IVP608 - September 2025

“A left-wing, grassroots orientation allows you to score points in times of polarization”

30 September 2025, by Antoine Larrache, Violetta Bock

How do you see the situation in Germany, especially the repercussions of the economic crisis?

The defining feature of the situation in Germany is the decline of the "old West." This applies both to its military and geopolitical role in the US-European alliance and to the economic basis of that alliance: the era when Germany occupied a leading position in European industry and played a dominant role in the global economy seems to be over for the time being, and there is currently no indication that this evolution could be halted or even reversed.

For years, production chains and growth have been increasingly shifting to Asia, particularly to China and India. In Germany, this development is not sufficiently understood, neither by the current government nor by large sections of the social left and the trade union movement, nor does it constitute the basis for considering future actions.

This is a dramatic situation, because everything we are witnessing today is taking place under the banner of these economic changes, in the context of a rapidly progressing climate catastrophe, with all its social and political consequences.

For the working classes, this translates into a strategic vacuum.

The climate catastrophe is now recognized as a reality, but serious reflection on its consequences is being supplanted by the social and economic crises that are developing alongside it. In truth, society should be investing in future projects that strengthen civil protection and social infrastructure, that enable people to cushion the consequences of the climate catastrophe, and at the same time prevent the continued destruction of our living conditions. Instead, war, geopolitical competition, and the defence of national industrial sites are taking centre stage. Investments are being made for war, exploitation, and plunder—in other words, indebtedness and social dismantling are being made to serve the military-industrial complex and everything that guarantees control over natural resources at the international level. This is where the profits and expectations of the ruling classes lie.

This significantly increases the pressure on the working classes, both materially and ideologically: on the one hand, through nationalist propaganda and the desire to widely militarize industry and society – in Germany, this is always done on the theme of "the Russians are coming" –, on the other hand, through the deindustrialization of the country, which destroys jobs and living conditions.

Germany, while remaining a central power in the EU, does not have the global banking power of Great Britain, the military supremacy of the United States, or even the dominant economic position of China. Even in the upper echelons of the trade unions, there are leaders who hope that, on balance, militarization will benefit them and that Germany will manage to regain ground in the race for competitiveness, with their help if necessary.

This also hinders daily struggles. As long as there is no strong hope for a better future, any movement will remain hampered. This is the task facing today’s left.

Violetta Bock – Organizing climate justice – in Parliament and in the streets.

What role does the far right play in this situation?

The AfD is a heterogeneous collection of right-wing currents. It initially criticized the European Union and

mobilized the so-called middle class, although its electoral base was from the outset largely made up of working people who felt let down by the political system.

Today, the spectrum ranges from conservative-nationalists and advocates of drastic economic liberalism to outright fascists who manage to present themselves as a radical opposition; they have, however, been trying for a long time to offer their services to the CDU as a government partner.

Through ongoing polarization, they have firmly entrenched their racist agenda within society, and their demands – such as the dismantling of the right to asylum – have been taken up by other parties and translated into government measures.

We are currently witnessing a shift to the right across the entire political spectrum (with the exception of the Left Party), which is making life more difficult every day for migrants, workers, LGBTQ+ people and all socially vulnerable people.

The fear of the emergence of a mass fascist movement is prompting a search for a central response within the framework of the broadest possible alliances, extending up to the CDU/CSU, the SPD and the Greens, in order to block the AfD at all levels. There is currently no mass fascist movement in Germany.

But we must expect that the CDU, the SPD, and even the Greens will be able to find political common ground with the AfD – in practice, this already exists. This is precisely what we must oppose…

In recent months, we have witnessed not only a shift to the right, but also a polarization, visible particularly in the growth of the Die Linke party. A growing segment of the younger generation is seeking more radical responses and is ready to take action. Responses to the shift to the right must therefore not focus on alliances against the AfD but must also put forward a socialist perspective as an alternative to militarization, nationalism, and social disintegration.

How are the unions reacting?

We regularly face vicious attacks on the right to strike and trade union rights. The current government, for example, openly attacks the eight-hour working day. In the 2000s, German trade unions missed the opportunity to shed their illusions in social democracy. Admittedly, there are now a considerable number of union officials who are firmly on the left, but at the same time, there are far fewer working-class leaders in the workplaces. This is a development that was emerging in the 1980s. At the same time, the social conflicts that focus general attention are on the decline, after a brief resurgence at the end of the last decade and the beginning of this one.

