

Against World War III

Social organization beyond state power

Songül Karabulut

April 7, 2020

Contents

Change of the world order	3
Drive for power accumulation	4
Social organization beyond power structures	4
A brief chronology of the Third World War	5
Proxy war in Syria and Iraq	6
The exploitation of Libya and Turkey	7
Turkey and the AKP	8
Idlib – a turning point?	9
Turkey’s domestic policy	10
Turkey will remain in power because capitalist modernity needs it	11
Conclusion	11

The year 2019 was marked by wars and resistance, and it is already clear that 2020 will be even more eventful.

Only three days after New Year's Eve, the commander of the Iranian Revolutionary Guard, Qasem Soleimani, was assassinated in Baghdad by the USA, and at the end of January Trump published his "Peace Plan of the Century" for the Middle East conflict. While Turkey is occupying further areas in Northeast Syria and is currently struggling for Idlib, Erdoğan had the mandate for a Turkish military operation in Libya approved by the Turkish parliament on January 2 and sent fighters to intervene in the Libyan conflict on his behalf. One after the other Libya conferences take place sometimes in Istanbul under Putin and Erdoğan, then in Berlin under Merkel, then in Geneva under UN orientation, all without any noteworthy success. The Syrian regime is expanding its power in the country and is currently taking action against armed militias in Idlib despite resistance and criticism. Military clashes are taking place between Turkey and the Syrian regime. Is the tide finally turning for Turkey in Syria?

Change of the world order

Undoubtedly, events are not limited to those in the Middle East; a whirlwind is also sweeping the world. In Latin American countries protests against police violence, social inequality, autocratic leadership and manipulation and corruption are increasing. The EU is changing due to the departure of Great Britain and EU states are struggling with both economic crises and the strengthening of right-wing parties. Climate protests and women's uprisings decorate the streets. The USA declares war on China economically by blocking its own door from the competition. In addition to political developments, natural events and diseases such as the forest fires in Australia or the coronavirus dominate the agenda.

It is hardly possible to capture developments on the basis of daily political events if the strategic driving force behind all these changes is not taken into account.

Before we look at current developments and try to put them into context, it might be useful to recall some key points:

We are dealing with a systemic crisis and with the capitalist system's attempt to use military, political, economic and psychological means to build a new political system in its interests. Even if the New World Order is cemented with the reorganization of the Middle East, it is by no means just a regional conflict. The transformation of the world order, led by the hegemonic power of capitalism, the USA, in the form of a new world war, the Third World War, is currently being carried out with full violence and destruction in the region. This project is meeting with resistance. The regional nation states, for example, with their regimes, which were brought to power in the 20th century with the support of the West and kept there, and which are now defending the status quo, are resisting because they are now being disempowered one by one. These regional regimes have done their duty in the eyes of capitalism and are now an obstacle to be overcome.

Then there are the population and social groups, the masses who have been deprived of breath, both under capitalism and under their governments, are oppressed and exploited, who now stand up for their interests and rights and fill the streets.

Drive for power accumulation

The fact that we are dealing with a systemic change is not only noticeable because of the disempowered regimes, but also because all international institutions, organizations and “values” as well as political and diplomatic practices are changing and losing their original meaning. Since the Kosovo war in 1999, the UN has had a serious identity problem; it is much more appearance than reality. NATO, which actually lost its basis of existence with the disintegration of the USSR, cannot be clearly defined either. It is no coincidence that Macron declared them brain dead. The EU, too, is in a process of transformation, especially after the departure of Great Britain. Who still talks about martial law or international law today? These were all 20th century institutions and “values”. These changes will also affect existing borders and will bring with them the emergence of new structures, institutions and customs.

