamboliski from the government. The respond of the communist Bulgarian Social Democratic Workers Party (BSDWP) to this coup d’état was the Sofia uprising. As he did to ex-leader of Farmers’ Union and ex-prime minister Stamboliski with the coup d’état, Tsar Boris set scaffolds for BSDWP leaders and its militants, tortured and murdered them in dungeons.

However, although the Tsar banned the BSDWP and Farmers’ Union, due to deficiency of mass support of fascism, he recognized the right to attend elections for fascist and reactionary parties which collaborated with him. Even he gave room for coalition governments in which these parties participated. Dimitrov interpreted this situation as an example of fascism to be forced to demonstrate some flexibility within certain limits in the case of deficient mass support:

“In certain countries, principally those in which fascism has no broad mass basis and in which the struggle of the various groups within the camp of the fascist bourgeoisie itself is rather acute, fascism does not immediately venture to abolish parliament, but allows the other bourgeois parties, as well as the Social-Democratic Parties, to

retain a modicum of legality.”

And Erdogan, too, cannot liquidate elections, parliament and political parties at one swoop due to relative weakness in the mass support, that people being accustomed to parliamentarism for a long time, lack of active support today from the fascist imperialists similar to the one in 1930's and 40's, and that being unable to stop the armed revolutionary resistance. But, by rising over an unauthorized parliament as a presidential diktat and by holding the mechanisms in his control that don't allow anyone except for himself to get elected as president, by beating up the opposition parties through arrests and putting their leaders in prison, he forces to hold de-facto plebiscites instead of elections. Who can deny that he practically banned the Peoples' Democratic Party (HDP). He even holds the Republican People's Party (CHP) under constant threat of imprisonment. The Justice March of Kılıçdaroğlu⁴ was actually an action of him to stop the upcoming move to arrest him.

Erdogan cannot remove elections at one swoop, but he applies the “no election” mandate for now in this form by legally and practically disabling the parliament's authorities and by not allowing any election that he can't win. He has the understanding and intent to live with plebiscites. What is more, he bares in his ideological mindset the Grand Chief role of the Grand Assembly, which Necip Fazıl Kısakürek⁵ suggested as one of his ideological mentor. He just can't realize it immediately because of the conditions, and that's it. The Grand Assembly is the council of elite reactionary-fascist intellectuals, that is formed without elections.

In the past, the Grey Wolves had been organizing under their chief system, following the orders of their head chief and they been planning attacks through this organization. And as we consider now that the Grey Wolves, mafia, MHP and AKP supporters see Erdogan as the grand chief, and not only the grand chief himself, but the basis which he tries to turn into fascists also espouses a regime without election.

How Necessary is “Totalitarianism”

The one who underlined the totalitarian feature of fascism was the Italian fascist ideologue Gentile. In Italy, after liquidating parties starting from communists, Mussolini fascism aimed to thoroughly reshape all political and social life as well as the overall power according to

4 In 2017, the leader of CHP, Kemal Kılıçdaroğlu, marched from Ankara to Maltepe Prison in Istanbul for 25 days in order to draw attention to the unjust trial processes after one of his party's deputy, Enis Berberoğlu was imprisoned. All along the way, people living in the cities he crossed, joined the march. Some intellectuals, trade union leaders, reformist left parties also supported the march.

5 Necip Fazıl Kısakürek was an Islamist ideologue, poet and novelist who was adopted by many political Islamist and fascist movements in Turkey.

the fascist ideology and to create the new fascist human of the “New Order” of “New Italy”. That was what it tried to realize. However, he just couldn't advance in this matter as much as Hitler fascism. This was due to low success, related with the strength of Italian bourgeoisie.

Yet, he still managed to mobilize the unemployed, the lumpen, backward sections of the working class and especially petty-bourgeois sections, who were all enraged to the corruption, lies and hypocrisy of the bourgeois parliamentarism. Italian fascism managed to activate masses on the issues like anticommunist aggression, mobilization for war and liquidation of parties, trade unions, democratic institutions. The “New Order”, “New Italy” demagogies were effective in this. But, the reactionary respond to parliamentarism and the selfishness and expectation from the imperialist invasions, which could provide a more privileged life, were also essential factors.

Hitler succeeded to move one more step forward the aim of founding a monist, suppressive, totalitarian system and the creation of the fascist human. He put new goals ahead to create “the master German race” and “national society” through domestic cleansing and to become a hegemonic power in the world as it deserved. While he had been seeing communism as the biggest threat to the capitalist world, he adopted the argument that Nazis were the only capable force to destroy it. He mobilized millions from the German nation. He created the fascist human type he could use in the massacres inside and outside the country. And depending on this active fascist organized mass, he managed to carry out fascism and new invasions. Although this mass was relatively broad, it had a certain limit; but Hitler took over other sections of the society with the fascist terror based on that and bulldozed vast majority of people with fascism. Even broader sections submitted to the fascist state terror, supported fascism due to social and political pressure or remained quiet. Besides, it is important to underscore, Nazi power managed to transform not only civil bureaucracy, but also the army from top to bottom through the SS and the plight of loyalty to Hitler.

Monist, suppressive, totalitarian feature and the aim to create new human are the elements inherited from the



institutionalized religions. Bourgeois revolutions and its liberalism put an end to this dogmatism. Currents which don't pose threat to the power of bourgeoisie were tolerated of their propaganda and organizing. Keeping this flexibility, these regimes also had the goal to create new human. The human who worships "entrepreneur spirit", "order of opportunities" and "freedom of capital and property ownership" have become the new human idol of the regimes of bourgeois age. But still, bourgeois modernism, through liberalism, ended the dogmatism not letting any ideological current except for religious dogma. Then it is something ordinary for every ideological current to create new human as in the direction of its goal on various levels and on condition not to fall into sacred dogmatism of institutionalized religion.

Rising from the need of bourgeoisie which organizes the masses actively and sets them on to fight and crush the revolutionary threat with a fascist identity, fascism enforces everyone and everything to obtrude a mono-type fascist feature, and even disallows different views of different bourgeois cliques and cultural diversity. By doing this, it liquidates them not economically, but politically. But still, fascist regime can achieve this on different levels in different countries and periods, depending on the scale of concrete mass support, on the international and domestic balances of power, on national, historical qualities, and so on.

Disregarding other fascisms which are less successful in creating "new" human and totalitarianism compared to Hitler and Mussolini regimes by looking at these different levels, presents a static conception not recognizing any other fascism except for the sort of Hitler-Mussolini and damages the antifascist struggle.

Besides, even though Erdogan is known with his eclecticism and pragmatism, rising "religious generations" or "domestic and national generations" and creating generations educated with a widened political-islamist agenda reside among his claims and he tries to apply this by driving forward all of his facilities. Erdogan aims to create the new human of the fascist chieftaincy regime. He tries to reorganize the state mechanism under his ordinance and with a political-islamist character, including not only civil bureaucracy, but also the police in his control and the army as well, through liquidating his opponents and restructuring the education system. And because the state has been restructured at least since the 1980 coup d'état, he is easily able to advance in this process.

Thus, these theorists hide the scale of the danger by veiling the monist, suppressive, totalitarian purpose and praxis of Erdogan fascism.

The theoretical theses of liberal leftists are the ones from Poulantzas' book "Fascism and Dictatorship". In this piece where he analyzes fascism, Poulantzas presents useful information about fascism by delving into different aspects; but he offers a theoretical basis only restricted with Hitler and Mussolini fascisms. By producing new regime categories like "authoritarian" and

"autocratic" or by advocating "marxist" versions of those produced by the liberals, he falls into crucial mistakes. It is known that these views damaged the antifascist struggle at that time especially during the conditions of developing US-backed fascist military dictatorships.