We are not currently seeing any major, high-profile struggles like those that took place a few years ago at Amazon, the postal service, hospitals and the civil service. Of course, there are always important initiatives and campaigns that give us hope and that we must support with all our might. To do this, so-called organizing methods [1] are increasingly being implemented. But they remain closely linked to the frameworks, decisions and perspectives set by the central trade union apparatuses.

We are also witnessing the emergence of right-wing works councils, particularly in small and medium-sized enterprises, and the creation of competing right-wing unions. Addressing this requires militant trade-union work, because they attack where it hurts: where works councils and commissions responsible for negotiating collective agreements are constantly making compromises that ultimately do not reflect the wishes of their colleagues.

A fundamental task remains to form core groups within workplaces that are dedicated to highlighting class contradictions and developing a social perspective. But without a socialist organization capable of presenting what the next step should be and also of bringing it to a successful conclusion, we will remain stuck in the stage of defensive struggles. This is exactly what we are currently experiencing: many small struggles, but practically none that manage to impose themselves in the social debate. In the service sector, efforts have been made to form citizen coalitions for this purpose, for example by cooperating with the movement for energy transition in transport during wage negotiations on public transport.

Our comrades in the workplaces are striving to transform, democratize, and radicalize trade union work, but often also simply to reorganize it. The Left Party can be of great help in this regard, but not if we lock ourselves into workplace cells that attempt to implement our party politics outside of this trade union work.

What form does the policy of social democracy take?

In times of crisis, the SPD has always been unable to develop an independent policy in the interests of the working classes, because for it, its success is inseparable from that of capital. Nothing has changed in this regard.

And as it has largely lost its roots in the working class, it is making less and less of a preteens of pursuing class policies. It is gradually disintegrating.

In my opinion, the role of the Greens is more interesting. Abroad, people often underestimate the importance the Greens have or have had in German society – they recently fell behind Die Linke in the polls. They have long represented a hope for renewal: ecological, progressive, pacifist, even if, in reality, they have always bowed to the interests of capital and reaction and led Germany into its first wars since the Second World War.

Today, they are at the centre of society, but they have become the party of "human racism," which keeps borders open for the benefit of capital, and that of "humanitarian war." They

have become an important party, especially among the middle class, but the betrayal of their own origins is, in my opinion, already ancient history.

Those who vote for the Greens now know quite clearly what they will receive in return: a policy in favour of capital, with electric cars and organic coffee pods.

What policy do you think Merz will pursue?

It's not yet determined. The CDU—and with it the SPD, its coalition partner—faces a dilemma. They are resorting to the well-worn standard capitalist recipe: draconian social cuts, the militarization of society, closing the EU's borders to refugees , and massive investments in European capital. They hope to create new room for redistribution through a new "economic miracle."

But there are good reasons to believe that this time, in the context of the general economic crisis, they will not be able to get out of it with a cornucopia of euros – the economic crisis is in fact accompanied by profound international upheavals in modern modes of production, alongside an imperialist reorganization of the relationships of forces. The rearmament programme alone will not be able to change the situation – it will only increase and spread the risk of war.

At present, we see the CDU/CSU and the SPD increasingly aligning themselves with the racist and nationalist slogans of the AfD . Why then would it not be possible for Merz to one day dare to take the plunge and form a minority government supported by the AfD ? This would be disastrous for the people of Germany, but it is a realistic scenario.

The bourgeois media and major industrial groups are pushing with all their might to bring about a conservative-style government. They are constantly talking about crises within the coalition, turning every disagreement into a catastrophe, and defending a concept of democracy according to which governments must be able to "force things through" without challenge or discussion, arguing that this is simply a necessity imposed by this crisis.

This is precisely where we socialists can sharpen our profile: we are democrats. We take diversity of opinion and open conflict seriously, because we assume that collective solutions can only emerge from confrontation and broad participation. This is a completely different conception of democracy from that of the authoritarian "forcing through" of the bourgeois centre.

Can you talk to us about Die Linke? What is its general political orientation? What has been the impact of the massive influx of young people?

To fully understand Die Linke, one must know its history. Initially, the party was the result of the merger of two factions: the successor organization to the former state party in the East, the PDS, and the Electoral Alternative for Work and Social Justice (WASG), which emerged in western Germany.

