

Socialist strategy and the party

[The question of how socialists should organise is a perennial one, not least due to the on-going fragmentation of the left. More recently, the threat of the far-right globally, has focussed the attention of a number of groups and individual activists on the urgent necessity of creating a popular and credible left alternative. In Scotland, where there is every likelihood of Nigel Farage's Reform party gaining a substantial number of seats in the Holyrood elections in 2026, there is the beginning of a new discussion about how socialists might organise going forward, drawing on both the positive and negative experiences of the past. Supporters of Ecosocialist.scot are keenly involved in these discussions, drawing on the experiences of [Fourth International](#) around revolutionary regroupment and the building broad class-struggle parties internationally. As a contribution to this discussion we are reprinting this talk by socialist scholar and activist Gilbert Achcar. In it, Achcar outlines the history of socialist organisations from the time of Marx and Engels to the present day, exploring the proposition that 'the communists do not form a separate party opposed to other working-class parties' as well as analysing the experiences of the Second International and of Bolshevism. Above all, Achcar warns us against fixating on some timeless organisational model, encouraging us to recognise the centrality of democracy to our socialist project and the need to adapt organisational forms to the specific social, historical and technological circumstances that we find ourselves in. Ecosocialist.scot, 20th February 2025]

Below is the transcript of a talk titled "Marxism, socialist strategy, and the party" by Gilbert Achcar (1), which was delivered to the South African initiative, [Dialogues for an](#)

[Anti-capitalist Future](#). Here, Achcar traces conceptions of the party from Marx to the present and its implications for socialist strategy today. This transcript has been revised, edited and completed by Gilbert Achcar. The original video recording of the talk can be found [here](#).

Thank you for inviting me to address this meeting. It's a great opportunity for me to discuss these issues with comrades from Africa, the continent where I was born and raised as a native of Senegal.

The topic defined by the organizers is quite broad: "Marxism, socialist strategy, and the party." These topics are all in the singular, although they cover a plurality of cases and a wide variety of situations. There are many "Marxisms," as everyone knows, each brand believing it is the only real, authentic one. And there are certainly many possible socialist strategies, since strategies are normally elaborated according to each country's concrete circumstances. There can't be a global socialist strategy that would be the same everywhere and anywhere. Likewise, I would say, there is no single conception of the party that is valid for every time and country. Strategic and organizational issues must be related to local circumstances. Otherwise, you get what Leon Trotsky aptly called "bureaucratically abstract internationalism," and that always proves very sterile. Let us bear this in mind.

I will discuss a few conceptions that were developed in the course of Marxism's history since our discussion adheres to a Marxist framework. And I'll try to reach a few conclusions drawing lessons from the now long experience of Marxism.

Marx and Engels, the Communist Manifesto, and the First

International

We may date the birth of Marxism as a combined theoretical and practical political orientation back to the Manifesto of the Communist Party that came out in 1848. That's a long history, which compels us to reflect upon the huge change in conditions between our present twenty-first century and the time when Marxism was born. Marx and Engels did show a lot of flexibility from the very beginning, however, starting with this founding document of Marxism as a political movement. The section on the communists' relation to the other working-class parties is well known, and quite important and interesting because it frames the kind of political thinking related to the emerging Marxist theory, which was still in its very initial phase. It is an early expression of the Marxist perspective and, as such, it is not perfect, to be sure. But it is a very important historical document in drawing out a new global political perspective. Conceived as a political "manifesto," it is very much related to action.

In it, we read those famous lines, "In what relation do the communists stand to the proletarians as a whole? The communists do not form a separate party opposed to the other working-class parties." This, of course, isn't to say that the communists do not form a party of their own, since the document's title itself is Manifesto of the Communist Party. In fact, a more accurate translation of the German original would have been: "The communists are no special party compared to the other working-class parties." ("Die Kommunisten sind keine besondere Partei gegenüber den andern Arbeiterparteien.") What is actually emphasized here is that the Communist Party is not different from the other parties of the working class. As for what is meant by "other working-class parties," this is clarified a few lines later, but the idea that the communists are not "opposed" to them is explained right after.

“They,” the communists that is, “have no interests separate and apart from those of the proletariat as a whole.” In other words, the communists do not form a peculiar sect with its own agenda. They fight for the interests of the entire proletarian class. They are an integral part of the proletariat and fight for its class interests, not for interests of their own. That’s a very important issue, indeed, because we know from history that many working-class parties came to be detached, as blocks of particular interests, from the class as a whole. History is full of such instances.

So, the communists have no interest separate and apart from those of the proletariat as a whole. No sectarian principles of their own, which would be separate from the aspirations of the class. What is distinctive then about the communists? “They are distinguished from the other working-class parties by this only”—two points follow:

1. The internationalist perspective or the understanding that, “In the national struggles of the proletarians of different countries, [the communists] point out and bring to the front the common interests of the entire proletariat.” This idea of the proletariat as a global class with interests that are independent of nationality (“von der Nationalität unabhängigen Interessen”) is a distinguishing feature of the communists in the Manifesto.

2. The pursuit of the ultimate goal of the working-class struggle, which is the transformation of society and the abolition of capitalism and class division. In the various stages of the struggle against the bourgeoisie, the communists represent this long-term perspective. They always keep in mind the ultimate goal, and never lose sight of it by getting bogged down in sectional struggles or partial demands.

These are the two distinctive features of the communists as a section of the working class, as a group or party within the working class, fighting for the interests of the whole class.

This bears both practical and theoretical implications. On the practical level, the communists constitute “the most advanced and resolute section of the working-class parties of every country.” They are the most resolute in political practice in that they always push the movement forward, toward further radicalization. On the theoretical level, thanks to their analytical perspective, the communists have a broad, comprehensive understanding of the various struggles. That’s at least the role they wish to play.

“The immediate aim of the communists is the same as that of all other proletarian parties.” This renewed emphasis on commonality is important, the idea that we, the communists—and that’s Marx and Engels writing here—are but one of the proletarian parties, not the only proletarian party. The sectarian claim to constitute the only party of the working class and that no other party represents the class is definitely not the conception that is upheld here.

And what is the immediate aim of the communists that is shared with the other proletarian parties? It is a good indication of what Marx and Engels meant by other proletarian parties. That aim is “the formation of the proletariat into a class, the overthrow of the bourgeois supremacy, and the conquest of political power by the proletariat.” These goals define what the two authors meant by proletarian parties. And they shed light onto the initial sentence that says that “the communists do not form a separate party opposed to the other working-class parties” (or a special party compared to the others). By working-class parties, Marx and Engels meant all parties that fight for these goals: the political formation of the class, the overthrow of bourgeois rule, and the conquest of political power by the proletariat.

Beyond this, what the political biography and writings of Marx and Engels clearly show is that they held no general theory of the party; they were not interested in elaborating such a general theory. I believe that it is because of the point I

started with: that the party is a tool for the class struggle, for the revolutionary struggle, and this tool must be adapted to different circumstances. There can't be a general conception of the party, valid for all times and countries. The class party is not a religious sect patterned on the same model worldwide. It is an instrument for action that must fit the concrete circumstances of each time and country.

This adaptation to actual circumstances was constantly at work in Marx's and Engels's political history, from their early political engagement with a group that they quickly found to be too sectarian—a group that was closer to the Blanquist perspective—to the more elaborate view that they expressed in 1850 in light of the revolutionary wave that Europe had witnessed in 1848. In a famous text focused on Germany, the Address of the Central Committee to the Communist League, the two friends described the communists as implementing exactly the approach that they had outlined in the Communist Manifesto, striving to push forward the revolutionary process and advocating the organization of the proletariat separately from other classes.

For this purpose, they called for the formation of workers' clubs. They had in mind the precedent of the French Revolution, in which political clubs such as the Jacobins were key actors. They advocated the same for Germany in 1850, but this time as proletarian clubs (forming what we would call today a mass party) whose tactic should consist in constantly outbidding the bourgeois or petite-bourgeois democrats. The proletarian party should do so in order to push the revolutionary process forward, turning it into a continuous process: "permanent revolution" is the term they used in that famous document.

Marx and Engels afterwards spent several years without being formally involved in a political organization, until the founding of the First International in 1864. The role they saw for themselves at that time was to act directly at the

international level, rather than getting involved in a national organization. The First International brought together a broad range of currents. It was anything but monolithic, including what we would today call left-wing reformists, along with anarchists and, of course, Marxists. The anarchists themselves mainly consisted of two different currents: followers of the French Proudhon and followers of the Russian Bakunin. Thus, a variety of tendencies and workers' organizations joined the First International, the official name of which was the "International Workingmen's Association" in the archaic language of the time.

The First International culminated with the Paris Commune. We have been celebrating this year the 150th anniversary of the Paris Commune, the uprising of the Parisian laboring masses, workers, and petite-bourgeoisie, that started on March 18, 1871 and ended in bloody repression after about two and a half months. This tragic outcome brought the International to an end after a sharp increase in factional infighting, as happens very often in times of setback and ebb.

The Second International, Social Democracy, Lenin and Luxemburg

The next stage was the emergence of German social democracy, which Marx and Engels followed very closely from England. One of the famous texts of Marx is the Critique of the Gotha Programme, which is a comment on the draft program of the Socialist Workers' Party of Germany before its founding convention in 1875.

Later on, after Marx's death in 1883, the Second International was founded in the year of the first centenary of the French Revolution in 1889. Engels was still active; he would die six years later. Marx and Engels, thus, contributed to very diverse types of organization during their lives. Consider the Internationals, First and Second: the Second involved mass

workers' parties that were quite different from the groups involved in the First, and it comprised a narrower range of political views. Although it was quite open to discussion, the anarchists were unwelcome in its ranks. The Second International was based on mass workers' parties engaged in the whole range of class struggle forms, from trade union to electoral, struggles that had become increasingly possible to wage legally in most European countries by the end of the nineteenth century.

These workers' parties involved in mass struggle emerged against the backdrop of a critique of Blanquism, which is the idea that a small group of enlightened revolutionaries can seize power by force, by way of a coup, and reeducate the masses after seizing power. This perspective, which grew out of one of the radical currents that developed from the French Revolution, had been strongly criticized by Marx and Engels as illusory and counterposed to their deeply democratic conception of revolutionary change.

Since the time of Marx and Engels, Marxism has gone through various avatars, as we know, but the most dominant in the twentieth century was indisputably the Russian model. More specifically, it was the variant of Marxism developed by the Bolshevik faction of the Social Democratic Workers' Party of Russia, a section of the Second International. After the party's split in 1912, both wings—Bolshevik and Menshevik—remained affiliated to the International, which soon went into crisis with the onset of World War I in 1914.

Russian conditions, of course, were quite exceptional compared to those of France or Germany, or most other countries where there were large sections of the International. Russia was ruled by tsarism, a very repressive state that allowed no political freedoms, except for brief periods. The Russian revolutionaries had to work underground most of the time, hiding from the political police.

It is in light of these very specific conditions that the birth of Leninism as a theory of the party must be considered. It was born at the very beginning of the past century, its first major document being Lenin's *What Is To Be Done?* (1902). This book offered a conception of organization and struggle that was very much the fruit of the circumstances that I described: the underground party of professional revolutionaries acting in a "conspiratorial" manner, which was the only way revolutionaries could operate under the circumstances of that time in Russia.

And yet, when we examine the evolution of Lenin's thinking on the matter, we see that after the Revolution of 1905, he modified his perspective towards a better appraisal of the potential of spontaneous radicalization of the working-class masses. Whereas he had initially insisted that the workers' spontaneous inclination is bound to remain within the limits of a trade-unionist perspective, he realized after 1905 that the working-class masses could, at moments, be more revolutionary than any other organization—including his own!

Yet, this did not resolve the dispute that unfolded before 1905 between Mensheviks and Bolsheviks about the conception of the party: How large should the party's membership be? What conditions should there be for membership? Should all party members be fully engaged in day-to-day political activity, or should membership include dues-paying supporters, regardless of their level of active involvement? That discussion heated up in 1903. But when the party split years later, in 1912, the most serious divergence was political—the attitude toward the liberal bourgeoisie—rather than organizational. This explains the attitude of someone like Trotsky, who was very critical of the party conception expressed in *What Is To Be Done?*, while still being politically closer to the Bolsheviks. Hence, his conciliatory stance toward both wings after 1912, since he agreed and disagreed with each of them on different issues.