Some theorists can't even let well enough alone with what Poulantzas said. They criticize him for avoiding theorization of totalitarianism and creation of "new" human in his fascism theory with the purpose of giving no harm to "totalitarianism" in Soviet Union. They claim that Poulantzas doesn't appeal the conception of totalitarianism just to avoid being pushed into approaching Soviet Union in the framework of totalitarianism and defining Stalinism.

Left liberals espouse the ideas of bourgeois liberals and defend them. Unsatisfied with that, they go beyond and claim that the fascist political-islamist Palace regime is far from being totalitarian, but it is just another pragmatist regime. Yet, their effort to prove that it is not fascist, is just in vain.

Autocratic Power

This category is also a view given place by liberal fascism theories, starting from Poulantzas' fascism theory. And under the appearance of creating a more profound theory, the bourgeoisie, in reality, put forth or supported this thesis among others to underrate its military and civil fascist regimes in neocolonies in the post-war period. In that period, imperialist bourgeoisie was waging a hegemony struggle against the socialist system by claiming to be the real victorious of the antifascist struggle and to be a bourgeois democratic alternative of Hitler-Mussolini fascism worldwide. In addition to this claim, they felt the need to underrate the fascist regimes in its own system.

"We defeated the Hitler and Mussolini fascism, they cannot resurrect and there is already no room for fascism in our order, some authoritarian and autocratic regimes may occur but they can be overcome." This or similar arguments have been used by the theses seemingly emerging from the left, but eventually beneficial for bourgeoisie. Today is no different.

As is known, the autocratic regime is a regime form of the era of kingdoms and empires. Regimes like absolute monarchy, empire, tsardom, sultanate, kaiser, etc. were autocracies where one-man decides all and have its own aristocracy and bureaucracy.

Then, together with the transition to the dominance of bourgeoisie over the economy, the mandate of king was no longer unlimited. It was restricted by the constitution and parliamentary in the political field and shifted to semi-autocratic regimes.

Bourgeois regimes ruled by a dictator emerged as more of regimes of military and civil fascisms in the new era, in the era imperialism and proletarian revolutions.

The revolutionary and counterrevolutionary experiences of the period between the French revolution and the beginning of imperialism show us this: the convention

of revolutionary period was authoritarian. In the revolutionary period, the dominance, of course, belonged to parliamentary and revolutionary junta, there was no political power period under one-man mandate. However, after the regime became reactionary and especially after Napoleon took the power, it was shifted to autocratic regime once again. But this time, the autocrat, as the sole ruler of the regime, played role in aligning the monarchist and autocratic regime with the need of speeding up the development of bourgeoisie; bringing back feudalism was not its function in this case. Likewise, Napoleon III., who took the power by elections, then transformed the regime into empire by proclaiming himself as the emperor, functioned in accordance with meeting the need to suppress the labor movement for fast development of capitalism. Still, these were surely autocratic regime forms, even monarchists.

As another semi-autocratic regime ruled by a dictator, Bismarckism had a similar function and was born from the need to develop German capitalism fast, to prevent the worker's uprisings in France from spreading to Germany and to suppress the labor movement. In the form of constitutional monarchy but ruled by the "iron man" prime minister Bismarck rather than king/kaiser, the regime was not actually autocratic, it was a reactionary dictatorship. Since it protected the kingdom, it can be called semi-autocratic.

After all these, with the emergence of proletarian revolutions in the imperialist era, bourgeoisie shifted to bourgeois fascist regimes in order to crush these revolutions or proletarian movements.

While bourgeoisie was building its fascist regimes, of course, it adapted all its historical reactionary and despotic ruling methods to suit the contemporary conditions and combined in fascism. One of these methods was the method of ruling in which one person is the sole decision-maker and absolute obedience to the leader is counted as a principle. The conceptions of duce, fuhrer, chieftain, caudillo came out from the experiences of fascism. With the claim to build a new order in fascism, they made broad masses embrace and accept the despotism of previous monarchist regimes, in which everyone conformed to the authority of one person like a king.

Bourgeoisie made masses embrace this through the ideology of new order and national interests. Or in addition to these, they brought in the aim of "fast development", "fast growth" in military and civil fascisms in neo-colonies as a support for their claim. Thus, they enabled the expectancy in the wide masses to embrace fascism; if that country/nation develops fast, then laborers can achieve the welfare of developed countries, different than their poor class siblings in the world.

Nevertheless, the feature of these regimes was not the same as kingdoms and emperors. Bourgeoisie adapted their ruling methods to contemporary conditions, combined with many additional features and created a new regime form, fascism.

Therefore, these regimes must be counted as fascist re-

gimes having autocratic and monarchist methods, but no longer same as the kingdoms and emperors of the past period. Otherwise, the formation of fascist regimes needed by bourgeoisie to overcome their crises and to get rid of the revolutionary threat cannot be fully understood and cannot be fought back.

Anyhow, these "authoritarianism" defenders and theorists already don't want to understand this reality of fascism, they don't want to lose their liberal ground. They keep their eyes closed to the features of fascism in which crowns were used to mop the floor and left its position to the kingdom of money. They restrict themselves with autocracy to describe fascism which is the open terrorist dictatorship of bourgeoisie with its ever-growingly developing militarist mechanisms with the supplement of giant capital accumulation, with its advanced weaponry and surveillance/control techniques, with its ability to use different kinds of organizations as a means of its dominance and hegemony. They try to elude their situation by adding autocracy when the conception of authoritarianism is not enough to convince. But, in the end, they especially damage the struggle against Erdogan fascism by underrating the actual and recent fascist developments and today's political powers.

In lieu of conclusion

Both in the international discussions and those in Turkey, from bourgeois liberals to left liberals, from self-proclaimed Marxist Poulantzas to the left liberals in Turkey, the authoritarianism and autocracy theories presented on a wide range bare a preventive character obscuring the understanding of fascism and disabling the mobilization of the accumulation of historical antifascist consciousness and anger to the antifascist struggle under new conditions. Therefore, they hit a blow to antifascist struggle. Particularly, they weaken the theoretical and ideological arsenal in the struggle against Erdogan's fascist chieftaincy regime. Since the necessity of such an arsenal obviously exists, we have to sweep and flush away these liberal theses.



Transformation of Fascism in Turkey under AKP

Fascism in Turkey draws on a long history characterized by counterrevolutionary attacks such as coups, massacres, states of emergency, and more recently by political-ideological transformation. As a result of revolutionary developments, a never-ending regime and state crisis continues, whereas the counterrevolution has taken various forms of rule and oppression. Fascism has changed its form several times over the course of history in Turkey.

However, the colonialist quality of fascism, which is based on the principle of one nation, one religion, one state, one flag, has not changed and ensures the existential maintenance of the Turkish state.

Since the AKP was elected into the government in 2002 as a result of a continuing regime crisis and the reaction of the population to the burdens of the economic crisis in 2001, the fascist dictatorship has gradually expanded, the regime crisis has deepened and with it, the aggression of fascism, too.

Through the years and due to the ongoing revolutionary developments, AKP has transformed fascism into a presidential dictatorship, a political-Islamist ruling regime that is pushing Turkey's colonialism against Kurdistan to its limits together with neo-Ottoman expansionist efforts.

The Era of AKP Fascism Begins

The era of the AKP, which determined the politics of the fascist Turkish state in the last 17 years, began in times of a regime crisis. This regime crisis was caused by anti-fascist mass struggles of the workers and toiling people, the national liberation struggle of the Kurdish people and it was deepened by the struggle for freedom of belief of the Alevis. For decades, these struggles have been attacking the foundations of the fascist state, above all with the rising national liberation struggle and the armed struggle led by PKK, the workers resistances between 1989-91 and uprisings in the quarters of the metropolises, like in Gazi, where the toiling people resisted against a state murdering to provoke a superstition conflict between Sunnis and Alevis. All these struggles abolish the monistic style of state. Although prior to the AKP's electoral victory, Kurdish people's leader Abdullah Öcalan was captured by an international plot in 1999 and the Kurdish freedom movement was forced into a reformist line, Kurdish guerrilla warfare and Kurdish people's rebellion continued and remained central for the regime's crisis.