Capitalist modernity with its 5000 year history of power changed and took new economic and political forms without really changing its fundamental character. When the form of “leadership” reached its limits, restorations were made to extend its life span. What remains unchanged is the urge to accumulate power, which in turn means exploitation and oppression. Every time it reaches its limits – as it has done again for several decades – it tries to shed its shell by reorganization, like a snake shedding its skin. The opening up of new territories, raw materials, reservoirs of labour, technical innovations, all serve to ensure the compulsion to accumulate. This in turn means more exploitation, more oppression, more crisis and chaos, war, poverty, flight, environmental destruction. This situation is comparable to the snowball effect – it becomes bigger and more unpredictable when rolling in snow. The pressure on people and on the environment is becoming more and more unbearable and stronger. We are currently in this phase in which capitalist modernity is trying to reorganise the world according to its own interests.

Social organization beyond power structures

Against the system of capitalist modernity there is only one true opponent and one true alternative. And that is social organization beyond power structures, with its own unwritten ethics, with its own organizational structures, with its own values, collectivity and solidarity. The core of this sociality is primarily represented by the group of women. Capitalist modernity was built on the basis of the subjugation of women’s gender and has since been structurally patriarchal. Women are the most marginalised and exploited by this power system. Then there are the ethnic groups which are disenfranchised and oppressed as a result of this power system, but which do not accept this, such as the Kurdish or Palestinian people. Any organised force that challenges the system is a strategic opponent of capitalist modernity. Against this background, we can say that the strategic opponent of capitalist modernity is the ethical-political society, in particular women. Sociality is still strong in the Middle East, defying the influences of capitalism with its liberal ideology. Against this background it is no coincidence that the Third World War was started in the Middle East. The sociality of the Middle East is one of the main targets of this war. A New World Order on the basis of the total conquest of the region by capitalism can only take place when the sociality has been smashed and the region with its people and ideals as well as material resources are available for exploitation. It is a war of the material civilization of the West against the moral civilization of the East. The AKP has the role of the Trojan horse here. More on this

in a moment. Against this background we can say that the current Third World War is strategically taking place between capitalist modernity and democratic modernity (the ethical-political societies).

In this war there is also a struggle for hegemony, which in turn can be seen as a power struggle between the forces of capitalist modernity. The USA is trying to assert itself as a hegemonic power, while other powers want to extend their influence and power and compete with the USA. Russia and China should be mentioned here. Regional states are also struggling for regional hegemony, such as Turkey or Iran. While all states of capitalist modernity defend the system against the strategic opponent, democratic modernity, they fight against each other in the question of power and influence. Thus, it is evident that the states are both fighting against each other and interacting with each other.

The states have to act militarily, politically, economically on a global level as well as keep their own population in check in domestic politics.

The states try to control the reactions of their own population, which is militarily, politically, economically and psychologically affected by the crisis. Some try it with dictatorial-fascist leadership and with violence and authority, others with ideological poison such as nationalism, sexism or religious fanaticism, and even more popular and widespread as in Europe and Latin America is the emergence of right-wing populist-fascist parties to make the population defend the old system (the “choice between plague and cholera”) instead of turning away from the system completely and looking for alternatives.

A brief chronology of the Third World War

A first sign of the Third World War after the collapse of real socialism was the Gulf War in 1990. After Saddam Hussein’s military intervention in Kuwait, the USA began to make preparations with military intervention. Saddam’s influence was limited to Baghdad and the foundations for the tripartite division of Iraq were laid. The Oslo peace process in 1993 weakened Palestinian resistance. And finally, with the support of Tansu Çiller [Turkish Prime Minister 1993–1996], the total war against the Kurdish liberation movement PKK was started with the aim of nipping it in the bud and preventing it from expanding towards Southern Kurdistan (Northern Iraq). Saddam could have been easily disempowered in 1990, but the conditions were not yet mature, so it was waited until then. Without these precautions, disempowerment of Saddam in 1990 could have led to the power vacuum being filled by actively fighting peoples. At the same time as preparations were being made for active intervention in the Middle East, attempts were also being made to integrate the Balkans, the Caucasus, Africa, Asia and Latin America into the system, which were set against global capitalism on the basis of real socialism.