During that same period, Rosa Luxemburg was actually more

critical of the German Social Democratic Party than Lenin was. Whereas Lenin regarded the party as a model and key inspiration, Rosa Luxemburg was the most prominent left-wing critic of the party's leadership. She, too, was critical of Lenin's conception of the party, because she held a fundamental belief in the revolutionary potential of the working-class masses and their ability to outflank the social-democratic party's leadership in revolutionary times.

This brief, and only partial, overview suffices to show that there existed a complex variety of conceptions of the workers' party and its role. This fact makes it all the more important to consider the different conditions of the different countries in which the holders of these views were based. The Bolshevik party turned into a big, mass party in 1917. In the course of the radicalization and the revolutionary process that year, the party won over a big section of Russia's working class, and other components of the Russian Revolution's social base: soldiers, peasants, and others. In order to absorb the ongoing mass radicalization, the party opened its ranks widely. We see here at work the flexibility of organizational form that is necessary in order to adapt to changing circumstances.

The formula "democratic centralism," which is usually attributed to Leninism, did not actually come from Lenin. It summarizes the organizational functioning of German social democracy, indicating the combination of democracy in debate and centralism in action. It wasn't meant to prevent discussion. On the contrary, emphasis was placed on the democratic half of the expression. Even under the harsh conditions of Tsarist Russia, there was always a lot of discussion, open disputes, and creation of organizational factions within each wing of the Social Democratic Workers' Party of Russia. Discussions came into the open within Russia itself when conditions changed in 1917.

It was only later—in 1921, in context of the difficult

conditions resulting from the civil war—that factions were prohibited in the Communist Party (the heir to the Bolshevik wing of the Social Democratic Workers' Party), a decision which proved to be a fatal mistake. It didn't solve any problem, but was used by one faction of the party, one group within its leadership, in order to take full control of the party and get rid of any opposition. That was the beginning of the Stalinist mutation.

In 1924, Stalin redefined Leninism and enshrined it into a set of dogmas. This included a very centralistic and undemocratic conception of the party: the cult of the party and its leadership, the iron discipline, the banning of factions and, therefore, of organized discussion within the party. There, the conception of the party as the instrument of the “dictatorship of the proletariat” is spelled out, a view alien not only to Marx and Engels, but even to a book like Lenin's *State and Revolution* (1917), in which the party is not even mentioned in the definition of that dictatorship (this, in some way, is actually a problem, as the book should have discussed the rights and role of parties after the revolution). But the key point is that this idea—that the party embodies the dictatorship of the proletariat—also became part of what was predominantly regarded as Leninism at that time.

Gramsci, War of Position and Maneuver

In the same way that various avatars of Marxism developed, there have been various Leninisms: that of the Stalinists, which I have just described, and other Leninisms, especially among groups that call themselves Trotskyist. Some of the latter were actually quite close to the Stalinist version; on the opposite side, we find someone like Ernest Mandel, the Belgian Marxist, whose Leninism is quite close to Rosa

Luxemburg's perspective.

A highly interesting reflection that developed after the Russian Revolution is that of Antonio Gramsci, the famous Italian Marxist. In considering the events that unfolded in Europe, he emphasized the difference between Russia's conditions and those of Western Europe. We get back here, again, to our starting point: the circumstances, the concrete situation of each country and region. In Western Europe, liberal democracy went along with bourgeois "hegemony." The bourgeoisie, in order to rule, did not rely on force alone, but also on the consent of a popular majority.

And that major difference must be taken into account, rather than simply copying the Russian experience. Under typical Western conditions, the workers' party must strive to build a counter hegemony, that is, to win over the support of the majority in breaking away from bourgeois ideological domination. It must wage a war of position under liberal democratic conditions that allows the party to conquer positions within the bourgeois state itself through elections. That war of position is a prelude to a war of maneuver, a distinction borrowed from military strategy. In a war of position, an armed force entrenches itself in positions and strongholds, whereas in a war of maneuver, troops are set in motion to occupy the enemy's territory and break its armed force. Thus, under typical Western conditions, the workers' party should envisage a protracted war of position while being ready to shift to a war of maneuver, if and when this is required.

A Materialist Conception of the Party, the Internet

Let me add to all this what I would call a materialist conception of the party. For Marxists, the starting point in assessing social and political conditions is historical

materialism: a given society's forms of organization tend to correspond to its technological means. This axiom can be extended to all forms of organization: they normally adapt to material conditions. That is indeed the case for the management modes of capitalist firms. The same goes for revolutionary organization: its type and form very much depend on the means it uses to produce its literature, which are in turn determined by the available technology and political freedoms. Thus, if a party mainly relies on the underground printshop, it is necessarily a conspiratorial organization that requires a high degree of centralization and secrecy. If it can print its literature openly and legally, it can be an open, democratic organization (if it is conspiratorial by choice, rather than necessity, it is usually more of a sect than a party). This brings us to the internet as a major technological revolution in communication. The belief that this technological change should not affect the conception of the party is the unmistakable sign that the latter has become a religious-like dogmatic organization.

Nowadays, all forms of organization are very much conditioned by the existence of the internet. That is why networking has become a form of organization much more widespread than it could ever be before. Networking made possible by virtual networks, such as social media, can also facilitate the constitution of physical networks. Thanks to the internet, a much more democratic way of functioning is possible, in both information sharing and decision making. You don't need to bring people from very long distances to meet physically every time you need to hold a democratic discussion and decide.

The potential of the internet is huge, and we are only at the beginning of its use. It feeds the strong aversion to centralism and leadership cults that exists among the new generation. I believe it is rather healthy that such defiance exists among the new generation, compared to the patterns that prevailed in the twentieth century.

Networking is very much the order of the day. It started early on with the Zapatistas who advocated this kind of organization in the 1990s. A major embodiment today is the Black Lives Matter (BLM). This movement began a few years ago, mostly as a network around an online platform and a shared set of principles. Local chapters only commit to the general principles of the movement, which has no central structure: just horizontal networking without a leading center; no hierarchy, no verticality. It is very much a product of our time that wouldn't have been possible on such a scale before modern technology. It's a good illustration of the materialist understanding of organization.

Networking is also at work in another recent major development, which occurred on the African continent, in Sudan. The Sudanese Revolution that started in December 2018 has witnessed the formation of Resistance Committees, which are local chapters mostly active in urban neighborhoods, each one of them involving hundreds of members, mostly young people. In every major urban zone, there are dozens of such committees, with hundreds of participants each. Tens of thousands of people are organized in that way in key urban areas. They function quite like BLM: common principles, common goals, no central leadership, intensive use of social media. They didn't take their inspiration from BLM, though. They are, rather, a product of the time, a product of the aforementioned aversion to centralized experiences of the past and their sad outcomes, combined with the new technology.

This, however, does not cancel the need for the political organization of the like-minded, of people who—like the communists of the Communist Manifesto—share specific views and want to promote them. But the qualitatively higher degree of organizational democracy allowed for by modern technology similarly applies to such parties of the like-minded.

[Marxist revolutionaries] should aim at building a working-class mass party and eventually leading it—if and when they

manage to convince the majority of their views. That's also why they should join mass, working-class, anticapitalist parties when these exist, or else contribute to building them.

To wrap up, the key point I made at the beginning is that the type of organization depends on the concrete conditions of the place where it is to be built. Time and place are decisive, in addition to the technological dimension. It is very important to avoid falling into the sectarianism of self-proclaimed "vanguard parties." Vanguard is a status that must be acquired in practice, not proclaimed. To truly be a vanguard, you must be regarded as such by the masses.

Marxist revolutionaries who wish to build a vanguard party should regard themselves, as in the Communist Manifesto, as part of the broader class movement involving other organizations of different types. They should aim at building a working-class mass party and eventually leading it—if and when they manage to convince the majority of their views. That's also why they should join mass, working-class, anti-capitalist parties where these exist, or else contribute to building them. It is not by building a self-proclaimed "vanguard party" and recruiting members to its ranks one by one that you build a mass party. It doesn't work like this. Moreover, socialism can only be democratic. It's banal to say it, but it means that you can't change society for the better without a social majority in favor of change. Otherwise, as history has shown us so tragically, you end up with the production of authoritarianism and dictatorship. And that comes with a huge price.

My final point is about the necessity of democratic vigilance against the corrosive effects of bourgeois institutions and bureaucratic tendencies. Not all countries in the world, but most of them, are countries where it is currently possible to engage in the war of position described by Gramsci, which includes a struggle within elective institutions of the bourgeois state. This is to be combined with a struggle from

without, of course, through trade unions and various forms of class struggle, such as strikes, sit-ins, occupations, demonstrations, and so on.

In the course of the war of position, revolutionaries are confronted with the corrosive effects of bourgeois institutions, because elected officers can be affected by the corruptive power of capitalism. The same can be said of the corruptive power of bureaucracy, which is at play within trade unions and other working-class institutions. Revolutionaries should remain vigilant against these inevitable risks and think of new ways to prevent this corrosive effect from prevailing. That's also a key part of the lessons of history that we must keep in mind.

25 April 2021

Source: [*Tempest*](#).

(1) Gilbert Achcar is currently Professor of Development Studies and International Relations at the School of Oriental and African Studies (SOAS) in London. His most recent books are *The New Cold War: The United States, Russia and China, from Kosovo to Ukraine* (2023) and the collection of articles *Israel's War on Gaza* (2023). His next book, *Gaza, A Genocide Foretold*, will come out in 2025.

**Leónidas Iza (Pachakutik,
Ecuador): 'Our election**

campaign is an extension of the people's struggle'

In conversation with Iain Bruce, Ecuadorian Indigenous leader and presidential candidate Leónidas Iza analyses the profound economic, social and institutional crisis the country is going through, marked by the advance of neoliberal policies, state repression and the precariousness of living conditions.

Iza reflects on the impact of popular demonstrations on the upcoming general elections, with the first round to be held on February 9, and the need to build a political project from the grassroots that defends plurinationality, the public sector and national sovereignty. He also addresses the tensions and challenges facing the Ecuadorian left, the role of the Citizen Revolution led by former president Rafael Correa, and his strategy for the elections.

Faced with a political scenario dominated by the right, the rise of drug trafficking and the fragmentation of progressive forces, the Indigenous leader reaffirmed his commitment to an alternative that does not abandon street protests, but rather integrates the electoral dispute into a broader social and political struggle to transform Ecuador.

Over the past year, Ecuador has faced a series of difficult situations – rising levels of gang violence and state repression, drought and an electricity crisis, deepening poverty and mass migration. Could you describe what the context was like at the start of this campaign, a little over a year after Daniel Noboa became president in November 2023?

Ever since the idea of a “bloated state” and excessive bureaucracy was introduced, the model imposed by the International Monetary Fund (IMF) – successively implemented by the [Lenin] Moreno, [Guillermo] Lasso and now Noboa

governments – has resulted in a fragile state lacking in social policies to strengthen key sectors of the Ecuadorian economy and society. Education, health and employment have been seriously neglected, as has support for the grassroots and solidarity economy. This has led to a drastic deterioration in living conditions for ordinary Ecuadorians.

As a consequence, in the most impoverished areas, many have ended up seeing drug trafficking, organised crime or illegal activities as their only way out. For the majority of Ecuadorians, this represents a problem; but for the political and economic elites, for the oligarchies, it is an opportunity – they have exploited this suffering to promote their usual projects.

We now find ourselves in [a painful situation](#). After [President Noboa's declaration](#) of a “state of war”, which is now a year old, these elites have managed to establish their hegemony over public consciousness and discussion. The so-called [Phoenix Plan](#) to tackle gang-related violence does not really exist and there is no real intention to put an end to crime; instead, what we are seeing is the use of this crisis as a mechanism of control.