The AKP led by Recep Tayyip Erdogan was elected to the government in 2002 as a result of this ongoing regime crisis. Although the AKP formed a single-party government by itself, the state power was not yet completely controlled by it at the time, it had only a share in the power. The ruling "bloc of the generals", which was based on the Turkish army but consisting also the president, the constitutional court, the supreme board of judges and prosecutors, the

supreme court, the state security court, the council of higher education and the national intelligence service (MIT), still had the largest share in power. Thus, at that time, the form of the fascist dictatorship used to have a semi-military character in which the deep state remained active as a counterrevolutionary actor.

The generals' bloc was not pleased that a political-islamist party like the AKP was the sole party in the government, so it would not have taken long before the counter-guerrilla developed a coup. The generals, however, had not sufficiently considered a fundamental change, that is, the financial oligarchy, US and EU wanted a restructuring of the Turkish State to accelerate its integration into the integrated capitalist world market of imperialist globalization. The AKP was part of the implementation of this plan, in which Turkey was transformed from a neocolony to a financial-economic colony. The implementation of this plan was aiming to accelerate the abolishment of the obstacles in front of the capital flow, which would be accompanied by the autonomization of the central bank, a huge wave of precarisation and privatization mostly for the sectors of education and health, as well as cutting the subventions for the public services and social security.

However, the state structure under the domination of the generals was an obstacle for this plan. At the same time, the generals did not agree with the liberal solutions for the regime crisis, whereas the ruling bloc of bourgeois change, which consisted of the followers of an IMF program and those parts of bourgeoisie who collaborated with EU and US capital, sought a bourgeois solution to the regime crisis in which the Kurds and Alevis should be integrated into the regime by remaining satisfied only with some individual rights.

The ruling generals insisted that this reform policy would give the Kurdish freedom struggle more room to maneuver. They also foresaw that they would have to give up their privileged position with this bourgeois liberal program.

The bloc of the generals planned an easy elimination of the AKP, because they had the power in the most important authority of the state, the National Security Council (MGK) while parliament and government were secondary in terms of authority in the state power. The decisions of the MGK had a character of a command for the government. Anyhow, the "Red Book", in which the strategical line of the state policy was written, had been prepared and updated by the MGK and it was standing above the constitution. At that time, the rule of the state was divided into two: the parliament and the constitution on one side, MGK and the Red Book on the other. The generals thought to have their old power, with their weapons, their counter-guerrillas, their institutions, financial resources and privileges.

In 2007, the presidential election had taken place, expressing the contradictions between AKP and the generals' bloc. In this election, which assumed the character of a duel, the generals had lost and a political-islamist president, Abdullah Gül was elected. It was a sign that the balance of power had shifted, but the generals were not aware of it. Before, the real power of the the generals' bloc was stemmed from the support of the financial oligarchy and the imperialists, especially the US. When this support was withdrawn, they had nothing left to lean on. Only after finding themselves in prisons as a result of AKP intrigues, widely known as the Ergenekon operations, the generals became aware of that reality. The AKP was a much more appropriate partner for the ruling bloc of bourgeois change. Thus, they paved the way for Erdogan to become the prime minister. Although the contradictions between the bloc of change and that of the generals led to a state crisis, at the end, the bloc of the generals had to throw in the towel.

From a Semi-Military Fascist Dictatorship to the Fascist Dictatorship

Even if the bourgeois change program was hardly implemented as a solution to the ongoing regime crisis, it at least contributed to the transformation of the fascist regime. The semi-military quality of fascism had passed. There were two influence factors that led to this transformation. First, Turkey's integration into the imperialist globalization, and thus becoming a financial-economic colony, was in the interests of the imperialist financial oligarchy and its collaborators. For a transformation of the economic base, it was necessary to also provide a reasonable superstructure. The second decisive factor was the positioning of the masses on the side of „democracy“ and their struggle for political freedoms against the fascist dictatorship in Kurdistan and Turkey. The AKP convinced the masses to introduce the „democratic“ change they wanted. The influence of the generals thus disappeared more and more through inner-state interventions of AKP, which transformed the semi-military ruling system by changing military fascist rulers with civil fascists.

After the generals have thrown in the towel, a new state crisis emerged. The state order, which had been in existence since 1960, consolidated with the coup d'état of 1971, the military coup of '80 and the '97 coup, was still structured according to the counter-guerrilla convictions and to the MGK's role in dedicating the basic strategic decisions of the state leadership. Now, the function of the MGK and the military influence on the state institutions were weakened, but what should take their place? The state had to be restructured for the new political-islamist fascists under the leadership of the AKP.

A New State Crisis

Although the semi-military character of fascism was abolished, fascism was still in place. And even though the AKP was supported by a broader alliance of political forces in the first years of its governance, it was actually historically the product of an alliance of political-islamist forces. Two

currents were crucial for that. One was represented by the tradition of the National Salvation Party (MSP) and the Welfare Party (RP). This branch inside the AKP was led by Erdogan and drew its power from the masses. The other one was the Gulen movement, which had strength primarily through cadres taking place at critical positions of the state and had connections to imperialist intelligence services. These relations, together with the Gulen movement, had a major impact on the liquidation of the generals' bloc, forcing Gulen supporters to take the vacant posts in state institutions. Important positions in the police and the judiciary were taken by Gulenists. But the Gulenists tried to take the old position of the bloc of generals. They tried to overthrow the intelligence service MIT with their position in police and judiciary, that is how the Erdogan clique realized what they were dealing with. The swords were drawn and a new state crisis had begun; this time between Erdogan's clique and the Gulenists.

In 2012, police and prosecutors under the control of the Gulenists opened corruption proceedings against Erdogan and his family, as well as against some ministers of the government and their families. This case went down in history as the „MIT crisis“ and the 17-25 December corruption scandal. Along with the voice recordings of Erdogan and his family concerning hidden money, were shared in public. The police made operations to the houses of politicians, some of which were taken into custody, and finally, a truck belonging to MIT, which was full of weapons for the Syrian jihadist, was stopped and searched by the Gulenist prosecutor, revealing the Turkish state's role in fighting against the Rojava revolution.

However, despite flawless evidence of corruption, despite all these attempts of the Gulenist circle, they had been defeated, Erdogan has won.

In order to clear Gulenists out of the way, Erdogan used the generals and nationalist fascists, which he had captured and liquidated from the state positions before, ensnaring them once again. This is an example, how pragmatist Erdogan is in his alliance policy. Gulenist police officers and their chiefs were arrested and the media, banks and companies of the Gulen movement were expropriated. The Gulen clique, in the face of these hard attacks by the AKP, had no other choice than a coup d'état with its cadres within the military, which was to follow a few years later.

The New Constitution and Presidential Dictatorship

In the meantime AKP carried on the de-facto transformation of the fascist regime into a new form, but this transformation had to be constitutionally supported. In 2010, a first constitutional referendum was launched, which in part formed the basis for a change. In this referendum, a new constitution was drafted, which should replace the old constitution, which was designed after the military coup of 12 September 1980, in which a military junta came to power. The amendments should bring the constitution into compliance with the bourgeois change requirements.

Under the AKP, the semi-military quality of the fascist dictatorship had now changed; the MGK, as a previous

ruling institution of the generals' bloc, became the government's means, not the other way around. Instead of the MGK, the parliament had gained more importance. But afterwards, the parliament became an obstacle to fascism. This time the fascist dictatorship needed again a structure that stood above parliament and could fulfill the old function of the MGK, whereas, it needed to be ruled by an elected authority. An elected president and a government appointed by him could do this. That was the expression of the search for a fascist dictator. The transformation into a presidential dictatorship started.