The second phase began with the attacks of 11 September 2001, which were used to take military action against Afghanistan (Taliban) and Iraq (Saddam Hussein). The PKK’s power of action was quite minimised by the international conspiracy in 1998 and later by the attempts to split in 2003, so that it was considered “harmless” when Iraq disintegrated. In its place, a “Kurdish state” was virtually founded in northern Iraq with system-compliant Kurds.

The third phase began in 2010 with the so-called Arab Spring. Tunisia, Egypt, Yemen, Libya and most recently Syria – the popular uprisings were used to control the civil war countries in order to shape the change according to their own interests.

As a fourth phase we can name the period after the liberation of Raqqa, i.e. after the victory over Daesch (the “Islamic State”, IS). The USA tried to claim the achievements of the struggle against the IS for itself and addressed new opponents. These are now undoubtedly Iran and the Kurds who are acting according to the paradigms of Abdullah Ocalan. Let’s take a brief look at key points of what happened after Raqqa: Kerkûk, occupation of Efrîn, Serê Kaniyê, Girê Spî, attacks on al-Hashd ash-Shabi, 2018 embargo against Iran, civil war-like developments in Iraq and Iran, US bounty on three high-ranking PKK leaders.

The USA wants to prevent the PKK from using the war between the USA and Iran to extend its influence and strengthen it as it did when it attacked Iraq. Therefore, an increase in attacks is expected.

This is also the reason why Turkey is supported despite differences. It will be supported for as long as a club against the Kurds is needed.

Proxy war in Syria and Iraq

After these basic constants and the brief historical background, we now turn to the political developments and try to classify them.

After the attacks on 11 September 2001, the then US President Bush declared Iran to be part of the “Axis of Evil”. In 2017, Trump underlined this once again and in 2018 he reinforced the sanctions. Iran has greatly expanded its influence in Iraq and Syria. The Hash-ash Shaabi forces he has created are active and effective. For this reason, the war between the USA and Iran in the form of a proxy war in Syria and Iraq has been going on for some time.

This changed when on January 3, at Trump’s order, the commander of the Iranian Revolutionary Guards, Qasem Soleimani, was killed by a US missile at Baghdad airport. Soleimani had coordinated Iranian foreign operations in the region. Iran was able to expand its influence in Syria and Iraq. Previously, the war between the USA and Iran had been concretely observed in Iraq. While pressure increased to persuade the Iranian government to resign, Iran used Shiite forces in the country against the USA and demanded their withdrawal. For months, mass uprisings continued in Baghdad and other areas (mainly Shiite cities) and attacks on the US embassy in Baghdad [see the interview with Sait Ervan in the last issue]. Even if the expected military escalation between the US and Iran did not occur after the attack on Soleimani, this does not in any way mean that the conflict has been resolved. The fuse is lit. In view of the statements on both sides, we can say that both want to prevent a direct war. Iran reacted to the assassination with threats of retaliation, not with the unleashing of open war. It seems that the US will try to break Iran’s influence in the region, to contain it so that it no longer poses a threat to Israel. Against this background, they will shift their activities more from Syria to Iraq. Iran is to be limited to its core country and persuaded to make concessions. Against this background, military activities against each other outside Iran and the USA are to be expected in the region from both sides. Furthermore, the USA will act economically and psychologically against Iran.

Although this attack has harmed Iran externally, it has been more beneficial to Iran domestically. The existing and active resentment of the population against the regime could be silenced with “enemy rhetoric and nationalism” by means of the US attack. But for a long time Iran cannot ignore the legitimate demands of the population. It could escape outside intervention if it seriously addresses the problems, if it develops sustainable solutions involving the various ethnic

and religious groups and women. But as with all other rulers, this option is unlikely. Either the country will be integrated into the New World Order system with limited violence, economic and political pressure through concessions, or it will also be confronted with direct war.