In economic terms, the declaration of war has hit the country hard. It has scared off investment and affected strategic sectors, such as tourism, which has declined on the coast, in the highlands and the Amazon. Furthermore, due to the energy crisis, we have recorded losses of more than \$8 billion, according to estimates by concerned business groups.

On the other hand, we are experiencing serious violations of human rights. Cases such as that of the four children in Maldivas [where four Afro-Ecuadorian boys were detained by the army and later found dead] are just one example of a systematic policy. It is estimated that under the state of war, more than 20,000 young people have been prosecuted but data indicates that only between 350-500 of them had any real

involvement in illegal activities. What happened to the rest? We do not know.

Added to this is a climate of structural racism. In Ecuador today, if a white or mestizo person sees someone of African descent, they assume they are a criminal. If they see an Indigenous person, they label them a terrorist and a “Quito arsonist” [in reference to the Indigenous-led uprisings of 2019 and 2022]. If they see a poor person, they stigmatise and racialise them. This is the scenario that the Ecuadorian right has been able to take advantage of, and it is one that we have to confront.

Today we face systematic violations of human rights, a state that operates with a monarchical logic, the breakdown of basic conditions for democratic coexistence, and the failure to comply with the Constitution and Code of Democracy. The four branches of government have subordinated themselves to the executive, and the latter, in turn, is subject to the conditions imposed by the IMF.

In the past year, Ecuador has agreed to a new loan of \$5.5 billion, not yet disbursed, but destined exclusively to pay previous debt. Meanwhile, the economic and political elites continue to control national politics, deepening a crisis that increasingly affects the majority of the Ecuadorian people.

Last month there was a major mobilisation in the Amazon against the construction of a super prison. Do you think this marks a reactivation of the social movement after the impact of Noboa’s security policy? And, in that sense, do you think this has influenced the campaign, generating a new political climate?

Look, Ecuadorians are, by nature, a fighting people. Throughout history, all governments have tried to curb this rebelliousness and dismantle organisational processes in different ways: criminalising and persecuting leaders,

inventing parallel organisations, or trying to link us to organised crime and drug trafficking. We have seen these strategies time and time again. But popular resistance is stronger, and they will never succeed in breaking it.

When we have mobilised, we have done so forcefully, as happened in 2019 and 2022. Leading up to the uprising of June 2022, there were 28 protest events; leading up to October 2019, there were 38. Currently, we have already had between 5 and 10 mobilisations, which indicates that concrete actions from different sectors are accumulating. First, there are scattered struggles, then they are articulated and, finally, they lead to social outbursts. This is a cyclical process, so I am not worried: governments can continue trying to repress us, but sooner or later the issues come together and the struggle arises again.

What happened in the Amazon is a blow to Noboa's government. He governs arrogantly, with a monarchical vision, as if he were the landowner on a big estate. This time, he had to back down because the resistance affected him electorally. He did not suspend the construction of the prison due to concerns about life in the Amazon – for him, the region represents only 3% of the national electorate, it does not interest him – but because he feared this would impact his image in other parts of the country.

For now, the project is suspended and they have promised not to resume it. However, they have not provided any official document to confirm this. We will continue to pay close attention to what happens.

How have these protests influenced the mood of the campaign?

I think that all mobilisations force people to have to take a stand. The first thing we must understand is that the political and economic elites have managed to implant the idea that politics is something negative for popular sectors and

their leaders.

They have constructed a discourse that if we participate in politics, we do so for our own individual interests, that we are “taking advantage” of mobilisations to run for office. They say, for example, “There they are again, the golden ponchos, using the struggle to get into elections.” But when they stand for election, then it is democratic, it is legitimate. Unfortunately, many people have fallen into that trap.

We, on the other hand, have been clear: without abandoning the streets, we are going to contest elections as a further extension of the struggle. We are not abandoning mobilisation, but complementing it with electoral participation. That is why the organised rank and file who have been on the streets are now taking a stand in this election.

I will give you a concrete example: our comrades who have been defending the hills and highland moors from extractivism. Yesterday I saw a statement from them that said: “We’re backing Leónidas Iza”. Not because they believe that the elections are an end in themselves, but because they understand that the electoral arena is another tool for channeling the strength that they have built up in the streets.

Our struggle is not reduced to electoral politics; it is another dimension within a broader process. We fight in the streets, in national and international courts, in the drafting and reform of laws, in local governments. What we have not yet fully achieved is consolidating all these struggles under a unified project. We are on our way to doing that.

That is why I firmly believe that, in time, we will succeed in aligning the struggle towards a proposal that represents the interests of the people in this process.

And what are the main planks of your program for government?

Well, when I am asked about “my” government platform, we end up going back to the same old stories that I have been fighting against these days. “What is Leónidas Iza’s government program?” No, that is to individualise politics, to make people believe that it is about personal interest. It is not my program, but the government program of the people, the program of the Indigenous peoples, the cholos, the Indians, the mestizos, the stigmatised Afro-Ecuadorians.

Our government program has not been produced from behind a desk, but out of grassroots struggle. It is the result of what we stood up for in 2019, of what we took to the streets for in 2022. And that was clear: financial relief for the people; no mining in watersheds and fertile areas; genuine and deep implementation of plurinationality; and total rejection of privatisations.

In our government, we will strengthen the productive capacity of Ecuadorian state-owned companies and defend national production. What does this mean? That we are going to promote policies to support small farmers – those whom the state has abandoned but who were the first to take to the streets when the crisis hit. This is a government program built from the people and for the people.

One of the central issues is crime. They have led us to believe that the solution is to put more weapons and more police on the streets. No. In our government plan we have been clear: yes, there are some young people who have fallen into criminal networks and who we may not be able to rehabilitate socially, and we will have to face up to that. But crime cannot be combated with repression alone; we need a solid social policy linked to neighbourhoods, communes and territories.

We need to strengthen education and healthcare and create minimum employment conditions. Why? To prevent 12- or 13-year-olds, whose parents work in precarious conditions and cannot

look after them, from being recruited by organised crime. This is the vision of the popular sectors, not of those who think that crime can be solved with a warmongering mentality, with more weapons and repression.

And what has happened? The state has been deliberately weakened, its capacity reduced under the pretext of combating its supposed "bloatedness". But when you dismantle the state, you dismantle the basic policies that sustain any society, be it in the First, Second or Third World.

In terms of institutional framework, we are going to respect democracy. Why do we write democracy in the Constitution if each government then interprets it as it pleases, turning us into a monarchy? No! Democracy cannot be a concept manipulated by political and economic groups as they see fit. It must be a democracy rooted in the people, not in the interests of an elite that uses it as an instrument to perpetuate its power.

Halfway through last year, in Pachakutik, in CONAIE, I believe you tried to unify or at least bring together the different left-wing currents and groups. I understand that at least a minimum agreement was reached: not to attack each other and to support whoever reaches the second round. Is that agreement, even if minimal, still in place? How do you see the current situation and what is your position towards a possible second round?

Yes, there is a general government program that some sectors accepted, assuming that it should be the basis for an agreement. However, there are central issues that many of those who call themselves progressive are still not willing to stand firm on. Issues such as mining, bilingual education, redistribution of wealth, defence of national production and the public sector continue to be points of contention.

For example, on the mining issue, some people ask: "Where are we going to get the money from?" The answer is clear: we have

to collect it from those who are not paying what they should. But many sectors lack the necessary determination to face these debates. These are pending issues that remain open and which, in the event that we are an option in the second round, could serve to unify the struggle even more from the perspective of the popular sectors.

Now, why have more pragmatic and long-term agreements not been achieved? Precisely because of the history of how certain sectors have governed. They have not understood what plurinationality really means, nor have they accepted that the rights of Indigenous peoples are not a concession from the state or a favour from governments, but fundamental collective rights.

Free, prior and informed consent, the application of Indigenous justice, bilingual intercultural education, defence of food sovereignty, of our culture and our languages ... all these issues have been left at the mercy of the political will of the government in power, without any real commitment. This historical debt has held back genuine unification through this process. These are issues that still need to be resolved in any space for debate.

Until now, the non-aggression pact has been respected. But in political and ideological terms, we must take as a reference point the structural problems that any government must overcome, regardless of who comes to power.

At the moment, there are candidates who claim to represent the left and others who present themselves as right-wing. They all try to present themselves as "new". But the real question is how much sensitivity and how much memory people have to recognise who can genuinely be a real option for Ecuador.

Sorry, Leónidas, but specifically, if you make it to the second round, you are obviously going to want the other left-wing parties to support you. Now, if the scenario were

different and the final contest were between Luisa González [the presidential candidate of the Citizen Revolution movement] and Noboa, would you call for a vote for the Citizen Revolution?

At the moment, I cannot say what will happen in the second round. We are focused on building support for our option in the first round. If we start discussing hypothetical scenarios now, people might end up voting in this first round for an option they do not really agree with. That is why the responsible thing to do at the moment is not to speculate about the second round, but to consolidate our proposal and our strength at this stage.

Now, if we reach the second round, and I am sure we will be one of the options in that round, at that point we will have to assess our capacity to integrate the different sectors of Ecuador and move forward based on that scenario

First published in Spanish at [Jacobinlat](#). Translation by Iain Bruce, which was edited by [LINKS](#) International Journal of Socialist Renewal for clarity.

Why do socialists organise internationally?

[Dave Kellaway](#) examines the arguments for eco socialists to be part of a revolutionary international

‘I mean you guys have less than a thousand members in most countries and you want to build an International? Esperanto has more chance becoming an international language than you lot building an International with any relevance.’

How often have revolutionary Marxists heard this retort? Mind you the same objection is often made to attempts to building a revolutionary socialist party just in one nation. Members of Anti*Capitalist Resistance are meeting in the New Year to decide whether to fully join up to the [Fourth International](#). So what is the point of building a revolutionary International?

1. An International is the historical legacy of our movement

Marx himself set up the First International, if you read the [Communist Manifesto](#) it is written as a draft programme for an international party – the Communist League, precursor of the International – for its Congress in 1848. Already in that year it was translated into a number of European languages. It was never a document for one nation. Given that at that time capitalism was at quite an early state of globalisation it is remarkable how far sighted Marx and Engels were. Since then capitalism has come to dominate the planet, even recapturing societies like the Soviet Union that had begun a transition to socialism to its rule. If capitalism is a global system since corporate investment and imperialism knows no borders then workers of all the world have to unite. The Manifesto ends with that slogan. It states that workers have a ‘world to win’. The chains of nationalism had to be broken.

Lenin, Trotsky and Rosa Luxembourg broke from the Second International over the capitulation of the German Social Democrats and their co-thinkers elsewhere to their own bourgeoisie’s support for the inter-imperialist First World War. At that time the revolutionary internationalist position was a very small minority. However the victory of the Russian Revolution and its impact among workers and peasants worldwide enabled Lenin and Trotsky to set up the Third International. This functioned as a revolutionary force for change with its parties having a real mass base. It did not get everything right, but if you read the documents of the [first four](#)

[congresses](#) there are rich debates about revolutionary tactics and strategy that still have some relevance today.

Stalin's rise to power in the Soviet Union and the physical repression of Trotsky, the Left Opposition and any other challenge to his rule resulted in the destruction of the democratic Third International. Thereafter Stalin set up the Comintern which was totally controlled from Moscow and defended the interests of the bureaucratic dictatorship rather than those of the international working class.

In the Spanish Civil war, for example, the Comintern's role included dividing the anti-Franco forces. Independent revolutionary parties like the POUM were repressed. Its leader, Andres Nin, and other fighters, were murdered by Stalin's agents. Trotsky, before his assassination by a Stalinist operative, set up the Fourth International in 1938 with the few revolutionary currents which were both anti-Stalinist, anti-capitalist and anti-imperialist.

2. Ecological crises make international organisation even more relevant today

Over the last few decades we have become increasingly aware that capitalism does not just exploit the majority of people for profit but threatens all human, animal and plant life because of its never-ending need to grow and exploit the natural world. Marxists, revolutionaries and eco activists are more and more seeing themselves in practice as ecosocialists. Pollution does not recognise borders. Extractive and fossil fuel companies operate indiscriminately throughout the globe.