The WASG emerged in the mid-2000s as a reaction to the Schröder government's radical offensive against social gains, the so-called "Hartz reforms." It was fuelled by disillusioned members of the SPD, but also by elements from the more radical left, many of whom had a Marxist orientation.

From the very beginning, it was clear that Die Linke was not just another political party, but rather the product of the coming together of different experiences and traditions, both politically and between East and West. Its appearance has changed several times throughout its history, and it will continue to evolve in the future. Because its success has always been and always will be linked to its ability to adapt to new social dynamics.

Today, Die Linke – and this is where a misunderstanding often arises – is less a party in the classical sense of the term than a mass organization, a mass rallying point.

What do I mean by that? It certainly defines political orientations, but does not impose that they be followed uniformly, preferring to put them up for discussion within the movements. It brings together both pragmatic left-wing social democrats and revolutionary socialists, without this generally leading to divisions, exclusions, or lack of solidarity. Everyone is aware that it is a common project that must be able to accommodate different currents. Its central objective is the defence of social gains, associated with the debate and the struggle for a socialist perspective, taking into account diverse experiences, both from the point of view of the history of East and West Germany and that of the different movements.

The political orientation of Die Linke is therefore difficult to summarize in a single sentence, and this is precisely where many observers stumble. They want definitive, unambiguous words, but that's not how this party operates. Its orientation is determined by the people who are active in it.

This is one of its strengths: those who get involved can influence how the party's work evolves. The line followed on central issues is constantly evolving and adapts to the movements.

The debate on how to address the rise of the far right is one example: some call for broad alliances against the AfD , including within parliament, while others want to show that there is more room for manoeuvre in capitalism. I, for example, oppose both positions. In reality, the objective room for manoeuvre for reformist strategies in Europe, and particularly in Germany, has shrunk in a context of deindustrialization and

authoritarianism.

We currently find ourselves in a rather comfortable, but difficult, situation: the party has more than doubled its membership, many come directly from social movements, others belong to a generation that is only just beginning to become politicized. The mere fact that these young people have decided to make Die Linke their organization is already significant. They are thus deliberately turning away from the Greens, a party often considered liberal-left, but which, in reality, partly advocates liberal-right policies. This generation has become aware that the entire party system in Germany has shifted to the right and that only Die Linke has remained in its place: as a force of hope, as a pole against exclusion and disenfranchisement.

And what do these young people expect from the party?

I think what they want is not the satisfaction of specific demands, but rather to be part of this opposition that brings hope. In the best case scenario, and this is what we see in many places, they see in Die Linke a space where they can act effectively in politics. What has also made it possible to get to this point is the fact that since Sahra Wagenknecht's departure, the party has managed to get away from public quarrels, that it has managed to find a central theme with the question of rents and that with the door-to-door campaigns it is possible to start acting at a basic level and, outside of small, closed circles, to establish contact with people on the basis of what they experience on a daily basis.

We have a historic opportunity here: the MPs and party officials are in the position they are today because they chose to embark on this project at a time when it seemed impossible to make a career in politics this way. As recently as last autumn, Die Linke was considered finished. Everyone who stood for election did so with the deep conviction that a left-wing alternative was needed. This is precisely what we can take advantage of today to build the future.

Regarding the Palestine solidarity movement: is there a new dynamic, particularly in working-class and immigrant neighbourhoods?

The Palestinian solidarity movement is currently one of the largest movements in Germany. It is primarily led by immigrants . As in many countries, repression is severe and serves to further fuel racism. It is therefore always important to distinguish between "published" opinion and public opinion. Among the population as a whole, there is a majority against arms deliveries from Germany, but this is not yet evident on the streets.

You will no longer be able to reach young people, but also many workers and certain sections of the population as a whole, if you broadly characterize solidarity with Palestine as a "problem" or "anti-Semitic." This view has long permeated the social left, not least because of Germany's terrible history.

Of course, it remains true that the more people are tied to state institutions in their daily lives—whether through their work or in their private lives—the more the old pressure of "reason of state" is felt. This remains an obstacle.

But this does not pose a major problem for a socialist strategy. Because it is above all to those who are not integrated into this system, but who suffer from it, that we are addressing ourselves. And this is precisely where solidarity with Palestine, despite all the attacks, takes on a new dynamic.