Fascism is Shaken in its Marrow

Meanwhile, as power struggles were still taking place, regime and state crises were steadily deepening. The demands of the Kurdish national democratic struggle and the freedom of belief of the Alevi people remained unanswered. The Kurds were not contented with individual rights and the Alevis did not want to be seen as a mere cultural diversity. At the same time, the oppression of the working class, which intensified through the politics of imperialist globalization, led to more resistances. Women continued fighting for their most basic rights and resist against the growing patriarchal violence, as well as the political-Islamist attacks of the AKP on their lives. The youth were involving the struggles not only for their educational rights but also for political freedoms, and ecological movements were resisting against the ecological devastation caused by AKP. The bourgeois change program was far from fulfilling all these demands. It was unable to give any solution for these freedom demands.

The revolutionary front shook fascism with several developments. With the Rojava revolution that started in 2012, the Gezi-June uprising in 2013, Kobane victory in 2014, the election victory of the HDP in June 2015, the entire Turkish state has lost its balance. The news of the beginning of the Rojava revolution has upset all the plans of fascism with which it sought supremacy in the Middle East. From the beginning, the Turkish state was and still is trying to destroy the revolution, first indirectly, with the help of the ISIS and al-Nusra gangs, but today through direct military interventions.

During the negotiation with the Kurdish freedom movement in 2013 the Turkish fascism thought to have the revolutionary situation in Northern Kurdistan under control, but then the Gezi uprising broke out as a revolutionary situation in Turkey. Erdogan's position was relieved by the lack of united, revolutionary leadership and lack of participation in the uprising in Northern Kurdistan.

Then there was the defense of the Rojava revolution, in which the resistance around Kobanê played a crucial role. Against the colonial fascism occurred between 6-8 October 2014 a popular uprising, the „Kobanê serhildan“, which spread from Northern Kurdistan to Turkey. It showed the degeneration of the foundations of the colonial fascist regime and the weakness of its rule. Fascism was able to save itself in its distress before this uprising, but it turned out that it would not be possible to integrate the



Kurds into the monistic state system and to satisfy them with individual rights, rather than with free, equal rights like political rights of self-determination. But these equal political rights for the Kurdish nation are not possible to be achieved within the Turkish state, because even collective rights on the most limited possible ground would attack the existential basis of the Turkish Republic. Collective rights of Kurdish people open the path for democratic rights of a Kurdish unification beyond the colonialist borders. A unification beyond the colonialist borders would mean, that the Turkish state and all the other colonialist states would break down. That is why any achievement of the Kurdish freedom struggle, for example the Rojava Revolution, endangers Turkey, because they have an influence on Northern Kurdistan and colonialism in the entire region. If a democratic autonomy had been recognized in Northern Kurdistan, it would not have been possible for the Turkish Republic to continue its current form. Therefore, the fascist state had to intervene and develop an extermination plan against this revolutionary danger.

All these developments, the wide spread Gezi people's uprising, as well as a crisis in Turkish economy, the negotiation process between Turkish state and the Kurdish People's leader Abdullah Öcalan took place at the same time, when the inner-state struggles against Gulenists continued.

“Extermination Plan”, the “Palace Coup” and Self-Governance Resistances

Erdogan agreed with the fascist generals on a new extermination strategy, which was intended to erase the idea of a national unity of Kurds in Northern Kurdistan with the other parts of Kurdistan. Shortly after the Kobanê uprising of 6-8 October, a MGK meeting was held, in which an extermination plan based on the model of Sri Lanka against the Tamils, was decided. After the HDP won a massive election victory on 7 June, 2015, the plan was put into action. Until that date, the negotiations between the Turkish state and the leader of the Kurdish people went on. With the ongoing negotiations the state tried to distract the Kurdish freedom movement. However, the Kurdish freedom movement was aware of this and preparing a revolutionary offensives against possible attacks.

As the HDP gained enormous mass force whereas the AKP



lost support, Erdogan turned the tide during the electoral period. He has changed his attitude in order to preserve nationalist voices and lay the groundwork for post-election attacks. The “Dolmabahçe agreement”, which was declared on 28 February 2015, with the presence both sides of the negotiation process, stating the basic concrete points of the new “peace” process without arms, was rejected and completely ignored by the state as if they weren’t the one sitting on the same table. The election victory of the HDP of 13%, which exceeded the fascist election threshold of 10% and prevented an absolute majority of the AKP in the parliament, was a decisive danger for the fascism in terms of HDP’s growing influence on Turkey’s politics. At all costs, the state had to at least neutralize the progressive forces in Turkey. The connection of the Kurdish freedom movement with the organized and politically determined, anti-fascist, revolutionary forces within the Turkish masses had to be broken.

In this election, the AKP had failed to form a government, which had seriously damaged its presidential agenda. Thus, with the help of the fascist generals, a political-islamist fascist palace junta was formed.

That was a new kind of coup. The aim of this coup was to break the will of the Kurdish freedom movement, the anti-fascist, progressive forces and the combat unit of the Turkish workers and the oppressed with the Kurdish workers and the oppressed.

This palace coup started with a first major offensive on 20 July 2015, with a massacre organized with the help of ISIS, which targeted the Communist Youth Organization of MLKP in Suruc. Right afterwards, a large number of HDP buildings were attacked, destroyed and partially set on fire by civil fascists. Bombardments against guerrilla areas in South Kurdistan started. After the building of a coalition government, Erdogan canceled the elections and ordered re-elections on November, 2015. Before these elections a mass rally for peace on 10 October in Ankara was again massacred with the help of ISIS.

Against these offensive shift, the Kurdish people, under the leadership of the Kurdish freedom movement, had practically implemented their right of self-determination in the proclamation of local governments in 2015. By rejecting the occupying forces of the colonial state, the people began to organize themselves through popular

councils. Self-defense committees under the “Civil Defense Unities” (YPS), in which the MLKP urban guerillas did also take part, have defended the self-governing cities and neighborhoods. It was obvious that the regime’s response should be tough. The excavated mines and self-defense units were a revolutionary resistance to the extermination attacks.

The state attacked with all its war apparatus and resources, but could not suppress these legendary resistances for months. This was a civil war between the colonial fascist state and the Kurdish people. This heroic resistance of the Kurdish freedom movement wrote history and ones again showed, that the structural regime crisis of the fascist bourgeois Turkish state is deepening.

In the following years, the extermination plan was implemented: waves of arrests; trustees deployed by Erdogan in Northern Kurdistan municipalities and elected mayors were imprisoned; imprisonment of political representatives including HDP deputies; the occupation of cities in Kurdistan and their destruction; assassinations; desecration of the dead; intensified fascist state terror.

Torn State: Coup Attempt by an Old Ally

On 15 July 2016, the sudden attempt of a military coup took place, which was thwarted the next morning. The number of generals and officers, the commanding military units and bases, as well as the number of cities in which the attempt took place, have shown that this was a large-scale coup attempt. It was a coup attempt organized predominantly by nationalist-islamist parts of the Gulen movement. They wanted to take revenge for the defeat in the internal power struggle with Erdogan and seize again the state power. Apparently, the coup had been brought forward because the intelligence service received information about the coup plans and the following day leading generals of the coup were to be arrested.

This coup attempt was in reality a counter-coup attempt against Erdogan’s presidential dictatorship, which started a palace coup and eroded power after the June 7, 2015 elections. This coup attempt of the generals was defeated due to the change of plans, insufficient low rank soldiers placed in the streets and their fear of shooting civilians and the last minute change of sides by some parts of the coup. In Ankara and Istanbul, it looked like the armed clashes took place between the police and the army, while the first one was siding with Erdogan and the latter with the Gulenists, since the Gulenists in the police force had been removed and jailed in the last 3 years.