Iran has so far been able to successfully keep itself out of the spotlight by engaging in confrontations outside the country. This is also the reason why it is once again active in Idlib and has offered itself as a mediator between Turkey and the Syrian regime on the Idlib question. Iran has no interest in such conflicts being resolved.

Iran and Turkey are competing for regional hegemony. While Iran bases its power on the Shiite presence, Turkey is relying on the Sunni presence. Despite deep historical differences, both have often proved that they can ignore them when it comes to fighting the Kurds.

Developments in Iraq will follow Iranian policy. The protests continue and a solution does not seem to be in sight. Due to the US attack, the Shiite forces in Iraq have been stirred up and the South Kurdish political forces do not want to antagonise neither the USA nor Iran. They are afraid of being faced with the choice. Therefore, they bet on a balanced policy. But that Iran has chosen US bases in Hewlêr for its retaliation shows that it will not be easy. Moreover, rumours say that the Democratic Party of Kurdistan PDK was involved in Soleimani's death; this uncertainty may provoke new crises.

It is also not unlikely that Turkey will start a military occupation adventure in Southern Kurdistan in the course of its neo-Ottoman hegemonic policy. Contrary to contrary statements of Nêçîrvan Barzanî (the President of the Autonomous Region), who legitimised Turkey's occupation war in Rojava with the same argumentation as Turkey itself, the population has perceived the danger emanating from Turkey as being directed against all Kurds. Many people said that Turkey would turn to Iraq and occupy its territory after a success in Syria. The mistrust of the population is becoming increasingly visible in the form of protests and campaigns against Turkey. Thus, for the first time in Southern Kurdistan, a very effective boycott against Turkish goods was carried out. Besides the economic damage for Turkey, it has a significance beyond that.

The exploitation of Libya and Turkey

Another unresolved and ever-increasing source of conflict is Libya. On 18 March 2011, the country was attacked from the air by the USA, France and Great Britain following a UN Security Council decision. On 22 August 2011 Muammar al-Gaddafi was finally disempowered and since then the country has been in civil war. After the 2014 elections, the country will be divided in two between the troops and militias of the transitional government of Fayiz as-Saraj (GNA) and the military ruler of eastern Libya, Chalifa Haftar.

In this relatively small country with a population of six and a half million, a proxy war for oil is also being waged because of its oil wealth. While the government under as-Sarraj enjoys the support of Turkey, Qatar, the EU and the UN, Haftar is supported by Egypt, Russia, Saudi Arabia, the USA, the United Arab Emirates and France. As in Syria, it is the regional and international powers that are waging war there.

On 2 January, the Turkish Parliament voted in favour of sending Turkish soldiers to Libya to help the government in Tripoli. The truth is that it is the jihadist groups, the al-Qaeda and Daesch remnants used against the Kurds in northern Syria. As in Syria, Turkey is one of the first countries to take military action and take sides in another country. Erdoğan had previously

concluded a “security and military agreement” with the government on November 27. At the same time, the Libyan side granted Turkish forces the right to be present in the Libyan part of the Mediterranean Sea as part of a security cooperation. As the Turkish President put it: “All projects which had the aim of keeping Turkey out of the Mediterranean and excluding it have been smashed by our latest steps. With the planned support of the legitimate Libyan government in Tripoli, we will ensure that the agreements with all their components are implemented.

Turkey’s partisanship for as-Sarrad supports the opposition to the Russian-backed party. Russia, for its part, has a military presence in Libya through the security firm Wagner. This could further strain the already tense relationship with Russia in Idlib. In addition to its military presence, Turkey has also tried to take the political initiative with Russia to negotiate a ceasefire between the parties to the conflict and prevent Haftar’s troops from advancing towards Tripoli. The meeting was unsuccessful, with the result that the conflicting parties and their supporting states decided to hold a broad Libya conference in Berlin just a week later, at which a cease-fire, an arms embargo and the withdrawal of all foreign combat units were decided. This conference also remained largely without consequences. The ceasefire was not respected, and countries such as Turkey did not comply with the embargo and increased their military presence. The United Nations is currently trying to negotiate a ceasefire.