Such an eco-socialist international is a change from the one that Marx, Lenin, Luxembourg, Trotsky envisaged. Even the new post-1968 New Left was slow to see the importance of the ecological struggle. A new revolutionary international does not just aim for working people to own and control the means

of production. We also need an ecological plan to remodel production in harmony with Mother Earth. The bureaucratic dictatorship in the former Soviet Union polluted and destroyed nature just as much as the capitalists in the west. For example industrialised cotton farming destroyed the Aral Sea.

A revolutionary international today has to interrogate traditional notions of growth and abundance put forward by our movement. So the need for a revolutionary International does not just depend on some sort of ritualistic bow to our Marxist or Leninist forebears. It has to respond to today's conditions and how they affect workers and peasants.

3. Forming internationalists

Building international parties helps to break down ingrained nationalist/imperialist reflexes that can even affect Marxist radicals who proclaim themselves internationalists. Centuries of empire, colonialism and imperialism will leave deep ideological and psychological traces, just as sexist behaviour can persist among radicals. Actively building an international party can lesson these risks.

It is interesting how the experience of some currents building internationals can replicate this ideology as the strongest section with funds that support the smaller groups becomes the motherboard of these currents. The self-designated centre essentially decides the political line at all times, intervening in its satellite groups if they go off message. Getting real input and balanced leadership that includes the global south is difficult although the extension of new technology can help.

Class struggle parties emerged to the left of reformism such as Syriza (Greece) or Podemos (Spain) in recent decades. They were not part of an international current and therefore more likely to succumb to pressures to join 'national unity' governments. Look at the *Bündnis Sahra Wagenknecht* (BSW) in

Gemany, led by Sahra Wagenekkt, which split from Die Linke on a nationalist, anti-migrant line.

Groups and individuals who are inside revolutionary international currents can also do the same – this happened in Brazil and Sri Lanka with the Fourth International (FI) in the past. However by establishing structures and education that consciously operates to develop an internationalist culture you can try and minimise such losses.

4. Do you need a major breakthrough in one country first before building an International?

Some people on the left may accept the need for an international abstractly but say it is premature to set one up now or to give it too much priority. Don't we have to concentrate on making an anti-capitalist breakthrough in one country which can then provide a resource and a model for revolutionaries everywhere? Look at how the victory of the Russian revolution really boosted the structures of the Third International. The period covering the first four congresses of the Third International was the only time we saw mass parties structured in an International.

Isaac Deutscher, the great biographer of Trotsky, argued it was premature to set up the Fourth International in 1938. But it is difficult to argue that it was any easier after the Second World War when Stalinist parties became stronger given the role of the Soviet Union in fighting Hitler and the CPs in the resistance movements.

Once you recognise that the revolutionary continuity is fatally broken you have to start again as Lenin did in 1914 with meagre support. The fact that some continuity through the Fourth International was maintained through to the post-1968 New Left meant that that generation was able to have access to an anti-Stalinist, revolutionary tradition going back to classical Marxism.

This argument is a bit like people saying in a national context that it is premature to set up a revolutionary organisation before there is a class struggle mass movement and a higher consciousness among masses of workers. The problem here is that you cannot leave it all to the last minute. Revolutionary crises will not provide the basis for a revolution if you have not achieved a specific weight of revolutionary cadre who can provide leadership to take the revolution forward.

How many times have we seen mass upsurges shake bourgeois states only to evaporate due to a lack of a conscious vanguard? It is also true that we should not get ahead of ourselves and have small groups proclaim that we already are the revolutionary nucleus and people should just join us.

5. Why an International is useful for revolutionary activists

It is useful both for political discussion and for taking action that has a political impact. Revolutionary consciousness benefits from regular structured debate with others throughout the world. A functioning international provides that training, the opportunities to regularly talk and discuss. Debates documented inside the FI on women's liberation, socialist democracy and ecosocialism have often been useful for wide layers of activists. Sometimes these issues were taken up before they became more mainstream in the wider movement. Books and publications sponsored by the IIRE (International Institute for Research and Education) and International Viewpoint/Inprecor help diffuse these ideas.

International structures are not just about generating political analysis or even communiques on the issues of the moment but can help coordinate actions internationally. The FI was rebuilt partly through its solidarity with the liberation movements in Cuba, Algeria and Vietnam. Later it made huge efforts to build solidarity with Nicaragua (in its radical phase), Solidarnosc in Poland and the 1982 British

miners strike to just cite a few examples. Today comrades in Italy are at the centre of solidarity with the GKN factory occupation/cooperative. We have organised international meetings to share the experiences of organising in solidarity with the Palestinian people.

An international can quickly disseminate practical information about certain struggles. Tours of comrades involved in exemplary battles can be set up in a number of countries. Another useful activity is to bring together young activists in an annual youth camp that has a different country as the venue each year. Groups or individuals from the global south can be subsidized to a degree by sections in the more advanced capitalist countries. This applies also to the international educational schools that are run in Amsterdam with its dedicated base. These schools are open to activists who are not members of the FI.

We can benefit too from sharing articles written by comrades across the world and published in the International Viewpoint [website](#). One thing that can be very irritating is when people from Britain pontificate about events in other places without giving voice to the activists in those countries. For example some people on the left here reduce the invasion and occupation of Ukraine to an inter-imperialist conflict provoked by US pressure on Russia. Contacts with sympathisers inside Ukraine allow us to counter such simplistic analyses and restore agency to Ukrainians.

With a functioning international structure, you can build a political culture that starts from understanding the conditions and interests of workers and peasants in different countries first hand. This is particularly important given the influence of campist sentiments today on the left. For campists revolutionary action is mainly determined by the conflict between the imperialist powers. If the main and only task is to weaken US interests that the needs and interests of workers in countries on the wrong side of this divide are

sacrificed. So some left wing people defended Assad as a lesser evil since the US was attacking him. Russian bombing and war crimes there were downplayed or ignored because Putin was supporting a regime that supposedly was part of an axis of resistance against the US and Israel. They see the overthrow of Assad as a massive defeat for workers.

6. An International that does not sound or look weird

Listening to Aaron Bastani on Novara media's [review of the year](#) (well worth watching) I was impressed by his final comment about the need for the left to build an anti-capitalist current that is not 'weird'. I think he is absolutely right about the need for the left to be accessible and approachable for people outside the left bubble. This applies to our championing of the need for an International.

The first maxim must be: do not pretend to be the world party of the international proletariat, particularly do not proclaim this on your publications. Talk like that puts you in the weirdo camp.

We must accept where we are. While we say we must not put off building an International today we see ourselves as a possible component of a much bigger one. Regrouping with currents coming from within or outside the Trotskyist tradition is essential. Indeed officially the FI does not define itself as Trotskyist and there are sections that come from Maoist or other traditions.

In Britain both the Socialist Party with the CWI (Committee for a Workers International) and the SWP with the IST (International Socialist Tendency) organises with its co-thinkers internationally. Neither is as present internationally as the FI or as structured, but we do not rule out working towards a convergence with such currents.

An international has to reject any pseudo Leninist idea that some sort of centre has to determine the political line to

take in each country. Each section has to determine its own strategy and tactics. It is only when a section in a country decides to cross class lines by for example joining a bourgeois government or breaking a strike that the International leadership would take action repudiating it. Just to give an example of democratic functioning today in the FI. There are nuances today on the line to take on Ukraine. While all groups call for the withdrawal of Russian troops not everybody agrees with Ukraine getting arms from Western governments. Publications of the International reflect that pluralism while making clear when positions are actually taken by international bodies.

Finally we should also keep in mind another reason for international organisation. The far right are organised internationally and they have a lot more resources than we do. Steve Bannon and others are always organising international meetings and funnelling money from their rich backers to groups around the world. Money from Putin's Russia also finds its way into the coffers of the far right. The left should organise on an international level, whether this is us as revolutionary ecosocialists or broader mass organisations like trade unions or Labour parties.

Dave Kellaway is on the Editorial Board of Anti*Capitalist Resistance, a member of Socialist Resistance, and Hackney and Stoke Newington Labour Party, a contributor to International Viewpoint and Europe Solidaire Sans Frontieres.

Originally posted as [Why do socialists organise internationally? – Anticapitalist Resistance](#) by Anti*Capitalist Resistance on 30th December 2024

Put an end to Macron and the Fifth Republic!

After the vote of no confidence, let's finish with Macron and the 5th Republic!

The result was clear: 331 votes in favour of the no confidence motion. The Barnier government resigned and the austerity budget law fell. This illegitimate government, a symbol of Macron's decomposition of the Macron presidency, had no future. The promise of ever more austerity and authoritarianism has been rejected by the vast majority of the population.

The economic and social crisis is leading to a political crisis the like of which we have not seen in decades. The capitalists and their institutions no longer have the legitimacy to organise society. They have no workable parliamentary majority. Macron must therefore leave and resign without delay. The forces of the New Popular Front (NFP), the parties but above all the unions, the associations, those from below, must close ranks to change everything. We need to move towards a constituent assembly process and put an end to the presidential system. We need to turn the page on this 5th Republic, which allows every kind of authoritarian power grab.

Faced with the democratic impasse, we need to impose a constituent process where democracy is not limited to the electoral arena but extends to the right to decide in workplaces and neighbourhoods. Decisions on what we produce and the use of resources should be made by the people primarily concerned – employees and users.

This means building strike action in the coming days, on 5 December in the civil service and from 12 December in all sectors. After Macron, this is the only way to defeat the

Rassemblement National (National Rally, Marine Le Pen -Tr), which is on the threshold of power. That's what the NPA, with its partners in the NFP, will be working hard to build in the hours and days ahead.

More broadly, this means building an anti-capitalist, ecosocialist alternative that puts an end to the exploitation of human beings and resources and all forms of oppression.

NPA – Nouveau Parti Anticapitaliste

4 December 2024

Montreuil, France

Translated by International Viewpoint from [L'Anticapitaliste](#).

Progressing by Grassroot Networks – An Interview with Catherine Samary

Before we turn to the discussion of the war in Ukraine and prospects for left internationalism, let's talk about the recent developments in your home country. How do you analyse the current political situation in France and the role that left-wing politics might play in it?

– Michel Barnier's new government combines two core elements: racism and attacks on social rights. The latter is evident in the ongoing parliamentary debates over the 2025 budget and social security funding. Marine Le Pen's National Rally (Rassemblement National) has played a key role in these discussions, not least due to the fact that no single party

has managed to achieve a stable majority in the French parliament. Even though the result of the New Popular Front (Nouveau Front Populaire) in the recent legislative election, which followed the dissolution of the Assembly last June, was unexpectedly high – and most welcome – it is still only a minor and relative victory.

This situation is unlikely to change unless the various forces within the New Popular Front come together, consolidate their victory, and start a large-scale mobilization. This could be achieved through the creation of local political alliances across the entire country that would be focused on concrete struggles. We should not forget that mass mobilizations against attacks on the social system are still possible – and so is the collapse of the government itself.

Against all evidence, the government wants people to believe that it has not introduced an “austerity budget” plan, but rather “a budget [plan] to avoid austerity” – at least, this is what the Minister of Finance Antoine Armand [declared](#) on the 21st of October. National Assembly deputies have proposed over 3,500 amendments to this plan! And yet, disagreements between different political alliances in the parliament are obvious. At the moment, no single one of them has a stable majority – these political struggles are indicative of what awaits us during the 2027 presidential election. In the current situation, there is a strong chance that the government will once again resort to Article 49.3 of the Constitution to pass the budget without a parliamentary vote. Previously, this procedure enabled the French government under Élisabeth Borne to push through the pension reform bill. However, the decision to use it now would pose a risk of early collapse for the government both due to internal divisions among the ruling classes and the general unpopularity of these measures.

And what better way is there to “divide and rule” than by designating a scapegoat – immigrants? Valérie Pécresse, who has held numerous high-level positions for different right-

wing political organizations, has become an emblem of the vile demagoguery that drives much of today's right-wing factions. On the 14th of October, she had the audacity to declare: "How do you plan to explain to the French that you are going to ask for more sacrifices from them, to pay more taxes, to benefit from fewer and fewer public services, while allowing immigration-related expenses to keep rising?" She added: "When we are too generous, we end up attracting people we do not want to welcome." Minister of the Interior Bruno Retailleau [shares](#) the same philosophy – his immigration bill is directly inspired by the National Rally's ideas. It is the duty of the left today to take a strong stance on this front as well and to stand firmly against all forms of racism.