It was followed by the period of state of emergency declared on 20 July 2016, after which the dictator ruled with statutory decrees and became even more aggressive against any resistance.

Fascist Chieftaincy Regime as a Form to Consolidate the Dictatorship

With the state of emergency thousands of newspapers, journals, TV channels, radios, associations, NGO’s have been closed; thousands of people, especially HDP mem-

bers, have been imprisoned; more and more revolutionaries have been killed extralegally; academicians who signed an open letter for peace have been fired and face trials; in general thousands of people have been fired through decrees, especially democratic trade unionist teachers; judiciary is being totally controlled by the dictatorship; strikes have been forbidden to protect the economy; municipalities are usurped by the deployment of the trustees; cultural and environmental devastation took place. The palace dictatorship began to prepare itself openly for a civil war and organized paramilitary gangs on the streets.

Through a Referendum on April 16, 2017, which Erdogan won through state terror against the HDP and through cheating in the whole election process, the legal consolidation of the presidency system has been secured. This package has remained the prime ministry and the president gained the authority to appoint ministers outside the parliament, to dissolve the parliament and renew elections. The president has the power to declare states of emergency and remove basic rights by decrees. The president has the right to remain the chairman of his own party, AKP, which brought an official character to the party-state structure. To summarize, all the changes of this presidency system via these cheated elections provided the one-man-dictatorship of the chief Erdogan a legal basis.

Practically, Erdogan was well prepared for this, because he ruled in this way. He reorganized the military structures, institution of the state and removed the last remaining autonomy of the army. The bourgeois parliament lost any function, the state of emergency became the state of normality, the intelligence agency was newly designed, democratic rights have been abolished. This all happened before this referendum, but with the referendum it gained a legal "legitimacy".

The Political-Islamist Transformation of State Ideology

Besides the consolidation of a presidential dictatorship, the transformation of fascism by AKP took place primarily in the transformation of the state ideology. Kemalism, the doctrine of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, had been the official state ideology since the 1930s where the political Islam was excluded from the state. Under the name of „secularization“, the Sunni-Hanafi religion was used as an apparatus, the Alevism was ignored and the rights of belief of the Alevi people and other religious communities were suppressed. However, by the 1950's, under the leadership of Turkish prime minister Adnan Menderes, the path for the political Islam as an anti-communist apparatus within the US' „green-belt“ policy was opened. In the military coup of September 12, 1980, the "Turkish-Islam synthesis" was developed to expand the social base of fascism to the parts that were not Kemalist in order to stifle any progressive thought in the bud. But these efforts, which were directed against socialist thoughts, ultimately served the development of political Islam. In addition to the development of political Islam, the basis

of Kemalism was also limited by the strengthening struggles of the Kurds and Alevis. Kemalism has lost its dominance as a bourgeois state ideology. For the first time, political Islam became able to form a single-party government with the AKP and subsequently came to power. This does not mean, however, that Kemalism, which is the essence of the Turkish Republic, has been totally repealed from the state ideology.

Political Islam in its seizure of power has included Kemalism; it revised and claimed its "uniformity" understanding. The AKP was using all the benefits of power to build its political Islamist base against anti-state sentiments expressed through the pressure from Kurds and Alevis, thorough demands for socialism, national liberation, freedom of belief, and secularism. With the aim of Islamization of social consciousness, the AKP followed to attack all sections of society. 1980 putschist Kenan Evren was resorting to the „Turkish-Islam synthesis“ while Erdogan tried to make the „Sunni Islam-Turkish synthesis“ predominant.

Existential Crisis of Turkish Fascism

The whole history of AKP fascism, is the history of a desperate colonialist-fascist state to survive against the ongoing and uprising revolutionary and democratic forces and it is the history of inner-bourgeois struggles. Despite all the brutal state terror, despite the massacres and colonialist war, they could not suppress the Kurdish freedom will, they did not crush the revolutionaries and hope is still on the streets. They could not solve the regime crisis, they even sank deeper in their own inner-struggles. The regime crisis is not a periodic crisis. It roots in the existential fear of the state to lose its colonial yoke over Kurdistan, its monistic state legitimacy, to lose its own fundamental base. That is why, it is not important which part of the ruling class dominates fascism. Whether the generals, or the politic-Islamists, they all unite in protecting and following the colonialist fascist state character against the Kurdish people, in suppressing the revolutionary will of the workers, laborers and the oppressed, as well the integration of Turkey to the financial oligarchy via the financial economical colonization process.

The struggle for political freedom, the antifascist war against colonialism will be the answer of all the oppressed to fascism in any form. Revolutionaries will continue to grow a united struggle to overthrow the fascist regime, because the history of AKP fascism does not reflect only the political-islamist transformation of the state ideology, neither the absolute state terror, massacres and slaughters. This history is also marked by historic achievements of the revolutionary movement, legendary peoples-resistances in Kurdistan, the first nationwide uprising in Turkey, a unique unification of revolutionaries and democratic forces to a further level of organization, a first women's uprising in history of Turkey, military revolutionary fronts against fascism. Leaning on this revolutionary basis, the communist vanguard will keep on its unyielding fight, using all means and forms of the struggle to overthrow fascism and build socialism.

Popular Militia in the Resistance Against the Palace Strategy and Partisan War

The communist vanguard uses every means and form of struggle as long as they respond to the needs of revolutionary struggle and in accordance with the given forces. Partisan war is one form of armed struggle and is part of the revolution strategy of MLKP.

As a form of struggle waged by a militarily and physically weaker force against a stronger force, partisan war is based on flexible, widespread and mobile mode of war of small units. Partisan war focuses on politically and militarily battering the enemy with sudden blows without facing with the main forces of the enemy at the front, aims at the hinterland of the front line of the enemy and tries to cut the connection between the forefront and the hinterland. It helps oneself accumulate force in order to turn into an army big enough to prevail when taking the field for a frontal war against the enemy. The forces of partisan war are classified into two categories: the first one is guerrilla, which professionally carries out the politic-military struggle with the enemy and constitutes of the attacking force; and the second one is militia, which is organized more broadly inside the masses and constitutes of the defending force.

Our anti-imperialist, antifascist, sexual emancipating, democratic revolution strategy, foresees that the united revolution of Turkey and Kurdistan will achieve the victory ultimately, through total urban uprisings due to their significance on the result, but at the same time by passing through a civil war or a series of civil wars, and that the whole process will carry a relatively long-lasting character. This means that the course of revolutionary development will not follow a straight line, a total popular uprising will not consist of only one clash, and that the revolution will be realized as an overall of a series of civil wars and uprisings, and “breather breaks” in between.

Thus, in this possible course of progress of our revolution, the partisan war in Turkey and Kurdistan, in urban and rural areas, is a significant means to ripen the subjective conditions of the revolution, to accumulate strength for civil war, to gather and prepare armed forces for popular uprisings in the cities, to reunite these forces in the periods between uprisings, and for the revolutionary will to play its special role in achieving these strategic goals. Since the revolutionary process will advance as a rich combination of struggles of masses, taking legal and illegal, peaceful and violent, unarmed and armed forms, partisan war is in service to develop these struggles all along.

Accordingly, the militia signifies the organization of a channel to realize direct revolutionary violent actions of masses and more effective forms of united popular resistance against the colonialist fascist regime. It also signifies the active preparation of the most progressive sections of the working class and oppressed for total urban uprisings and the creation of massive armed forces to move the outburst of uprisings forward.

The Tactic of Active Defense and Popular Militia

Facing the mass massacres of the fascist political-islamist Palace junta, carried out by means of ISIS and facing the state terror especially aggravated to utmost after the July 15th coup attempt of Gulen movement, the antifascist and democratic mass movement is retreating. Despite this fact, the structural crisis of the regime is continuing with all its current expressions and the struggle dynamics of the masses, which have retreated without experiencing an absolute direct defeat, keep on existing endogenously. Revolutionary conditions remain. As the elements of civil war accumulate during the course of political developments, political-islamist fascist dictator Erdogan accelerates both redesign of the armed forces of the regime and organizing street gangs inside the AKP basis as striking forces.