Many observers agree that Turkey is playing dangerous poker in Libya. The concern not to seize opportunities as they arise leads to hasty reactions that could have adverse effects. We should mention Syria, Egypt and now Libya.

Turkey and the AKP

As has been emphasized many times before, Erdoğan’s party, the AKP, was supported and developed as a “liberal Islamic model” for the region within the framework of the Greater Middle East project. The USA turned away from its hitherto strategic ally, the Kemalist elite, and decided to play an Islamic card.

The AKP was literally pushed onto the political stage by the USA, the EU and the Arab countries and propagated as an Islamic stronghold of freedom, democracy, prosperity and the rule of law. All the possibilities of the system were opened to it. She has chaired international institutions, been invited to the most important meetings and political events, and has performed at them. This went so far that Erdoğan was celebrated as the saviour of Arab states.

While on the one hand, the AKP presented itself according to the US project of liberal Islam, on the other hand, it received the support of the colonial-fascist Turkish state because of its promise to eliminate the Kurdish question. It used the advantages of this support to consolidate its power within Turkey and infiltrate the state. She has succeeded in this in the last years. She has expanded her power in a fascist manner.

The contradictions of the US-EU-Arab “pact” with the AKP began to reveal themselves with the Syria policy and have become more and more obvious since then.

Turkey pursues its hegemonic policy and in this context makes claims on territories that it had to give up after the First World War. The claimed territories include western and eastern Black Sea areas, Cyprus, Thessaloniki, Sofia, Batumi and Nakhchevan, as well as Mûsil, Kerkûk, Hewlêr, Silêmanî, Aleppo up to the border with Iran.

Erdoğan has begun to describe the Treaty of Lausanne as a betrayal and, by occupying these territories on the centenary of the founding of the republic, wants to establish its hegemony in the region and, in 2071, on the thousandth anniversary of the annexation of Anatolia, prove itself as an important force in the region.

Its occupation wars in Rojava and its military, economic and political presence in South Kurdistan as well as its policy towards Libya have to be seen against this background.

The AKP's anti-Kurdish attitude in its Syria policy has damaged its relations with the USA to such an extent that it made a hundred and eighty degree turn and turned towards the Russian dominated camp. Russia managed to position Turkey as a NATO state against its own allies, which was further reinforced by the sale of S-400 missiles. But even this short-term ACP-Russian alliance seems to have reached its limits in Idlib and possibly also in Libya.

Idlib – a turning point?

The city of Idlib has been in the hands of rebel groups since March 2015. Besides the Al-Nusra successor organization Haiat Tahrir asch-Sham (Committee for the Liberation of the Levant), Islamist groups such as Failak al-Sham or Ahrar al-Sham also belong to it.

The conditions for the inclusion of Turkish President Tayyip Erdoğan in the Moscow Declaration (December 2016), the Astana Declaration (January 2017), the de-escalation agreements in May 2017 and the Sochi Consensus (September 2018) by Russian President Vladimir Putin were obvious from the beginning.

In each declaration, reference was made to the fight against terrorism and to Syria's territorial integrity. Turkey took over the coordination of transporting armed groups from Eastern Aleppo, Daraa, Eastern Ghuta, Qunaitra to Idlib. Why? To be able to continue to sit at the table and have a say, to be able to play along and get involved, to be able to keep armed confrontations in the background and, most importantly, to have a trump card in hand that can be used against the Kurds.

The road map from the Sochi Agreement of 17 September 2018 provided for a demilitarised zone in Idlib, fifteen kilometres wide, to be cleared of heavy weapons by 10 October 2018 and for all armed groups to be able to leave the region by 15 October. Within this framework, Turkey had positioned itself as the protective power of the "opposition" in Idlib and had taken on the task of dividing the jihadists in the region into "moderates" and "radicals"; the M4 and M5 motorways were to be opened by 31 December 2018. Under this agreement, Turkey maintains twelve observation posts in the Idlib and Russia thirteen.