– During the elections this year some of the international issues – in particular, those related to the wars in Ukraine and Palestine – were included in the programmes of all political parties. Would you say that international issues are politically divisive in France? Are they an important electoral factor in national political life?

– I would answer "yes" to the first question, but for the second question I am inclined to say "no." Political divisions on international issues have never played a central role in the electoral campaign or had any impact on its outcome. As I mentioned earlier, domestic issues have overwhelmingly dominated the political scene, especially in the wake of the crisis triggered by Emmanuel Macron's decision to call early elections. His choice to appoint Michel Barnier as Prime Minister in September – instead of [Lucie Castets](#), the candidate proposed by the New Popular Front, which came first in the legislative elections – highlighted the focus on domestic issues even more prominently. Macron's choice had little to do with international matters: it was strictly about pushing forward his social agenda.

It is also worth noting that parliamentary decisions about the sums allocated to Ukraine were made back in March and did not

generate much controversy during the elections. That being said, a lot of things regarding France's foreign policy are up for debate. The country's contributions to European and global aid packages to Ukraine are minimal. The current military budget is more allocated towards nuclear programs, furthering neocolonial interests in Africa (the "Françafrique" policy), and military support for Israel, rather than towards Ukraine. [1] The lack of real debate on these issues does not imply that they are of secondary importance; rather, it reflects the poor state of parliamentary "democracy" and the limited transparency around France's foreign policy.

– And internally, within political organizations?

– I am not the best person to give a detailed answer here, as I don't closely follow the inner workings of every party across the spectrum. However, what I can say at the very least is that their "political life" lacks democratic transparency. Most of the time, the only thing we see are public "positions" taken by party leaders – and these sometimes shift in noticeable, even awkward ways.

This happened with the right-wing approach to the war in Ukraine. After the invasion, which was widely recognized as an act of aggression, Marine Le Pen, as a representative of the National Rally, had to readjust her public position to distance herself from Vladimir Putin. Macron had to do the same, although this shift did not result from internal debates among his supporters or within his party Renaissance (RE). The same goes for his recent, cautious criticism of Israel's politics in Gaza and his call to recognize the rights of the Palestinians. Yet, overall, there is a consensus among the right on demonizing so-called "Islamism" as a tactic to discredit any form of support for Palestine.

As for the left-wing parties – from the communists and socialists to La France Insoumise (FI) – there are, of course, political disagreements on various international issues,

including ongoing military conflicts, both between the parties and within them. Some people on the radical left, in France and abroad, frame the Russo-Ukrainian war as a clash between NATO (the United States, essentially) and Russia – thus overlooking Ukraine itself. They see it through the “main enemy” lens and reduce the equation to a single “imperialist enemy” – in particular, the United States and NATO. As Gilbert Achcar puts it, this view might eventually come down to the following conclusion: “The enemy of my (main) enemy is my friend.” This explains Jean-Luc Mélenchon’s (leader of La France Insoumise) once somewhat sympathetic stance toward Putin compared, for instance, to Raphaël Glucksmann’s active campaign against Kremlin’s politics in his role as a socialist deputy in the European Parliament.

Given this range of political sentiments and positions within the parties composing the New Popular Front, it was reassuring to see straightforward, positive statements on foreign policy in their last program. They have taken a firm stance on “promoting peace in Ukraine,” specifically by “unwaveringly defending Ukraine’s sovereignty” through arms deliveries and asset seizures from Russian oligarchs. As far as Gaza is concerned, the New Popular Front has called for “an immediate ceasefire” and a “just and lasting peace,” condemning the “complicit support” of the French government for Benjamin Netanyahu’s policies. The program demands effective sanctions against Israel, along with official recognition of the state of Palestine in line with the United Nations resolutions. However, while these positions are important and encouraging, we have not seen much of a real political “battle” in the parliament or during the elections to make these statements more concrete.

– What do you think about the political situation in France in the aftermath of the Russian invasion of Ukraine in February of 2022? What discussions took place within your organization, the New Anticapitalist Party?

– The invasion was certainly a major political shock that raised serious questions across all political organizations. As the war continued, these questions have only deepened, and no clear consensus has emerged. Many pre-war conceptions continue to be actively debated – though, unfortunately, many of these views have not been updated. Even the basic condemnation of the Russian aggression has not led to the development of a unified position and approach across the political spectrum, especially regarding NATO or the European Union’s planned expansions to Ukraine, Moldova, Georgia, and the Western Balkans.

Before the invasion, Macron (much like Putin!) had considered NATO a “brain-dead” organization. His conclusion was based on NATO’s withdrawal from Afghanistan as well as internal disagreements among member countries regarding Russia and its energy resources. Ironically, the war has led to NATO’s expansion, harsher sanctions against Russia, and the legitimization of increased military budgets. At the same time, support for Ukraine has been hypocritically instrumentalized. As I said, a large share of the military budget in France (and in the United States, for that matter) is not actually directed toward Ukraine. There is also significant uncertainty around the United States’ concrete international commitments, which Macron sees as an opportunity to promote France’s arms industry in Europe and beyond. However, all this is not up for debate among the right.

On the left, including the New Anticapitalist Party (NPA), there has been limited debate around what Achcar calls the “New Cold War,” even though it is a necessary discussion. The prevailing logic within the NPA has been the following: even without a clear understanding of the rapidly changing world around us, without understanding the connections between various crises, and lacking viable socialist, anti-capitalist alternatives at national, European, and global levels, we can still fight for grassroots internationalism grounded in the

defense of universal equal rights. Echoing our comrades from Sotsialnyi Rukh (Social Movement) in Ukraine, we declared: "From Ukraine to Palestine, occupation is a crime!" We viewed and condemned the war in Ukraine as an aggression by Putin's Russia against Ukraine's very right to exist. We stand with our comrades from political organizations and labor unions in Russia and Ukraine, while maintaining independence from "our national governments" and disapproving of their neoliberal practices. We oppose Russian imperialism, shaped – among other things – by czarist and Stalinist legacies, while affirming our stance against "all imperialisms." We have also called for Ukraine's debt to be canceled and, alongside our Ukrainian comrades, we have condemned any attempt by Western powers or the Zelensky government to exploit Ukrainian resistance against the Russian aggression as a pretext for imposing anti-social policies.

Practically, the NPA has supported Ukraine's resistance, both armed and unarmed. We have recognized its legitimate right to request weapons (from those who manufacture them) for self-defense. Since March 2022, we have been involved in the European Network in Solidarity with Ukraine and Against the War (ENSU), where we remain active both at the European level and through its French branch, working alongside progressive Ukrainian groups.

This does not mean there has been no debate or disagreement. While all of us agree on Ukraine's right to request weapons for self-defense, several questions and dissensions emerged immediately: Is it politically justifiable for an anti-capitalist organization like ours to request arms from "our own bourgeoisie" and for a bourgeois government? Is it practically possible to call for military aid while also opposing militarism and military alliances like NATO?

Personally, I answered "yes" to both questions, as did the majority of the NPA members. Alongside other comrades, I represent the NPA within ENSU and work directly with leftist,

feminist, and student groups in Ukraine engaged in multiple struggles. But this activism requires us to differentiate our position from both “militarist” attitudes and “abstract pacifism.” This is achievable by “politicizing” the arms debate, which entails nationalizing the arms industry so that military budgets and the use of weapons become an object of political debate.

To summarize: “yes” to arms delivery to Ukraine in solidarity; “no” to sales to dictatorships and oppressive regimes like Israel! ENSU recently discussed and adopted a statement on this issue, which will soon be available on its website.

– And what about Emmanuel Macron’s statements regarding the potential deployment of French troops in Ukraine?

– Macron himself admitted there was “no consensus” – and that is an understatement – on this idea. His suggestion was met with criticism, with many seeing it as dangerously escalatory, if not reckless. Still, Macron maintained that “in the face of a regime that excludes nothing, we must exclude nothing ourselves.” However, critics pointed out the discrepancy between Macron’s “commitment” to helping Ukraine and the limited aid that France has actually provided so far. They also highlighted the difference between “deploying troops,” which implies co-belligerency, and sending military personnel and technicians for support tasks, like managing foreign-supplied military equipment. Macron’s other semantic improvisations were heavily criticized as well, for example his statement that France and the European Union were entering a “war economy.” This notion doesn’t match reality, as current production systems haven’t undergone any such transformation.

As I mentioned earlier, another crucial issue is the need to politicize and increase transparency around military budgets. This requires analyzing what the military industry is really producing and sending to Ukraine, alongside the financial and material aid needed to support Ukraine’s actual “war economy.”

If Ukraine's economy remains state-run and dependent on Western aid tied to neoliberal conditions, it is bound to fail. This is why I support the "internal" strategy of the Ukrainian leftist organization Sotsialnyi Rukh, which criticizes the current trajectory of Zelensky's government and instead prioritizes the popular and democratic resources of independent Ukraine itself.

– How have people reacted to Vladimir Putin's repeated nuclear threats?

– Reactions have been mixed and have changed over time. Putin clearly knows that he is spreading fear this is exactly what he wants – and we cannot exclude the risk of a catastrophe. However, it is hard to imagine what "effective" use of nuclear weapons could look like from Putin's perspective. So far, each of his "red lines" has shifted back in response to the Ukrainian military operations, including those on Russian territories, without triggering the nuclear retaliation he promised. Another reassuring factor has been China's explicit veto against any use of nuclear weapons by its Russian ally.

Still, some "pacifists" continue to instrumentalize the fear of nuclear escalation as an argument against sending more weapons to Ukraine to avoid further "provoking" Putin!

– Are there ongoing discussions and debates in activist circles about France's nuclear deterrent and its possible strategic uses?

– No, these debates are not – yet – taking place among activists, who are not necessarily in a position to have such discussions. There is justified political distrust toward our government, especially given France's post- and neo-colonial history. Both this distrust and our necessary independence from the government make it hard to imagine how a radical, anti-capitalist organization like ours would ask Macron to use "his bomb" in the name of vaguely defined common interests.

Journalists have questioned Macron about the French nuclear deterrent in a context of growing uncertainties surrounding the United States' commitments: while he has not "ruled out" a form of European "mutualization" of France's nuclear arsenal, he has insisted that command would remain under French control.

However, current discussions about "security" should extend far beyond nuclear deterrence. For instance: How should the military and police forces evolve? How can we exercise civilian, democratic control over their actions? The growing influence of far-right ideas within the French police force is particularly alarming. Likewise, the European left urgently needs to consider what a progressive, "alter-globalist" approach to "European defense" might look like. The ongoing crisis in global and European social forums has caused significant delay in this area, but there are efforts underway to revive a "European alternative public sphere." This movement is essential, and we must support it to address these multidimensional "security" issues. I am a participant of a newly formed working group in France comprising left-wing "alter-globalist" activists working on these questions and committed to defending equal social and political rights – both individual, collective, and across national borders.

– Security issues do not solely concern international relations: the ultra-right, for instance, resort to threats, "attacks on the Arabs," and even murders. What options does the left have to counter the rise of the far-right, which is one of this decade's most serious challenges?

– Here too, it is crucial to examine how such factors as state structures of "legal violence," the justice system, and the rise of fascist private militias interact in each country. Much depends on who is in power and the nature of current social struggles. Historically – and likely in the future – the key factor has been the ability of mass organizations, involving both men and women, to self-organize and unite in

self-defense while conducting information and denunciation campaigns in the media. This topic is a central point of discussion within the “European alternative political space” that is currently being (re)built.

– What does it mean for the contemporary left to engage in international politics?