As the armed and illegal forms of struggle and methods based on violence gain weight, the conditions of this period require both struggle tools and organizational forms appropriate to this objective reality. The conditions also demand that the communist vanguard uses those more effectively and adapts its organizational structure to this. Therefore, militia organization gain much more political significance today as one of the organizational forms required by the struggle period we are living in.

Antifascist masses who are opposed to the Erdogan's sultanate are in need of boosting morale and courage by the resistance actions and the militant vanguard stances of the revolutionary and communist subjects in order to participate in the struggle more strongly. They anticipate that the most effective way to take a stand against this unbridled fascist state terror can be materialized by using the forms of struggle based on revolutionary violence, and they understand this from their own experience. Clearly, when such a resistance praxis cannot be executed by the revolutionary and communist subjects as expected by the masses, each unsatisfactory situation will not only push those who talk about this necessity but don't carry out such actions into a terrible opportunist inconsistency, but also pave the way for the deepening of hesitancy of the masses and the fading away of the combatant dynamics.

A critical link of the application of the tactic of active defense against the fascist political-islamist Palace junta, simply putting it, a link that can pave the way for “resistance and victory against the dictator” is now organizing the popular militia in the broadest way possible. Popular militia is the self-defense organization containing the most progressive ranks of the laborers and oppressed. It is the militant force of the resistance against fascism in neighborhoods, the massively characterized organization using means and methods of violence. It is the struggle group composing those who are “casual in the day, armed in the night”.

The popular militia groups will be functional in a wide range of tasks, such as carrying out violent actions targeting the

official or civil extensions of the Palace fascism and providing security for the mass movement during mobilization and demonstrations. This functionality will be materialized in one case by destroying an AKP representative building or an institution associated with ISIS and in another case, it can be shattering an armored water-cannon vehicle or in often cases, defending political mass demonstrations against the police attack in a vanguard way. It can be sometimes responding the civil fascist mobs at schools with means of violence, sometimes punishing a snitch or organizing illegal “free” propaganda demonstrations in laboring neighborhoods. So, popular militia will express itself in its own language about the current issues of political class struggle, manifest a resistance practice in the unique forms.

Active counterrevolutionary forces concretized in various examples such as local AKP organs and administrators, the Ottoman Hearths, local MHP organs and administrators and the Grey Wolves, police stations and vehicles, ISIS extension organizations in the appearance of associations, workplaces linked to ISIS, mukhtars and municipality employees who attempt to do public enemy works, trustees in replacement of the elected mayors, collaborators and snitches of fascism, publication services oriented by the Palace, harasser and rapist persons and institutions, high school headmasters applying fascist oppression to students, bosses responsible for workplace murders will be in the crosshairs of the revolutionary violent actions of popular militia.

Each local resistance practice of popular militia will prevent the spreading of the mood, “one cannot resist, one cannot succeed”, which the Palace fascism is trying to create. Each one of them will open the gates to position those who tend to resist but wait for a vanguard-gripping praxis, in the ranks of struggle. These practices will play role in breathing determination and trust to masses. And the overall of these resistance practices, on a general basis, will both politically batter the fascist Palace dictatorship and be a lever for antifascist mass movement to revive and grow in the resistance direction.

The Structure of Popular Militia

All the vivid and energetic elements of the antifascist masses must be hailed as the potential forces of popular militia. There is no need for militia constituents to leave their own regular work and life places, on contrary, these groups of people become militia in their daily routine and join the resistance. Undoubtedly, the main human source of the militia groups is the laboring neighborhood youth. These militia groups can be formed in a flexible and inclusive way and as trios. This means that laboring neighborhoods are the primary places for popular militia to organize and spread fastest. However, popular militia is surely not limited with laboring neighborhoods. The aim has to be spreading it to schools, workplaces and everywhere possible. And again, forming self-defense units unique to different social and political struggle dynamics, such as women’s liberation militia, Qizilbash-Alevi militia, student’s militia, worker’s militia, has a great value as a political pathfinder.

Popular militia organization cannot be approached isolated from the antifascist mass movement which manifest itself

with legal or de-facto legitimate struggle forms on a general or local level. It must be considered exactly as a form of mass movement. Because, militia is not an organizational model only limited with the organized forces of communist and revolutionary subjects. It cannot be expected that popular militia will spontaneously gain a massive character in practice. In the beginning, the party must organize its bellicose poised basis as militia or form militia cores together with other revolutionary subjects. Yet still, the vivid and especially young sections of the antifascist masses must certainly be attracted to the ranks of the militia. Defending each Kurdistan district where the autonomy was declared via militia units composing hundreds of people, under the name of YPS (Yekîneyên Parastina Sîvîl- Civil Defense Units) and the fact that this whole self-defense process has arisen over the heroic resistance of the militia numbering tens of thousands are just quite fresh examples for popular militia developing as an armed mass movement.

To put a short emphasis, the current issue is not about organizing militia only as a special and narrow underground structure, but beyond that, it is to build a network of popular militia ever growing inside the suitable popular antifascist dynamics popping up at the de-facto legitimate struggle front. Some of these militia groups can be directly bound to MLKP and some other can be bound to the Peoples’ United Revolution Movement or locally organized united resistance committees.

Each militia group must have a minimum political and technical capacity without any kind of perfectionism or idealization. This can cover practical training of the militia constituents on basic technical topics such as preparing molotovs and using pistols. But at the same time, it also covers basic trainings for group members to comprehend what kind of enemy targets should be politically prioritized, how to maintain secure connection inside the group, which aspects should be taken into account while preparing an action plan and how to make a stash appropriate for the purpose.

A working and struggle mode based on constant mobilization is vital for militia groups. Militia must never be stuck in a mood of cooling off and must constantly take on new tasks, focus on dashing small but perpetual hits. Being mobile for a militia group must be complemented with an integrity of all aspects, which contains simple trainings, intelligence works, supplying equipments, free agitation works, preparation of some possibilities like house and vehicle, or setting up stash places as well as the planning and carrying out of revolutionary violent actions towards a fascist enemy target.

The revolutionary will of the communist vanguard must be embodied in the successful fulfillment of the tasks augmenting and strengthening the resistance ranks of our peoples against the political-islamist fascist dictator Erdogan. Here, as much as it develops and spreads, popular militia will become both an icebreaker for the united antifascist resistance of the working class and oppressed, and a big source of fighters for the politic-military front and guerrilla units of the communist vanguard.

The Dialectic of Breaks and Leaps at the Developmental Thresholds of a Revolutionary

Everyone who looks at social life a bit analytically can easily become aware of the fact that there are countless “transition moments” in human life. From birth until the end of life, countless transitional moments are hidden throughout life, but they are also hidden in certain stages. Start with crawling and running, spelling and speaking; beginning the school, changing home, changing education or profession, changing to another city or country, loving, falling in love, marrying, divorcing, completion of primary or elementary school, changing school, beginning high school or university, changing the current social environment, becoming mother or father, joining to an any form of organization, plunging into political struggle, creating cultural, sportive or artistic artifacts, debiting, undertaking new responsibilities...

In human life, countless given situations disappear as they get obsolete and innumerable new situations arise. There are turning points and thresholds between given situations and new situations. Human is a social being and the “human as an individual” is nothing but the sum of social relationships. As in all other times, the human as an individual can not be segregated from society and can not be treated in isolation, even in the moments of transition. Thus, the moments of transition can also be comprehended through the interaction of the human as an individual with its whole social relations. But each threshold, each transition moment is conditioned by “internal struggle”. And this internal struggle takes place in interaction with the social environment in which it realizes itself.