How is the struggle against repression going? Can it be overcome? Can the movement become stronger than the repression?

Of course, repression has an effect, particularly on those who work or act closest to the state or who are in some way dependent on state institutions. In some places, repression is becoming apparent, for example, when Jewish women are banned from speaking out publicly because they clearly oppose Israeli policies, or when courts condemn brutal police interventions after the event and later lift bans on certain slogans. Within the solidarity movement, we regularly see new advances as new sectors of the population join the movement and significant breakthroughs are made.

The fact that more and more organizations can no longer turn a blind eye has also contributed to this. Those who have once managed to overcome their fear are all the more determined. The state's attitude is shaking many people's fundamental trust in the system. Within the solidarity movement, there is still a wide range of positions, from an emphasis on humanitarian demands to anti-Zionist positions.

The major problem in Germany at the moment is quite different: the fight against depression and the feeling that there is no way out. The federal government has long stubbornly refused to decide on anything that might put pressure on Israel. So we are against the state, but the state is not budging. The German "reason of state" hovers over everything and permeates the entire foreign policy.

Many activists therefore feel as if they are tilting at windmills. For those who have been campaigning in solidarity with Palestine for decades, this period is dominated by the horror of what is

happening in Gaza, the West Bank, and throughout the region.

And at the same time, this phase marks a major step forward: a new generation of activists and party members has come to the forefront, no longer held captive by the idea that any criticism of Israel is inherently anti-Semitic. This progress may not have an immediate impact, but it creates a solid foundation from which we can build a more radical internationalist perspective in the years to come.

How do you see your role as a Member of Parliament in this situation?

I always approach my role as a Member of Parliament with the question of the relationship between Parliament, movement and party in mind.

Fortunately, in recent years, there have been many debates and clear progress within Die Linke. We have learned lessons about how this relationship should be structured and have introduced precise rules, for example, for financial payments or the regular holding of social consultations. It is very clear that the MPs I work with today did not run for office out of professional ambition, but out of conviction. Of course, there remains an old way of functioning within the party, in which MPs tended to organize themselves into small working groups. Such tendencies regularly resurface for structural reasons. But we have begun to break this logic. And I think we are on the right track, even if we are only at the beginning.

Concretely, I distinguish three aspects in my work.

First, we must ensure that movements can benefit from existing resources. I'm not talking primarily about money, but rather about information, networks, and opportunities to be heard. This is often reduced to simple financial support. But what is crucial is providing movements with analyses, theses, evaluations, impressions, and a good understanding of the opponent. These are resources that we have at our disposal as MPs .

Second, it's about being a role model. We shouldn't attach to this role the goal of one day becoming part of the ruling bloc of the powerful and the government. As MPs , we must show that we don't disappear as soon as we're in the Bundestag. In Kassel, especially in the Rothenditmold district, I founded a community centre with many comrades. After my election, many wondered if I was now "gone."

But for me, one thing was clear: work in parliament and local roots must not be contradictory [2]. That is why I continue to do social counselling, that is why I support the tenants' movement – which, in this crisis situation, has become, and this is no coincidence, a central area of activity for the entire party. In this way, we are proving that it is possible to work within the bourgeois parliament without becoming "parliamentarians."

Third: We must use the parliamentary platform in a landmark way. In these times of war and climate catastrophe, it is important to give the struggle for climate justice and against imperialist interests the greatest possible visibility. This is the great task before us, but it must not be dissociated from the class struggle as it is actually unfolding. On the contrary, it is an extension of it. I would be happy if, in two or three years, precisely these issues—organizing work, grassroots work, and activity toward and with the working class—formed the basis of our internal party debates. And I am confident in our ability to contribute to this. For we have already shown that an orientation anchored to the left and to the grassroots is not a caricature but actually allows us to score points in times of polarization.

1 September 2025

Footnotes

[1] Violetta Bock is the German translator of the landmark book *The Seven Components of Transformative Organizing Theory* by Eric Mann, director of the Labor/Community Strategy Center in Los Angeles

[2] Violetta Bocka has written, in collaboration with our comrade Thomas Goes, *Ein unanständiges Angebot ? With linkem Populismus against Eliten and Rechte* (*An Indecent Proposal? Left-Wing Populism Against the Elites and the Right*, 2017.). In it, they advocate a "socialism for ordinary people" and "the organization of a counter-power in order to create laboratories of hope and a hinterland of solidarity." They also describe Sahra Wagenknecht as a "failed populist".