– Environmental threats are just as serious as attacks on social rights, with the poor being the most affected. The “contemporary left” is diverse and currently grappling with issues that weaken its capacity to respond to urgent problems. These issues stem from a series of crises: the crisis of countries that once pursued a socialist project – if not a reality – and those who identified with it, be that in Europe, China, or Cuba; the crisis of social-democratic movements, which have largely given up on transforming capitalist societies; and the crisis within the radical left, which often struggles, for diverse reasons, to offer viable alternatives to the system it criticizes and sometimes indulges in dogmatic, sectarian “vanguard” positions.

These widespread crises have also impacted the global and continental social forums working to invent new transnational modes of operation and action in a rapidly changing world-system. All these difficulties have led to significant political concessions and, at times, acceptance of a “lesser evil” logic. However, valuable assets persist across all the leftist currents I mentioned and beyond. From the radical left to the new social, feminist, eco-socialist, and antiracist movements, there is a wealth of accumulated experience and past struggles. While criticizing “vanguardism” is important when it attempts to substitute itself for social movements, it is equally important to reinforce pluralistic, democratic, international cooperation among anti-capitalist groups. These connections are currently limited, but they are vital for achieving a broad, pluralistic understanding of past challenges and mistakes we made.

It is crucial to progress forward by building strong grassroots international networks that focus on concrete issues. The European Network in Solidarity with Ukraine and the [BDS \(Boycott, Divestment, Sanctions\)](#) campaign in support of the Palestinian cause demonstrate that this is possible. Likewise, we need campaigns that address feminist, anti-racist, social justice, and environmental issues, which are essential to reestablishing a multi-issue, alternative space for rethinking globalization. This vision is taking shape in Europe, and while there is no magic solution, it is clear that failing to move in this direction will only leave us vulnerable to the rising threat of the far-right.

20 November 2024

Source: [Posle Media](#).

Catherine Samary (<http://csamary.fr>) is a feminist and alterglobalist economist and a leading member of the Fourth International. She has done extensive research on the former socialist and Yugoslav experiences and European systemic transformations.

Fund drive for the Congress of the Fourth International

The Fourth International is organizing its world congress in February 2025. This will be an opportunity for around 200 delegates from all over the world to meet and exchange views.

We note that the world is particularly complicated to grasp at the moment, with the multiple crises that capitalism is experiencing, combining economic, social, political and

ecological crises, the rise of the far right, and so on. Comparing the situations in different countries, as we are doing by exchanging texts and organizing discussions in all the countries before we meet for the congress, is extremely useful for better analysis and action.

To meet these challenges, we are discussing a new Manifesto for the Fourth International based on our ecosocialist orientation and outlining the world we want to build. We will also discuss the state of the world as it is around our international resolution with two specific focuses on Palestine and Ukraine, our activity in the social movements of the exexploited and oppressed where we build class struggle forces, and of course strengthening our own International.

Organizing a congress costs a lot of money, because we have to have a residential centre where the delegates are housed, a full team of interpreters and secretariat, and subsidize comrades from the Global South – from Asia, Africa, Latin America – for their transport tickets, which have become much more expensive since the covid pandemic.

If you can contribute financially, please make your transfers to

Account Name: A.F.E.S.I.

(Association pour la Formation, l'Education, la Solidarité Internationale)

IBAN: BE03 0013 9285 0884

BIC/SWIFT code: GEBABEBB

And of course, take part in the discussions in your country!

A video :

<https://fb.watch/vD3eKIZ8Gk/>

https://www.instagram.com/reel/DB6ABV0Kxyw/?utm_source=ig_web_copy_link

<https://youtu.be/SbNvi751B6I?feature=shared>

Trump's Second Term – Now is the Time for a Global Fightback – Statement from Anti Capitalist Resistance

The following statement on the US Presidential Elections has been issued by the comrades of Anti*Capitalist Resistance and has been reproduced as a contribution to how we should respond to the Trump victory here in Scotland. For further information about Anti*Capitalist Resistance visit their website at <https://anticapitalistresistance.org/>

Donald Trump won a second US presidency on 6 November 2024. The Republican Party is now in almost total control of US establishment politics as they also made gains in the Senate, giving them control of the entire legislature, the presidency and the Supreme Court. It is a victory for the US Plutocrats and Oligarchs, Elon Musk, Jeff Bezos, the crypto-fanatics and west-coast Tech Bros. Trumpism is part of the global counter-revolutionary wave we see with far-right populists, authoritarians, semi-fascists and libertarians taking power in countries around the world. What we are seeing is a process of a general shift to the far-right caused by neoliberalism and the collapse in the post-war liberal consensus that it has

brought about. Trumpism is the same trend that produced Modi in India, Duterte in the Philippines, Meloni in Italy and so on.

But this victory, in particular, is a disaster for billions around the planet. The power of US imperialism to act or not act is still a decisive factor in global politics.

A second Trump presidency will be as chaotic and vile as the first. Only now his key intellectual backers will be much clearer on what they want to get out of it. Project 2025 is a blueprint for an authoritarian USA; it includes the proposals to sack thousands of government employees and place the rest of the US government bureaucracy under central presidential control. Elimination of the Department of Education to allow state-level control of curricula. It involves Rolling back transgender healthcare and social rights, making trans existence almost untenable in some states. It means the elimination of federal protections for gender equality, sexual orientation and reproductive rights. It will almost certainly prevent abortion pills from being sent through the post, which is the number one way people get abortions in the USA. We will see the mainstreaming of “conversations” about disenfranchising women. It also involves slashing funding for renewable energy research and development, increasing energy production and scrapping targets for carbon reduction.

Whether Trump’s promise to be a dictator on day one and use the military against political opponents was hot air for electioneering or not is unknown. But that he ran such a reactionary campaign and got such a decisive vote reveals something about the growth of far-right populist ideas. We know that both he and his Vice President JD Vance recently endorsed a book called *Unhumans*, [a manifesto for the mass murder of left-wing activists](#) along the lines of Pinochet in Chile. This reveals the fascist kernel of neoliberal politics, which has come full circle.

This defeat largely rests on the wretched politics and failed strategy of the Democrats. It is clear that the Democrats are not even a dented shield against the growth of the far right; they actively feed the problem. They were business as usual in a period of anxiety and division.

They ran a campaign against a populist who was appealing to 'the common people' by instead focusing on the virtue of the establishment – constantly repeating that Trump was a felon as if there are not millions of felons in the USA in a corrupt and unfair judicial system who might see in him a persecuted martyr. The Democrats' fixation on the law courts to undermine him before the election failed utterly and added to his populist credentials. They preferred a campaign from the centre, focusing on celebrity endorsement, winning over middle ground Republicans, and parading with Liz Cheney. They appealed to the belief that the US is a country of equal opportunity and post-racism when it palpably isn't.

Trump and his supporters see through this. They know it is a lie. They prefer bullish, macho posturing, might makes right, freedom from consequence. The Democrats focussed in the last few weeks on labelling Trump a fascist – the response from his supporters was either a shrug or to embrace the fact that he wound up the liberals so much. Trump is a cypher for all the most selfish and reactionary views in US society, but the Democrats were no alternative. His movement crystallised a view of the USA that rejects equality and embraces domination. His movement is not foreign to the US body politics; it is rooted in it.

The global counter-revolutionary wave is largely a reaction to the gains of the post-war era – the advances made by women, Black people, the LGBTQIA+ community and others. Trump appealed especially to white people and young men, to Christian nationalist far right and tech bro supporters of Elon Musk. He also picked up votes from the Arab American community that turned on the Democrats for their funding of

Israel's genocide in Gaza (although Trump will pursue the same policy). But he also drew support from a [significant number of Black people](#) (meaning people of colour) and women, those who reject the liberal establishment and want to resolve the contradictions of American society by embracing its supremacist values. Some of the US Black population also backs mass deportations of recently arrived immigrants if it drives down prices and improves wages (as Trump claims). That is the point of populism; it combines contradictions and appeals to different people in different ways while claiming to provide simple answers to complex questions and denying meaningful change.

There will be considerable contradictions in his populist programme. Trump promised a carbon fossil fuel bonanza to drive down energy bill costs and tackle inflation, but he also wants tariffs on imports to strengthen US industry, which will drive up prices. He seems unlikely to deliver better living standards and more jobs for US citizens, especially with massive public sector cuts. But we also have to be wary of assuming that people primarily vote on economic grounds – the modern political landscape is far more complicated and riven by ideological divisions rather than simple financial calculations.

His indication that he will withdraw support from Ukraine and 'end the war there' almost certainly means that Russia's imperial annexation will be allowed to proceed. What this means for the broader region as Putin continues his expansionist project remains to be seen. Certainly, the emergence of a more multipolar world will propel us closer to a third world war at some stage. For the Palestinians, it also means more slaughter and defeat, Trump has been clear with Netanyahu that the far right leadership of Israel can "do whatever they need to do" to win.

The need for continued resistance goes without question. There will be many people feeling hopeless or full of despair right

now, and that is exactly what the far right and fascists want. They take sadistic pleasure in the defeats they inflict on the 'woke' and on the left. But politics is determined by struggles for power and counter-power, building mass coalitions of resistance, identifying the weak points in the enemy's side and mobilising forces to shatter their strength.

ACR is in total solidarity with those in the USA who reject this authoritarian turn and want to fight for a better world. We know the next few years will be difficult, but our movement has faced difficult times before. We know things will get worse before they get better. But we also know that we can argue for a world beyond capitalism, imperialism, and militarism, based on a society that provides for everyone and is sustainable with the environment. Runaway global warming is already with us, as is the worldwide strengthening of the far right; the two are linked. And politics does not end at the ballot box – that is another lie the Democrats relied on. Power comes from our organisation and resilience. We fight for a revolutionary change. Our role is to be part of the international fightback to change the world, to reclaim the future and build a better society for everyone!

Publishing a New Collection of Writings by Daniel Bensaïd

In 2009 the IIRE (1) published the collection *Strategies of Resistance + 'Who are the Trotskyists'*. In 2025, fifteen years after the passing of our comrade, we want to publish a new, significantly augmented edition, collecting essays on history, politics and strategy.

Donations can be made [here](#).

'Who are the Trotskyists?' (2002) is a historical text on the evolution of the Trotskyist movement. Rather than strive for academic comprehensiveness, in this essay, partly informed by his personal experiences, Bensaïd puts forward what he considers the elements of continuing relevance in Trotskyism. 'Theses of Resistance' (2004) is an ambitious attempt to confront the theoretical challenges facing Marxism in the so-called 'postmodern' age. Written a few years later, 'Myths and Legends of Domination' (2008) critically engages with writers like Herbert Marcuse and Michel Foucault to interrogate the historical shift that took place with the victorious 'new spirit of the free-market counter-reform' since the seventies. In these and other texts, Bensaïd puts forward an interpretation of Marxism as a thought without guarantees, one that refuses ideas of historical inevitability to instead focus on the decisive role of social struggles and political decisions. A red thread running through these essays is the dialectic between the identities that can form the beginning of resistance and universal emancipation as the revolutionary horizon of social struggle. Crackling with insight, erudition and wit, Bensaïd's writings are a valuable legacy for revolutionaries. We need your help to pass it on. To contribute to the costs of translation and production, the IIRE is raising 5000 euros. People who donated 60 euros or more will receive a book of the book once it is published. We are aiming for publication in autumn 2025.

Table of contents

included in original edition:

Who are the Trotskyists?

Theses of Resistance

The Mole and the Locomotive

Hegemony and United Front

Thirty Years After: A Critical Introduction to the Marxism of Ernest Mandel

Stalinism and Bolshevism

New texts:

Stalinism against communism: on The Black Book of Communism

Myths and Legends of Domination

Marxism against Totalitarianism

What it means to be Marxist

Marxist notes on Jewish emancipation

A fragment on Fanon
Marx's Paris Turn
Commune, State and Revolution
The powers of communism

Donations can be made through the [crowdfunding appeal](#). Please share the link to help us reach our goal!