As in social life, there are also countless “transition moments” and turning points in the revolutionary life for the vigorous builders of the party and revolution, ranging to administrators and leaders. Tasks and responsibilities of a revolutionary change and a revolutionary goes from one field to another task. The working area may change, from the de-facto legitimate struggle front to the free underground; a mass agitator may turn into a commander of the militia, or vice versa, if the conditions allow. One may be a propagandist, but becomes an organizer, a soldier or a commander, and vice versa. One may be a soldier or commander in the urban guerrilla, but may have to move to the rural guerrilla. One may be a press laborer, a militant for the news of the revolution, but tomorrow may be an organizing militant of the mass work. One may need to take part in a front organization and to change city, and vice versa. The revolutionary can be arrested, imprisoned, or even move to another prison or cell, then gets out of jail. Likewise, political conditions may change and one has to continue under new conditions. Numerous similar situations are the thresholds in the life of a revolutionary militant. The “transition moments” also apply to parties that are collective en-

ties. When the political conditions change, they must pass from the old situation to the new situation and they must do this without any delay. “The changing period” challenges the collective subject by giving it the task and responsibility to adapt to new conditions and to be the revolutionary response in all respects of the new conditions.

Collective revolutionary subjects, revolutionary leaders and revolutionary militants face the deepest and most profound problems of change and renewal in transition moments of world history. It is unpredictable whether this confrontation will start from the theoretical, programmatic, strategic, tactical or organizational areas and problems, as well as how it begins and progresses. One of many options becomes actual. However, since the economic, social and political aspects of the world, in which the collective subjects act, have changed, this new objectivity encompasses them and forces them to face it. Objectivity challenges the subject through the right to exist and existential questions under the new conditions, with the demand to reorganize. When collective subjects and individuals do not solve the problem of “reorganization” in these moments, they become resistant to history and thus fall out of history. The response to the revolutionary call of history and to the problems of theory, program, strategy, tactic and organization, that the new objectivity demands from the revolutionary subject, corresponds to a reorganization. The first and last quarter of the 20th century, as a process, have presented both situations, the falling apart of history and the restructuring within the reality of collective structures and their leaders, which fight with ambitions of socialism or fight on the basis of socialism.

What is the “revolutionary dialectic of transition moments”, separately from their scope and depth, and their specific histories? What does it mean for the collective and how does it take place in the development of a revolutionary militant? What is (are) the break(s), what do/es the decline(s) mean? Can a break only be a break or what happens if a “break, remains as a break”? What is a leap, is it possible to “leap without a break”?

The metaphor of a bridge connecting two fields, describes the transition moments well. The bridge emphasizes the value of the meaning of its own existence, in a way, by underlining the existence of two sides with their separate unique realities. The two sides, that the bridge connects one to another, are two separate geographies. The bridge metaphor describes the transition from one state to another in the revolutionary life of a militant. The bridge is fixed, but the transition is mobile and dynamic. The moments of transition are nothing but short or long, deep or shallow, simple or complex dialectical processes. There are various types of bridges that differ in length, height and variety. The



moments of transition cannot be the same, of course, each of them has a unique history, but the moments of transition are “characteristically” phases with the same “quality”.

Without exception, a transition from one situation to another means a change and a movement. All transitional states include contradictions, problems, uncertainties, possibilities and risks, “wonders”, “what if”s, “or”s and numerous questions that seek for an answer. Essentially, transitions to new situations, are the moments of internal tension and crisis for the revolutionary individual subject. The driving force, the impulsive dynamic of the “transition movement” exists in the structure, which is loaded with the active contradictions that the state of transition has evoked and fermented. For this reason, each transition state is an “objectivity” that challenges its subject. It can be a revolutionary springboard, but it can also turn to a retreat and a return to the order, a pit of falling backward, a mutilating swirl. There is no other way; a revolutionary will face the state of transition, which will challenge him*her, being aware of it, consciously and voluntarily or spontaneously. There is no doubt that the militant already has a continuous revolutionary task and responsibility, as conditioned by his*her revolutionary existence and revolutionary history, such as managing his*her own revolutionary development. Each revolutionary more or less does this in a planned and systematic or spontaneous way. However, the moments of transition are out of routine, the nodes of revolutionary life are the thresholds of the revolutionary development. The militant has to lead his*her own development for revolutionary purposes and in a revolutionary manner, with consciousness and purposeful desire, will and leading of “break and leap”, which are conditioned by the transitional state.

Each “given situation” tends to maintain and sustain itself with the comfort of the convenience provided by habits, with its status quo and addiction to the habits it produces; the subject’s consciousness and emotions are conditioned and narcotized in this direction. However, every new situation demands, conditions and forces change and painfully challenges a “given revolutionary existence” with questions, contradictions, doubts, uncertainties and risks. What is challenged, is the quality of the revolutionary’s existence and revolutionariness! This challenge, however, can only be

responded in a revolutionary manner, with a higher level of production and structuring of revolutionariness, with a leap from a given situation forward.

Not only professional revolutionaries, every candidate of a professional revolutionary and every revolutionary militant has to know, that he*she will face countless transition periods during his*her revolutionary life. The situation will test revolutionary devotion, but he*she will give water to his*her steel by solving the nodes of transition moments in a revolutionary manner and gaining new qualities of revolutionariness.

If one end of the node of transition moment is the break with the given state, the other end is the leap to the new state. If the break with the given state occurs as changing field and duty, it becomes actual and physical and seems sharp as a knife. In that case, the status of the given situation is physically distorted, but the revolutionary can still bear the old habits, ways of thinking and mentality, which played a revolutionary role under the conditions of the given situation. The deepest jolts undoubtedly occur in the given structuring of emotion, and the emotions will be restructured while renewing in an atmosphere of the most staggering, shaky internal storms. The conclusions drawn from the critical revolutionary questioning of the status quo, the habits, the way of thinking, the emotional structure and the mentality, gives the break a revolutionary meaning and depth and becomes a revolutionary antidote for conformism. The breaks mean a little bit, “getting rid of the burdens of a given state”, don’t they?! Breaks must find their correspondence in the demolition of habits caused by the given situation, as well as in the revolutionary critical overcoming of the way of thinking and mentality, as well as in questioning the emotional structure and working style associated with the given situation.

The revolutionary militant, who is the subject of the transition moment in emotion, thinking, habit, mentality, fills his*her time with the cleaning of the burdens as the break with the ball and chain; but the break does not immediately and directly mean a leap. The break is about what is related with past, what belongs to past in emotion, thinking, mentality and mode of working. If we look closer to our metaphor here, break means to remove and destroy the

ties, which are not only burdens from the past about feeling, thinking, the mode of working and binding, but also obstacles for the future.

The leap is about the future. It is the construction of the future side of the bridge. It is the constituent revolutionary action responding to the revolutionary requirements of the new situation. Breaks, as well as leaps, are very striking, when they occur with the participation of a woman or man laborer, who lives a taught life, of an oppressed, a youth, to the revolutionary action as a party member. But the flowing and ongoing revolutionary life requires, conditions and demands new breaks and leaps on the basis of revolutionariness. If we look from the perspective of the first case, this is the break rooting in depth. Leap does not only mean for a revolutionary to remain at the height at which he*she reaches, but that he*she categorically gains altitude, and rises to the more advanced new level of revolutionariness. The integrity of break and leap means the militant freeing him*herself from burdens, destroying his*her boundaries, gaining a revolutionary character by overcoming his*her limitations and narrownesses, and deepening his*her revolutionariness by passing to a more advanced level of revolutionariness. In the life of a revolutionary militant, the leap, as well as the break, must be an organized revolutionary action.