Trump Increases Repression Against Political Enemies and the Left

29 September 2025, by Dan La Botz

Trump's number one enemy is James B. Comey, former head of the FBI appointed by former president Barack Obama, who had been in charge of investigations of candidate Trump's campaign and possible coordination with Russian interference in the U.S. election. Comey's investigation did not find evidence of Trump colluding with

Russia, but left his possible obstruction of justice an open question. Trump fired Comey in 2017, but has been out to get him ever since. When a U.S. Justice Department attorney said he couldn't find a legal basis to charge Comey, Trump fired him and replaced him with one of his personal attorneys who had been on the White House staff, and just days before the statute of limitations ran out, she indicated Comey for making a false statement to Congress, and obstructing a congressional proceeding, with a possible sentence of ten years in prison. Comey says he is innocent and welcomes a trial.

The Justice Department is also going after George Soros, a billionaire donor to the Democratic Party who also funds the Open Society Foundations (OSF). Trump for some time has demanded that Soros be thrown in jail. An internal memo says that Soros may be charged with crimes ranging from arson to material support for terrorism. The OSF, to which Soros has given billions, was originally founded to help Soviet Eastern Bloc countries achieve a democratic and capitalist society. But it also gives millions to civil rights and social justice NGOs in the United States, such as the Organization for Black Struggle. The rightwing Conservative Research Center accuses OSF of funding Al-Haq, a Palestinian human rights group that Israel designated as a front for a terrorist organization in 2022. OSF and other human rights organizations dismissed Israel's claim as an attempt to silence critics. There has not yet been an indictment of Soros.

Trump is also going after leftwing activists who are protesting against the Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) raids on immigrant communities and workplaces. In Portland, Oregon, a couple of dozen protestors show up regularly at an ICE facility to protest day and night, but after midnight federal agents come out of the building to confront protestors, resulting in skirmishes, but no serious violence. But now Trump is sending in the National Guard, as he has already done in Los Angeles and Washington, D.C., now supposedly to stop Antifa.

But both Democratic Party Governor Tina Kotek and Mayor Keith Wilson say "there is no rebellion," which is the only legal justification for sending in the guard. Kotek said, "There is no national security threat in Portland. Our communities are safe and calm." Adding that "any deployment would be an abuse of power." Portland is known for its militant demonstrations and now there will surely be more protests against ICE and Trump.

The fight for democracy in America is on.

28 September 2025

II Latin American and Caribbean Ecosocialist Meeting: Free Territories and Convergence for Action

28 September 2025, by Vanessa Dourado

We have seen that many of these responses come from projects that rely on war as a strategy, whether commercial—as we have seen since Donald Trump became president of the United States—or genocidal, as is the case with Gaza and the continued "desert campaign" project, which has its versions in different parts of the world. In all these projects, the accumulation of capital and colonialism are the conditions that make their success possible. The current war for resources and the maintenance of global hegemony has generated a global governance crisis that raises new questions and challenges. It is necessary to generate new diagnoses for this scenario, which is experiencing a more pronounced dynamic of change.

Faced with the challenge of conceiving, creating, and executing an alternative plan to the imposed project of death, marked by a subjective change that seems to accompany the Cannibal Capitalism that Fraser characterised, the International Ecosocialist Meetings play a fundamental role. If we assume that there is no future without a present and that today's task is to create the conditions for a livable world, the proposal for an Ecosocialist Transition Program—which seeks to build an ecosocial solution to the profound environmental crisis that threatens the continuity of life forms as we know them on Earth—is a tool that allows us to imagine a future in the face of seemingly insoluble crises.

The need to move beyond an observer's diagnosis is fundamental to thinking of ourselves as actors of transformation at a time when our worldview has been significantly attacked. In this sense, there is a before and after Gaza: the ecosocialist struggle is the struggle for life. Therefore, anyone considering an ecosocial transition program with an anti-capitalist horizon cannot ignore this dimension. Genocide and ecocide have always gone hand in hand: one is the condition for the possibility of the other and vice versa.