After Turkey failed (or did not want) to disarm the groups in accordance with the Idlib agreement, Assad troops with Russian air support began a military attack on the Idlib and recaptured the city. In the process, Russian and Turkish troops clashed. There were casualties on both sides. Even though Russia does not take responsibility for the attack on Turkish soldiers and blames it solely on the Syrian regime, nobody seriously believes that it happened without Russia's knowledge. Turkey has been forced – to save face – to declare that this incident was caused by the regime and that it therefore sees no reason to take action against Russia.

Turkey's and the USA's plans with regard to Idlib are identical. Erdoğan wants to maintain the status quo here, because he knows that if the front in Idlib is closed, it will be the turn of the territories occupied by it (through Operation Olive Branch, Operation Shield Euphrates and

most recently Operation Fountain of Peace). He will not give up until all the fruit from the Astana-Sochi meetings has been collected. The USA, on the other hand, also wants to maintain Idlib, as a bleeding wound that the Syrian regime is working on. If Idlib is closed in any way, they also fear that their military presence will be on the agenda.

The United States cites Iranian influence as the reason for its presence in Syria, and Israel also justifies its attacks in Syria. Against this background, Iran had also been somewhat reluctant to act on Moscow's advice. But after the assassination of Qasem Soleimani, Iran intervenes again in Idlib and talks about chasing the USA out of Iraq and Syria in revenge.

It is of course no coincidence that Turkey is supported by the USA in its Idlib policy and that Erdoğan visited the Ukrainian city of Kiev on February 6th and greeted the soldiers here with "Glory to Ukraine", who in turn responded with "Glory to the heroes! This show is considered as provocation and retaliation for the eight Turkish soldiers killed in Idlib. This could also be the beginning of the end of Russian-Turkish relations. It seems that the contradictions between the Russian camp and Turkey are no longer there. The short-term alliance seems to have come to an end. Turkey could once again turn to its strategic ally, the USA.

Turkey's domestic policy

A renewed change of course in his alliance policy would also have an impact on domestic policy. Both Russia (Eurasia) and the USA (West) correspond with corresponding forces in Turkey. It remains to be seen, but the current polemic between former Chief of General Staff Ilker Başbuğ and Erdoğan could also be seen as an indication of this.

As soon as the Ergenekon people have been "pardoned" with the rapprochement with Russia, a rapprochement with Fethullah Gülen can be expected.

While the AKP is sticking to its armchair more firmly than ever before, its support among the population is all the weaker. It is continuously losing support. The country is divided, economically and morally at its lowest level.

In Turkey everyone is still a terrorist who does not support Erdoğan's politics. The Kurds have always been the main terrorists of the country. The AKP, with the support of the capitalist system, makes sure that no field of articulation remains for them. The total isolation of the Kurdish representative Abdullah Öcalan continues. Only briefly during the death fast, his lawyers were allowed to visit him in May (after eight years). Öcalan called on the hunger strikers to end their death fast. On his initiative it was ended in May and since August the talks on Imralı are again prohibited.

The former co-chairs of the Democratic Party of Peoples (HDP), Figen Yüksekdağ and Selahattin Demirtaş, are still in prison. The AKP government continues to depose HDP mayors and appoint forced administrators, now 24, and dozens of mayors are currently in prison. The military operations against the Kurdish guerrilla both at home and in Southern Kurdistan continue unabated. High-tech attacks are being carried out and the guerrilla's ability to move is being limited. The struggle against the Kurdish liberation struggle as one of the strategic opponents of capitalist modernity is being carried out with international support. Despite the court decision from Brussels that the PKK is not a terrorist organisation, the Belgian government, for example, declared that nothing will change. In other words, it was confirmed once again that the terrorist classification and ban is a political decision and not a legal one.