Notes:

(1) The International Institute for Research and Education (IIRE) provides activists and scholars worldwide with opportunities for research and education in three locations: Amsterdam, Islamabad and Manila. [Read more](#)

Documents of the Fourth International

[Manifesto of Revolutionary Marxism in the Age of Capitalist Ecological and Social Destruction](#)

[International Situation; Social Movements; Role & Tasks; Minority Texts](#)

Texts submitted for discussion at the 18th World Congress of the Fourth International by the International Committee of the Fourth International

Fatal Flaws in UK-Mauritius “Joint Statement” on planned Treaty on Chagos

The “Joint Statement” that Pravind Jugnauth and Keir Starmer have concocted is obviously riddled with fatal flaws for Mauritius’ future. It is dangerous on all the main issues: decolonization, closing the USA’s military base, the elementary right to free movement over all the land and sea for all Mauritians including Chagossians, and thus the right to return for Chagossians. It is even a blow to Mauritian sovereignty, itself. So, the Treaty must be opposed. LALIT now puts the following issue on the agenda for the general elections: Full sovereignty to be exercised democratically over Chagos, and a date for base closure and clean-up! No to militarism! No to prolonged occupation or colonization!

In fact, taken as a whole, the 3 October Joint Statement is one big booby-trap for Mauritius. It prolongs colonization of the Republic of Mauritius, it denies the right to free movement by all Mauritians, it denies the free right of return, it prolongs military occupation and even puts base closure and thus peace outside of Mauritius’ democratic control in our own land, it puts sovereignty up for bilateral negotiation outside the established norms of international law. So, it must be opposed. The victory of the historic ICJ judgment of 2019 would be shattered by such a Treaty. It is a blatant move by the UK-USA imperialists to steal a good part of Mauritius.

Perfidious Albion is at it again. Doing America’s dirty work. And another fawning Mauritian leader is at it again, too, this time as leader of an independent State, while being egged on, it seems, by the Modi Government. And we deplore the inability of the Mauritian opposition to oppose the military occupation

head-on as the prolonged colonization it is.

The Exact Wording

The Agreement purports to be the result of bilateral negotiation, yet the two signatories make a point of stating in the document, that they also have “the full support and assistance of our close partners, the United States of America and the Republic of India.” Now we know the real reason India’s Foreign Minister Jaishankar was here in July for a lightning visit that seemed, at the time, to be for reasons vague and ephemeral. The real reason was obviously to get Mauritius to agree to this Joint Statement. India is presumably getting its share in terms of American arms sales, use of Diego Garcia base for its navy, and cover for its secret Agalega base.

It is pitiful when big empires begin to collapse. Their moral core rots publicly. Every decision they take is the wrong one. Let us explain. The USA and UK are supposedly the closest geopolitical allies in the world. Yet circumstances pit them against each other over Diego. The UK-USA were so isolated at the UN General assembly that they only got three countries to vote with them, once Maldives withdrew its vote: Israel, Hungary and Australia’s previous right-wing government.

At the same time, Britain and the USA sound either half-witted or mad when they stand up and shriek in support of Ukraine’s right not to be occupied by Russia. The exposure of the USA’s genocide alongside Israel against the militarily occupied Palestine is also a source of mutual blaming – especially when at the ICJ the very same issues are cross-referenced in the Mauritius’ case against the UK for its colonization and military occupation and the Palestinian case (put in by Nicaragua) against Israel for the very same thing. So, the UK is in a corner, and the USA can’t get it out of the corner. And they have difficulty coming to any consensus.

And, even on what seem small things, they fall out. Yes, the USA recently went ahead and denied a British judge access to Diego Garcia when she had to be there to judge a British Indian Ocean Territories (BIOT) Supreme Court case about 64 refugees being held illegally there. So, the UK state was cornered on this human rights issue that exposed its continued colonization and military occupation of Mauritius. Now, "Great" Britain's judiciary does not take kindly to this kind of thing. It is not up to Royal standards of a United "Kingdom", so to speak. So, the "special relationship" starts to fall apart. The UK Brexit vote was thoroughly tampered with by the USA's right-wing politicians like Trump's advisor Steve Bannon, and so US interference and Brexit have bankrupted the UK. As it is, the UK, like the rest of Europe, is suffering from a refugee crisis provoked by the USA. It is American wars that cause people to flee from bombed out societies and ruined infrastructure in Iraq, Afghanistan, Syria and also from Libya where nearly 2 million non-Libyan Africans worked. And this has led to a political crisis, in the UK. This crisis caused the Conservative Government to set up a far-fetched and illegal scheme in Rwanda to "out-source" the UK's refugee problem to another country.

The UK and USA rightly anticipated there would be a huge immigration crisis around the BIOT and the military base on Diego – just as there is on Lampedusa in Sicily and on Spain's Canary Islands, and in particular when the USA is busy sparking war against China via Taiwan. The 64 Sri Lankans were merely the early-warning signal of a "flood", to use the right-wing language, of refugees. So, in reality the American base is threatened not by China or Russia, as the UK and USA pretend it is, but by 64 poor Sri Lankans, some of them children, shipwrecked there. It shows how every bit of protest against the imperialists, when their empires start to topple, counts. And it also shows what the UK-USA empire has come to. The Rwanda scheme – already billed to cost British VAT-payers some 4 billion pounds – was shut down by the new Labour

Government for being against international law. But, the UK judiciary still had to deal with the 64 Sri Lankans without transferring them to Britain. This became the last straw.

So, dire circumstances lead to dire actions, like the UK trying to both “give” (to quote the international press) and “keep” its sovereignty over the place the USA, in fact, controls! It is this confusion that has produced this flawed “Joint Statement”.

Here are the flaws of the Joint Statement, concentrating on paragraph 3:

While the Joint Statement says at paragraph 3 that “Mauritius is sovereign over Chagos, including Diego Garcia,” we must remember that its first paragraph described the document as being about not “sovereignty” itself but about “the exercise of sovereignty”. The wording implies there are two different things: Who “is sovereign”? The document says Mauritius is. But who has “the exercise of sovereignty”? Are they one and the same? The two expressions seem, at first view, to mean the same thing. But in the Joint Statement they definitely do not. In any case, this kind of formulation is so bizarre, especially coming from the perfidious Albion, that it ought to set off alarm bells in our heads.

Here is the first problem: the meat of the third paragraph reads, “the United Kingdom will be authorised to exercise with respect to Diego Garcia the sovereign rights ... of Mauritius required to ensure the continued operation of the [US military] base”. Let us deal with this in grammatical terms. In black and white, it says “the UK will be authorised to exercise ... the sovereign rights ... of Mauritius”. So, Mauritius is sovereign, as the document has already said, but the UK is authorised to exercise this Mauritian sovereignty! What is this?

So, here we see the perfidy of the words “exercise of

sovereignty” that we mentioned from the first paragraph, which declares what the Joint Statement is about: it is about the exercise of sovereignty, not about sovereignty. Yes, believe it or not, Mauritius is not “sovereign over Chagos, including Diego Garcia” as promised earlier in paragraph three, because the UK will be authorised to exercise the sovereign rights of Mauritius, and this is what the Joint Statement is about. No less.

And, to mask all this perfidy, the formulation is intentionally clumsy in another way. Not only is this authorization for the UK to exercise Mauritius’ sovereign rights supposed to be only “with respect to Diego Garcia” (pretending to spare the other outer Chagos islands, and leave them to Mauritius’ sovereignty) but also, added on afterwards to include we suppose literally “anything anywhere” concerning those sovereign rights “required to ensure the continued operation of the base”. This means it may be “with respect to Diego Garcia” or it may also include anything “required to ensure the continued operation of the base”.

We know that the USA has always objected to Mauritius controlling not only Diego Garcia, but any of the other islands. But now, in respect to Diego Garcia, any form of sovereignty that is “required to ensure the continued operation of the base” will be exercised by the UK. Of course, what exactly this means will be decided later by ... none other than the USA. Just like the USA decided to kick the British judge out of BIOT. So Mauritius has what is left of sovereignty when Britain has exercised any sovereignty “required to ensure the continued operation of the base”, and the USA will decide on the meaning of the bland “with respect to Diego Garcia” en temps et lieu.

Other oddities in this paragraph must now also be looked at. Where it says, “the UK will be authorised to exercise ... sovereign rights ...”, after the word “rights”, there are the two words “and authorities”. This, we can only guess, is to

ensure all the “rights” Mauritius has, as well as all the “authorities” it has, meaning all the powers it has, “powers” flowing from sovereignty, will be authorised to be exercised by the UK.

The next oddity is the frank, “For an initial period of 99 years.” Let’s deal with the word “initial”, it means that what Britain means is that its exercise of sovereignty will last for “ONE CENTURY”, but that is only to begin with. This formulation is a synonym for “forever” – unless we are talking geological time, and the first lap lasts, as it is, “... well into the next century”.

The third oddity is ensuring that Mauritius, the weak partner, will agree with the strong partner, the UK to submit to the exigencies of the really big masked partner, the USA. Read this paragraph hidden in the middle of paragraph 3: “At the same time, both our countries are committed to the need, and will agree in the treaty, to ensure the long-term, secure and effective operation of the existing base on Diego Garcia which plays a vital role in regional and global security.” Decisions about what will ensure the “secure and effective operation of the existing base” will be made presumably by the USA.

The blood money in exchange for the war machine on our land

There are two paragraphs mainly about money. They are vague and humiliating for Mauritius. “The treaty will address wrongs of the past”, the Joint Statement says. How? An apology for stealing the land? An apology for hounding out the Mauritians living there on that Mauritian land? Or are they talking about money? Who knows?

And it goes on “and demonstrate the commitment of both parties to support the welfare of Chagossians. Mauritius will now be free to implement a programme of resettlement on the islands

of the Chagos Archipelago, other than Diego Garcia, and the UK will capitalise a new trust fund, as well as separately provide other support, for the benefit of Chagossians.” No mention of free movement for anyone. No mention of all the ordinary aspects of sovereignty. Can Mauritius build ports or an airstrip? Or will this affect the “secure and effective operation of the existing base”? The wording is absurd.

“It will also herald a new era of economic, security and environmental partnership between our two nations. To enable this partnership the UK will provide a package of financial support to Mauritius. This will include an indexed annual payment for the duration of the agreement and the establishment of a transformational infrastructure partnership, underpinned by UK grant funding, to deliver strategic projects generating meaningful change for ordinary Mauritians and boosting economic development across the country.” This is the bribe. This is the blood money. This is what aims to draw the Mauritian people into moral degradation by agreement to it!

Then the Joint Statement goes on, “More broadly, the UK and Mauritius will cooperate on environmental protection, maritime security, combating illegal fishing, irregular migration and drug and people trafficking within the Chagos Archipelago, with the shared objective of securing and protecting one of the world’s most important marine environments. This will include the establishment of a Mauritian Marine Protected Area.” This is Mauritius will “cooperate” with the UK to do all this, including a “Mauritian” MPA, as opposed to Mauritius doing all this independently and in a sovereign way.

Conclusion

Let us end with a simple quote from the Mauritian Constitution. Section 1 reads “Mauritius shall be a sovereign democratic state”

and Section 111 reads,

“Mauritius includes:

“(a) The islands of Mauritius, Rodrigues, Agalega, Cargados Carajos, Tromelin, and the Chagos Archipelago, including Diego Garcia and any other island comprised in the State of Mauritius;

“(b) the territorial sea and the air space above the territorial sea and the islands mentioned in section (a);

“(c) the continental shelf; ...”

LATIT, Wednesday 9 October 2024

<https://www.lalitmauritius.org/>

Reposted from International Viewpoint

Strategic Reflections on the Escalation of Israeli Intimidation in Lebanon

Not even an hour had passed after I wrote my article of a week ago (“Lebanon and the Israeli Strategy of Intimidation”, 17/9/2024) when the Israeli intelligence agencies launched a mass terror operation in Lebanon by blowing up individual communication devices in two successive waves over two days, killing more than 40 people and wounding more than 3,500. These two waves of mass terrorism were followed by an escalation in the exchange of shells across the border,

between Hezbollah and the Israeli Aggression Forces (aka IDF), preluding to the intense violent bombardment that poured down on Monday on southern Lebanon and other areas where Hezbollah is present, killing nearly 500 people and wounding more than 1,600. The bombardment is still ongoing as these lines are written.