The commitment to an affective shift, necessary for thinking and acting in these cruel times, as Rita Segato suggests, places eco-territorialised solidarity, the internationalism of peoples, and the conception of work based on care at the center of the debate, without losing sight of urban and union struggles and the disputes for better living conditions for the

working class, because resistance in these days also means knowing how to confront the precariousness of life in all its aspects.

Second Latin American and Caribbean Ecosocialist Meeting

It is in this profoundly challenging context that the Second Latin American and Caribbean Ecosocialist Meeting will take place. To be held in Belém, Brazil, on the occasion of COP30 this is, symbolically, a response to and a rejection of the idea that the field of economics can justify or plan what we do as a society. We know that the solution to environmental collapse, at the hands of those who caused it, is illogical, contradictory, and based on false solutions and unattainable goals, as Kim Robinson so aptly illustrated in her book, The Ministry of the Future.

The criticism is old, yet it is especially necessary. Despite the fact that COP30 is being held in one of the most important countries for devising strategies to enable the advancement of eco-territorial struggles, the Brazilian government has been demonstrating a lack of commitment to the groups in struggle and a rapprochement with green colonialist projects. This is evidenced by the approval of the so-called Devastation Bill (PL da devastação, in Portuguese) —albeit with vetoes—, the announcement of the end of negotiations, with possible ratification, of the Free Trade Agreement between the European Union and Mercosur and Lula's enthusiastic stance on the Tropical Forest Fund for All Seasons (TFFF, for its acronym in English), which should be one of the main projects defended by the Brazilian government during COP30, and which is, as Mary Louise Malig and Pablo Solón explain in this article, an ambitious green capitalist project that seeks to correct supposed "market failures."

Along the same lines, it is worrying that the spaces critical to COP30 are proposing a direct connection with governments. The need to create autonomous spaces, such as the Counter-Summits or People's Summits, from a perspective consistent with anti-systemic struggles, is essential and should be non-negotiable. Government interference in civil society's self-organisation processes weakens and undermines the possibility of proposing grassroots alternatives.

Within the framework of alternative approaches and autonomous spaces for debate, the Second Ecosocialist Meeting will take place from November 8th to 11th. These dates were carefully chosen so as not to interfere with the activities of the People's Summit, which will take place from November 12th to 16th, nor with the Earth Charter initiative, scheduled for November 7th to 8th.

Strategically, the second meeting—which is a continuation of the debates held in Buenos Aires in 2024 and also builds on the five previous meetings held in Switzerland, Spain, the Basque Country, and Portugal—seeks the convergence of ecosocialist perspectives and other anti-capitalist alternatives that have emerged in recent decades, with the aim of generating opportunities for concrete, coordinated actions to build a common horizon. To this end, the central points of the proposals of various groups that have been thinking about and building alternatives to the capitalist system's forms of production, reproduction, consumption, distribution, organisation, and worldview and civilisation will be debated.

This will be the first meeting to be held in the Amazon region and seeks to bring together the voices of groups fighting for the demarcation of their ancestral lands and for the preservation of forests against deforestation and the environmental racism that affects racialised peoples. Additionally it will provide a critical assessment of the experiences of plurinational states and sharing the projects for territories free of fossil fuels and mining that are taking place in different parts of Latin America.

The meeting also offers in-depth and critical debate about proposed transitions without the participation of populations affected by extractivism and a characterisation of imperialism in the current political context. Projects such as the BRICS and China's repositioning raise questions about the opportunities and threats facing the territories of the Global South. Wars, militarisation, debt, and trade and investment agreements emerge as the familiar—albeit more violent since the rise of the neo-fascist right—strategy of subordination, dependence, and control of territories, threatening the sovereignty of countries.

Continuing the debate present at all previous meetings, one of the central themes will be eco-unionism and the world of work, as well as ecofeminism and care economies from an eco-territorial perspective. Within the discussion on ecosocialist strategy, tactics toward ecosocialism, ecosocialism and power, dialogues between the North and South on the methods and content of discussion, positioning regarding the COP, among other debates such as degrowth, rights of nature, urban peripheries and urban populations, and ecosocialist democracy will be discussed.

Despite the enormous challenge of constructing this process, due primarily to the logistics and high accommodation costs in Belém, the Meeting has already confirmed its venue and has a local committee in place to organise the event's logistics and provide support, including accommodation options, for those attending the meeting.