The USA and Russia are allowing Turkey to occupy the Kurdish administered areas and to settle “refugees” there. A demographic cleansing is being carried out in north-east Syria with the support of the USA, Germany, the UN and others.

Turkey will remain in power because capitalist modernity needs it

The AKP serves as a cudgel against the Kurds and it will be useful against Iran. The discussion about a split has been on the agenda for some time. When there was great displeasure among the people, an alleged new party was immediately propagated and expectations were raised among the people. Against this background, I think this new “future party” (Gelecek Partisi) under ex-premier Davutoğlu should continue to secure power Erdoğan's. It is a precautionary measure to keep the voters under control. The established parties have used up their credit, so the system will send new parties into the field for its continued existence. In addition to the new parties from the AKP corner, there may also be new foundations in the centre and left.

The country has been ruled under high tension for years. War, elections, polarisation, militarisation. The problems in the country are not solved but accumulated and the population is controlled by violence and nationalist feelings. An important part of the “liberals” is leaving the country, a part has withdrawn and a part has degenerated. Femicides have increased dramatically, young women are disappearing.

With the existing nationalist, militaristic, autocratic, Kurdish and misogynist policies of the AKP, a dangerous social hopelessness is spreading. Contrary to the propagated economic success story of the AKP, the people can no longer secure their everyday lives. A new development is shaking the country emotionally: people are taking their own lives because they are no longer able to survive economically. In November 2019, four siblings collectively took their own lives, and a few days later news of further suicides, this time from Antalya, startled the public. A father poisoned himself, his wife and the nine and five year old children. He left a letter full of hopelessness and despair. Finally a man in Hatay set himself on fire in front of the governor and shouted: “I can't feed my children anymore.”

According to a report by the deputy leader of the opposition Republican People's Party (CHP), Gamze Akkuş İlgezdi, 233 people took their own lives for economic reasons in 2017.

Unemployment stands at 13.4% (December 2019) and youth unemployment at 26.7% (April 2019).

According to the Turkish statistical authorities, the inflation rate in January was 12.15% compared to the same month last year. The inflation rate thus rose by 1.35 % compared to the previous month.

There is nothing worse for a country than its population not seeing light at the end of the tunnel. The AKP is responsible for this resignation because it has a strait-jacket effect on people's lives.

Conclusion

As mentioned above, the strategic opponents of capitalist modernity are women and organized population groups. Against this background, it is also to be understood that the attacks on women

have increased during the thirty-year period of upheaval and the situation is getting worse and worse. The jihadist terrorist groups such as Daesch, al-Nusra, Boko Haram and whatever else they are called have primarily attacked women and reduced them to sexual objects of men. But this extreme form found its projections in different states. For women in particular, everything under the AKP has turned negative. The fascism of the patriarchy takes its free course unbridled. This is how it looks at the moment in Turkey. An increase in the number of cases of abducted, raped and murdered women can be observed here. Politics is patriarchy and society is becoming more misogynist. Everywhere in the world, a deterioration in women's rights is evident. This is directly related to the system. Last year was marked by mass protests by women all over the world in response to this dangerous development. We can also see that the attacks on the Kurdish liberation movement or similar social movements have increased. With all the violence they are trying to prevent an alternative from emerging beyond their system.

But capitalist modernity has never been so unmasked. People realize that this system is the cause of all the problems and is not able to develop solutions. The search for a solution or an alternative becomes more intense. Women will play a leading role in this century and will not just leave the field to patriarchy. The "third way" of the Kurdish movement is also a real alternative to the system. The setbacks in Rojava do not mean that the alternative is unsuitable, but rather how much this alternative is feared.

The Anarchist Library (Mirror)
Anti-Copyright



Songül Karabulut
Against World War III
Social organization beyond state power
April 7, 2020

Retrieved on 2020-04-07 from komun-academy.com

usa.anarchistlibraries.net