The question that imposed itself on everyone, starting with those targeted in Lebanon, is whether this sudden escalation in what we called the “Israeli strategy of intimidation” is paving the way for a full-scale aggression against Lebanon that would include indiscriminate heavy bombing of all areas where Hezbollah is present, including the densely populated southern suburb of Beirut, with the aim of making it “look like Gaza” in the words of one of Benjamin Netanyahu’s close associates. It is indeed feared that the Zionist state will carry out a brutal aggression on parts of Lebanon, similar to the aggression that targeted the entire Gaza Strip, in line with what one of the overseers of the Israeli aggression on Lebanon in 2006 called the “Dahiya doctrine” (a reference to the southern suburb of Beirut, the Arabic word *dahiya* meaning “suburb”). This doctrine aims at achieving deterrence against anyone who has the intention of confronting Israel, by threatening to inflict a high level of violence on areas inhabited by the civilian population to which those who nurture that intention belong, like what happened to the southern suburb of Beirut in 2006, which is the main area where Hezbollah’s popular base is concentrated.

It is a fact that the 2006 aggression that followed an operation carried out by Hezbollah fighters across the southern Lebanese border against Israeli soldiers, killing eight of them and capturing two, had a deterrent effect, which was acknowledged by the Hezbollah’s Secretary-General Hassan Nasrallah in declaring his regret, when he famously said on television in the aftermath of that war: “If I had known for one percent that this abduction operation would lead to a war

of this magnitude, we certainly would not have done it for humanitarian, moral, military, social, security and political reasons.”

What the Western media, which are quick to condemn war crimes when they are committed by the West’s enemies, such as the Russian regime in Ukraine, do not say, is that the “Dahiya doctrine” is not an instance of military genius and a doctrine worthy of being taught in the military colleges of civilized countries, but rather a blatant violation of the laws of war, which consist in the practice of war crimes on a large scale, up to a genocidal level in Gaza, through an explicit intent to target civilians in order to deter combatants. It is, in other words, a terrorist strategy formulated by a terrorist state par excellence, which constitutes a stark confirmation that state terrorism is much more dangerous than the terrorism of non-state groups, as it applies the same logic, i.e. the killing of civilians for a political purpose, but with immeasurably greater potential for lethality and destruction.

Hezbollah learned two lessons from the 33-Day War in 2006. The first translates in that it has since then taken into account what it sees as a red line that, if crossed, would give the Zionist state a new pretext to attack Lebanese civilians. In order to ward off its popular base in the first place, Hezbollah did not carry out any bold operation like the one that sparked the 2006 war – or the one carried out by Hamas about a year ago, igniting the war to destroy Gaza and exterminate its people. The second lesson led Hezbollah to acquire a huge arsenal of missiles that established a counter-deterrent by threatening civilian areas inside the Zionist state, thus achieving what is called in the vocabulary of nuclear deterrence a “balance of terror”.

This equation is what explains Hezbollah’s initiative of starting a limited war of attrition with the Zionist state the day after Operation “Al-Aqsa Flood”, in response to Hamas’s call for it to join what it had initiated. That call came in a

message from the military leader of the Islamic movement in the Gaza Strip, Muhammad al-Deif, broadcast at the start of the operation: "Oh our brothers in the Islamic resistance, in Lebanon, Iran, Yemen, Iraq and Syria, this is the day when your resistance will merge with your people in Palestine so that this terrible occupier will understand that the time in which it rampages and assassinates scholars and leaders has ended. The time of plundering your wealth has ended. The almost daily bombing in Syria and Iraq has ended. The time of dividing the nation and scattering its forces in internal conflicts has ended. The time has come for all Arab and Islamic forces to unite to sweep this occupation from our holy sites and our land."

However, Hezbollah was smarter than to be overcome by euphoria to the point of believing that the day of victory over Israel and liberation of Palestine had come. It decided therefore to enter the battle as a supporter rather than a full participant, a decision that translated into the limited war of attrition. The party wanted to express its solidarity with the people of Gaza, but without exposing its popular base to a fate similar to that of the residents of the Strip. However, this calculation is now backfiring on Hezbollah, as the Zionist aggression army, having finished its intensive large-scale operations in Gaza, is now focusing on its northern front, launching what we called the "strategy of intimidation", which is a gradual escalation in attacks with a threat to shift to implementing the "Dahiya doctrine".

This Israeli behaviour demonstrates the effectiveness of Hezbollah's counter-deterrence, as the Zionist government is forced to be cautious about igniting a full-scale war that it knows will be costly to Israeli society, even if the cost to Hezbollah's base will be much higher given the great superiority of Israeli military capabilities. The Zionist government hence resorted first to escalation through "asymmetric warfare", a term that usually describes the

actions of an irregular force against a regular army. Here, it is the Zionist state that is dealing a devious and painful blow to Hezbollah and its civilian milieu by blowing up communications devices. This was followed by an escalation of conventional war that began on Monday, constituting a dangerous escalation of pressure on Hezbollah to force it to surrender and accept the conditions set by Washington with the approval of the Zionist government, the most important of which is the withdrawal of the party's forces to north of the Litani River.

Confronted with this escalating pressure, the party finds itself trapped in mutual, but unequal, deterrence. It does not possess the capabilities of waging "asymmetric warfare" deep inside Israel and cannot strike there in a way that would cause hundreds of deaths, like what the Zionist army inflicted on Lebanon on Monday, for fear that the response would be overwhelming, knowing that Israel is fully capable of responding at a much higher level. The Zionist government is wholly aware of the conditions of the equation. While it wishes to dismantle Hezbollah's deterrent capacity, it cannot initiate a comprehensive war without ensuring full US participation in it, similar to Washington's participation in the war on Gaza during several months, the most deadly and destructive months, to the point of countering all calls for a ceasefire. The Zionist government needs such full US complicity in the event of launching a full-scale aggression on Lebanon, the political conditions of which have not yet been met. It is working to achieve them, however, and may well issue a warning with a limited deadline to Hezbollah for that purpose, as we mentioned a week ago.

From all of this, it appears that Netanyahu has begun to fear that his friend Donald Trump might well fail in the upcoming US presidential elections in about a month and a half. It seems that he therefore decided to escalate matters, taking advantage of the last months of presence of his other friend,

the “proud Irish-American Zionist” Joe Biden, in the White House. The question now is: will Biden pressure Netanyahu firmly enough to prevent a war that is likely to negatively affect the campaign of his party’s candidate, Kamala Harris, or will he once again go along with his friend’s criminal endeavour, even if accompanied by an expression of regret and resentment meant to deflect the blame in his and his Secretary of State Blinken’s usual hypocritical way?

Gilbert Achcar

Translated from the Arabic original published by [Al-Quds al-Arabi](#) on 24 September 2024 and posted at <https://gilbert-achcar.net/strategic-reflections-on-lebanon>

Portugal: Deadly forest fires

Seven people have died and 118 have been injured in the fires that have been raging since September 15 in the north and centre of the country. In just three days, 2024 has become the year with the fourth-largest area burned in the last decade.

Seven people have died and 118 have been injured in the fires that have been raging since September 15 in the north and centre of the country. In just three days, 2024 has become the year with the fourth-largest area burned in the last decade.

Between Sunday and late Tuesday afternoon, more than 71,000 hectares burned in Portugal, compared to 22,500 hectares previously, including the 5,000 hectares of the Madeira fires. In just three days, what was supposed to be a quiet year in terms of burned areas has become the fourth-worst year of the last decade. The figures are published by *Público* , but the newspaper warns that they are based on satellite images and

therefore may be excessive. But even if we do not take into account 15 per cent of the burned area, this year's figures are only exceeded by those of 2016, 2017 and 2022.

In the north and centre of the country, the fires have spread due to weather conditions considered to be the most severe, particularly the easterly wind with strong gusts. On Wednesday, the National Emergency and Civil Protection Authority (INEM) counted five deaths and 118 injured, including ten in serious condition, stressing that the number of deaths was transmitted to it by the INEM and does not include the two civilians who died of a sudden illness. The maximum risk of fire affected 50 municipalities on Wednesday and the government decided to extend the state of alert until Thursday.

More than 100 active fires

On Wednesday morning, there were more than 100 active fires, with restarts and wind changes during the night, which made the situation in Águeda "uncontrollable" and approached urban centres. The firefighters who fought the Albergaria a-Velha fire, which has entered the resolution phase, are also fighting these fires. During the night, the Castro Daire fire progressed towards Arouca, reaching the Paiva footbridges and confining several villages, after people with reduced mobility had been evacuated. In Covilhã, the night was spent fighting a fire in a pine forest area in Gibraltar that had escaped the Serra da Estrela fire two years ago.

Very complicated traffic

Several fires are also raging in the Porto district and some villages have evacuated their inhabitants. In Mangualde and São Pedro do Sul, it is reported that homes and businesses have been destroyed by fire. By late morning, Civil Protection reported 142 fires, 58 of which were in the final stages, with

more than 5,500 agents on the ground, accompanied by 1,700 land resources and 37 air resources.

At the same time, the government reported that rail traffic on the Douro line between Marco de Canaveses and Régua and on the Vouga line had been interrupted, with several trains suspended. The A43 motorway between Gondomar and the A41 and the A41 between Medas and Aguiar de Sousa were also closed on Wednesday morning, as was the A25 between Albergaria and Reigoso (Viseu), as well as several national roads.

Bloco de Esquerda

Monday 27th September 2024

Republished from International Viewpoint:
<https://internationalviewpoint.org/spip.php?article8682>

Bloco de Esquerda is a radical left political party in Portugal formed in 2000 as a coalition of the formerly Maoist UDP; Política XXI, a current that had left the Communist Party; and the PSR, Portuguese section of the Fourth International. Today it is a recognised political party with elected representatives in the national and European parliaments.

**On-Line Event: Ecosocialism
or Extinction? An
Introduction to Ecosocialism**

Building Internationalism from Below in a Multi-Polar World – afternoon school 27 April 2024 Glasgow

A day conference organised by the [Republican Socialist Platform](#) on 2pm-5pm , Saturday 27th April 2024, [Renfield Centre, 260 Bath Street, Glasgow G2 4JP](#)

Building Internationalism from Below in a Multi-Polar World.

Book here:
<https://www.eventbrite.co.uk/e/building-internationalism-from-below-in-a-multipolar-world-tickets-858894254837>

Please note this event was rescheduled from 23 March due to speaker illness

Hear from Prof Gilbert Achcar, author of ‘The New Cold War’, and speakers from the Palestinian, Kurdish and Ukrainian solidarity movements.

The [Republican Socialist Platform](#) invites friends to discuss ‘Building Internationalism from Below in a Multipolar World’ in Glasgow on **Saturday 27th April 2024, 2pm-5pm.**

Our main speaker is **Professor Gilbert Achcar**, professor of development studies and international relations at the School of Oriental and African Studies (SOAS), University of London.

His many books, published in a total of 15 languages, include:

- *The Clash of Barbarisms: The Making of the New World Disorder* (2002, 2006);
- *Perilous Power: The Middle East and U.S. Foreign Policy*, co-authored with Noam Chomsky (2007, 2008);
- *The Arabs and the Holocaust: The Arab-Israeli War of Narratives* (2010);
- *Marxism, Orientalism, Cosmopolitanism* (2013);
- *The People Want: A Radical Exploration of the Arab Uprising* (2013); and
- *Morbid Symptoms: Relapse in the Arab Uprising* (2016).

Most recently, Professor Achcar is the author of [*The New Cold War: The US, Russia and China – From Kosovo to Ukraine*](#), which was published in 2023.

On the day, we will also be joined by speakers from the Palestinian, Kurdish and Ukrainian solidarity movements to provide an update on the current state of these struggles and what we can do to support them.

This event is free to attend, but we welcome donations to help us cover the costs of arranging speakers and the venue.

This public event will be governed by the RSP's [comradely conduct and care](#) policy.

To join the Republican Socialist Platform,

visit: <https://join.republicansocialists.scot/>



**Republican
Socialists**

[Heckle](#) is an Online Scottish publication overseen by a seven-person editorial board elected by members of the [Republican Socialist Platform](#).