During the transition moment, which comes up due to the necessity or the obligation of change of the “given situation”, the task, the fighting front, the city, the political and organizational conditions; the revolutionary militant has to organize the revolutionary leap action as well as the revolutionary break action. Only the mental and emotional concentration for the new situation, the new period, the new task in a revolutionary manner can organize the leap. But to turn the directions of emotions and thoughts towards the future is a good beginning to organize the leap without shifting any indirect way. The acceptance of the new situation should not satisfy on its own, transition to the new state, accordingly revolutionary positioning should also be wanted, desired and the revolutionary should even be passionately locked into the future. This means understanding and analyzing the new area and the situation, the problems and tasks that arise from them. Understanding the conditions, barriers, problems and challenges to carry out the revolutionary tasks disperses the fog-curtains, puts an end to the hesitation created by uncertainty and develops the self-confidence of the revolutionary militant as well as an openness of thought. Just as the backwardness, ambiguities, contradictions and blind spots, selfishness, individualism, the occurring of “small bribes of the system” in the feelings and thoughts of a revolutionary put a brake on the strength of his*her revolutionary action, just as they produce indecisiveness and even drown him*her; from the contrary point of view, an openness of thought, a comprehensive and deep understanding of revolutionary tasks and clarity awaken his*her revolutionary energy, sharpen his*her revolutionary determination and revolutionary will, and also whip up the desire to mentally and practically get into action and the passion for success.

At every threshold, if the revolutionary militant leans on the strict critical revolutionary analysis of the transitional period in which he*she enters, then he*she can properly make use of both the process and the revolutionary possibilities of breaking and leaping offered by the transition process, and then turn them into a leverage for his*her revolutionary development. Each turning point, each threshold is determined by an internal struggle taking place in the existential reality of the revolutionary. Loyalty to socialist and revolutionary goals, as well as commitment to revolutionary values, must manage this internal struggle. And, of course, the party’s experiences should guide the revolutionary militant. One cannot play hide-and-seek with the reality of the internal struggle of the moment of transition. One cannot escape and fear from facing with oneself and looking into the eyes of one’s revolutionary reality! By leaning on the basis of the revolutionariness he*she has internalized and grow what is revolutionary inside, he*she must deliberately open the distance with the non-revolutionary, with what belongs to the order, just like opening the gap with the enemy in a real battle; he*she must fight the emotions and thoughts that limit the revolutionary action, as if it is a fight with the enemy; he*she must turn the inner struggle into an opportunity to deepen in his*her freedom.

“The revolutionary violence of criticism” is the strongest weapon of a revolutionary in the inner struggle, which is resulted by revolutionary development. Courageously, masterfully and wisely, basing on the ground of experience of the party, he*she must walk against his*her weak sides, against the old, lingering, ball-and-chain inner walls of oneself setting barriers in front of his*her development, against the small and diminishing cesspool mounds of capitalism. At every threshold of his*her revolutionary development, the revolutionary must be inspired again and again by the revolutionary consciousness of the deliberate action of “burning the ships” and must lead the revolutionary process by burning the shipyards and ships of the given conditions.

The revolutionary militant should know well that in this struggle, the political conditions will have a word impacting and influencing in their unique way. The general political atmosphere diffuses in one side of the internal struggle, and puts its weight there, through very different means, but in some cases directly. Just like each apple carries its worms at its heart, the enemy of a revolutionary lays within him*herself. In particular, the counterrevolutionary, daunting pressure of the conditions of the fascist aggression that stepped up a fierce level, echoes in the weak sides of the revolutionary militant, nourishes the bonds with the order, and gnaws the revolutionary determination. The revolutionary breakthrough period of the struggle nourishes the revolutionary front of the internal struggle and gives courage and energy to the revolutionary.

The revolutionary militant must know well that the personal revolutionariness experience and even personal history before being a revolutionary will have a word affecting the reality of the internal struggle of each threshold, each transition. Because the internal struggle at each threshold

has a historical background that finds its value in personal revolutionariness history. That background, whether conscious or spontaneously, will affect and pick a side of the inner struggle of each period in a complex way. While organizing the break and leap required by that specific moment, when a militant places this organizing process in a context of a continuous development line in his*her revolutionariness history, which follows a sequence of break and leap – accumulate and advance – break and leap – accumulate and advance, this understanding brings depth to the break, altitude to the leap and enlarges the diameter and horizon of the revolutionariness, all of which are not only conditioned by the revolutionary history and actual moment, but also demanded by the revolutionary mind. This is also the way to build his*her historical integrity. It smashes the given boundaries, leads a higher level of freeing oneself. It is the construction of higher level of self-confidence in every revolutionary leaping forward. A revolutionary is the one, who enlarges revolutionary claims at every threshold. When the founders of Marxism said that everyone makes his*her own history, they weren't just saying futilely. Practicing Marxist doctrine is to enable action; revolutionary unity of praxis mean to be based on the general critical revolutionary analysis of own revolutionary development line in every period, at every threshold of revolutionary development, and to bind that threshold to the whole. This gives the revolutionary militant the inner illumination and control over his*her own history, as well as the possibility and ability to manage his*her own development.

The party and the revolutionary militant must know very well that the party environment, in particular, the party leadership and the leading organs have a strong and effective word during the internal struggle of transition phases of revolutionary militants. This, of course, is in connection with “the party's own situation”, because the role played by a leadership, which develops and leads the march forward of the party, is not the same role played by a leadership, which is faltering and inadequate, for example. However, what is spoken about is realizing the management of the transition of the cadres to the new situation as a structural element of the cadre policy of the party, under the conditions of changing front, field or duty of a cadre, as well as the changing political situation and party policies. An organizational leadership is functional as long as it is able to do so in terms

of its main cadres constituting the backbone of the party, and thus can lead the cadre policy as a whole. This is not the only determinant, but the leadership must be able to direct and manage the internal struggle of the revolutionary militant. On the other hand, the revolutionary militant is an active collective individual and can and should lead his*her own internal struggle. The ideal is the meeting of collective subject and individual subject with the revolutionary mind and will. The party has to perceive the inner struggles of a revolutionary in transition periods within his*her own microcosm.

The most solid assurance of a revolutionary militant in all crossroad moments is the criterion of updating the close adherence to the revolutionary and socialist goals. It is not the sustainment of devotion to the revolutionary and socialist ideals, but rather the continuation of it by “updating” and “renewing”. All given conditions will cause loss of meaning and fading by abrading the bond and commitment of militant with his*her ideals through the status quo they create. Updating is a renewal and deepening of bond and commitment.

At each crossroad, self-criticism is the closest combat companion and the most reliable comrade-in-arm of a revolutionary militant; what is felt this way is the revolutionary violence of self-criticism. Self-criticism is, first and foremost, the ideological action that leads to overcoming the level of revolutionariness achieved in the given situation. The revolutionary action of self-criticism begins with the “acceptance” of limitations, deficiencies, failures, narrownesses, errors and weaknesses. But it only starts with it! It proceeds in a revolutionary way, with a critical revolutionary analysis of the assumptions and determinations, in particular by inquiring the causes, the questions of how and why. Revolutionary violence of criticism is the ideological fire, questioning the limits of the current state of revolutionariness and shaking the right of existence and legitimacy of this current state with its subversive effect.

This revolutionary fire, which sets up the breaks on the ground of revolutionariness, is the bow of the revolutionary leap forward. As much as the future orientation becomes clearer in emotion and thought, as much as it sets up action, the revolutionary action of leap, with its new reconstructed level, is shaped as the revolutionary thinking, revolutionary mode and stance of the new conditions.



Marxist Leninist Communist Party Turkey / Kurdistan



“... the militia signifies the active preparation for total urban uprisings of the most progressive sections of the working class and the oppressed, organizing the massive armed forces to move the outburst of uprisings forward. “



RED DAWN #18

www.mlkp-info.org
mail@mlkp-info.org