Registration for the event will open soon, but it is mandatory, as we have a capacity of only 350 people. The event, in keeping with its principle of autonomy, is fully funded by the organisations and individuals participating in the event, so we cannot guarantee funding for tickets and/or transportation.

Greater participation from groups and individuals from Brazil's territories is expected; therefore, if necessary, the participation of delegations by country may be limited, with the goal of

ensuring the discussions are as inclusive and diverse as possible.

Free territories and convergence for action are the goals of this meeting, bringing proposals, questions, and debates to the 7th International Ecosocialist Meeting, which will take place in Brussels in the first half of 2026.

Information about the Meetings' organisation process can be found on the inter.ecosoc Instagram page. Those who wish to sign the call can do so by filling out this form.

Translated for International Viewpoint by David Fagan.

The Nepalese paroxysmal crisis and its regional context

27 September 2025, by Pierre Rousset

The Nepalese crisis appears to be a distant replica of the social earthquake that had Indonesia at its epicentre. "Civil society" is very active in this country, using social media to stay informed about the actions undertaken in the immense archipelago (280 million inhabitants). At the end of August, parliamentarians danced after granting themselves a very substantial housing allowance. The video of this indecent spectacle went viral. It was the spark that ignited the anti-corruption movement in the capital, Jakarta.

The death of a motorcycle delivery driver, Affan Kurniawan , 21, who was hit by a police armoured vehicle, further boosted the protests, which spread to more than a hundred urban centres. Government buildings and the homes of some leading politicians bearing the responsibility for the policy of repression were set on fire. The revolt covered a wide range of issues, such as regional inequality, poverty, budget cuts in health and education, and the risk of militarization: President Prabowo Subianto is a general with a long history of repression who is currently granting new powers to the army. The repression has been severe: deaths, disappearances, numerous injuries, incarcerations... The regime has taken some temporizing measures in the face of popular anger, but it is currently hardening its stance and denouncing the protesters as "traitors to the nation."

In Nepal, it was the ban on social media, such as WhatsApp and Messenger, that sparked a widespread social explosion, fuelled by the spiral of repression and radicalization. Driven out by poverty and the lack of prospects for young people, a large number of Nepalese men and women (some 7.5 per cent of the population) have emigrated. These social media platforms are essential for keeping loved ones in touch and for ensuring that money sent by expatriates reaches families back home. Furthermore, many small and medium-sized businesses also depend on them. Their use is therefore vital for the population, a fact that the government could not fail to be aware of. To nip the nascent protest in the bud, the so-called security forces opened fire, killing at least 19 people (including schoolchildren walking to class in uniform). In two days, September 8 and 9, the country descended into paroxysmal violence. Many buildings were set ablaze, including hotels, and a minister's wife was burned to death. The presidential palace, residences of prominent figures, Parliament, and the Singha Palace were among the targets. Durbar (a complex where many government departments and most ministries operated), the Kathmandu High Court and the Supreme Court went up in flames (along with their archives, in a country where they have not been digitized). The army declared a curfew, imposing its control.

Nepal is no longer governed by royalty or a general, but by a coalition led by... communist parties. In 2006-2008, an uprising had put an end to the constitutional monarchy (the absolute monarchy had been overthrown in 1990), and then established a republic – and the royal palace was converted into a museum. After renouncing armed struggle, various communist parties, with Maoist references, succeeded one another in government, forming shifting coalitions, with or without the Congress Party. KP Oli, Prime Minister at the time of the riots, was thus labelled "communist" (he distinguished himself in 2020 by attempting to dissolve Parliament). Factionalism prevented the stabilization of a government. In the absence of a policy of radical reforms capable of keeping popular momentum alive, the ruling apparatus of the various Nepalese communist parties became integrated into the dominant oligarchy. A fairly classic co-optation process, justified in Nepal by a programme affirming the need for an alliance with the "national bourgeoisie." The political crisis became evident when the communist parties lost the municipal elections in Kathmandu (the capital) in 2022, to an independent candidate, Balen Shah (a rapper and structural engineer turned politician).

Nepal has a population of some 30 million. It is known as a Himalayan state (it has eight of the ten highest mountains in the world), but part of the population resides in the Ganges Valley and has traditionally been neglected by the central government. It is a country of great complexity, multi-ethnic, polyglot (the official language is Nepali), multi-religious, multi-cultural , comprising many castes. It is backed by China and borders India. The Himalayan range is the scene of border tensions. Global warming and melting glaciers are

creating temporary lakes that threaten to devastate the valleys, and water control is also becoming a major geopolitical issue here. The regime has attempted to negotiate a balance in its relations with its two large neighbours, China and India, without much success. The internal opposition, like the monarchists, may seek allies in South Asia. Hindu supremacists, linked to Indian Prime Minister Narendra Modi, can claim to defend the Hindu populations of the lowlands, who are effectively discriminated against.

The appointment of lawyer Sushila Karki as interim Prime Minister has helped restore calm, even though the military maintains de facto power. She enjoys a reputation for honesty that dates back to her time as a member of the Supreme Court. However, regime crises are occurring in many countries in the region (and elsewhere in the world!): the overthrow of Rajapaksa in Sri Lanka in 2022, the overthrow of Sheikh Hasina in Bangladesh in 2024, a popular revolt this year in Indonesia, and a massive anti-corruption mobilization underway in the Philippines.

Solidarity and its difficulties

The events in Nepal were closely followed throughout the region. Progressive movements were quick to demonstrate their solidarity with the Nepalese youth and working classes. This was particularly the case with the NPA's sister organizations in Asia, which initiated calls to this effect [1]. However, organizing this solidarity encountered several difficulties:

• The historical links woven in the past with the Nepalese progressive movements often concerned the communist parties and their trade union or peasant organizations, which, upon taking power, were unfortunately taken prisoners by it.

• The "figures" representing the youth mobilized against corruption, the so-called "Generation Z", were, by their own admission, completely overwhelmed during two days of riots, the scale and nature of the most extreme violence being unjustifiable. Here, unfortunately, we can still see the political and organizational weaknesses of " Gen Z" or Nepalese "civil society".

• Many unknowns remain regarding what happened on September 8 and 9. The "events" express above all the degree of socio-economic and democratic crisis that prevailed in the country. A revolt of this magnitude is not the product of a "foreign conspiracy." However, national (monarchists, etc.) and international (Hindu supremacists, state, etc.) actors could have fan the flames.

• It seems that what is on the agenda is the general reconstitution of a political and social left, a process which, it seems to me, can only be long and in which the progressive forces of the region are best placed to help.

Nepal, however, is making its way onto our own international agenda: an issue to follow, hopefully for the better.

24 September 2025

Translated by **International Viewpoint** from ESSF.

Footnotes

[1] https://www.europe-solidaire.org/spip.php?article76246

Flotilla approaches Gaza

26 September 2025, by Mariana Mortágua, Paul Murphy

"Compared to the horror in Gaza, it's nothing"

Paul Murphy (Ireland): There's a genocide, you know about it, you can see it, you know that 60,000 people were killed. As was the case in Ireland, there is an organized famine. So, we have a duty to do something and put pressure on our own governments to act accordingly.

All those who participate in the flotilla run the risk of being arrested by the Israeli army and detained. We can't know what will happen. It is possible that the boats will be sabotaged in the port and that they will not be able to leave, there is the possibility of an attack at sea – we saw drone attacks a few months ago.

And there is the possibility of being kidnapped in international waters, being taken to Israel and being detained there. This is what happened most of the time. There is therefore a personal risk in this action. But compared to the horror that people in Gaza are experiencing, this is nothing, absolutely nothing.

"Our conscience is now in Gaza"

Mariana Mortágua (Portugal): We are on our way, and I would like to ask you something. This is your third attempt to go to Gaza. I'd like to know why you keep trying?

Greta Thunberg: We promised the Palestinians that we would continue to do everything in our power to liberate Palestine. Giving up is simply not an option. When we are confronted with oppression, genocide, war crimes that happen every day, it is our duty to stand up and act.

And we will come back until we have reached our goal. What we are doing now is responding to the call of the Palestinians to end the complicity of our states, acting in solidarity with them and using all the means at our disposal, such as these boats, or even our own bodies to try to get there.

You are known for your activism on the environment. Why does a person from Sweden or Europe, who has spent their life doing something else, think it's important to be here?

I have not changed my orientation in my activism. I always act in accordance with the same values. I always act according to the principles of justice, sustainability and well-being for humans, the planet and our ecosystems. For me, these principles are extremely interconnected. We cannot have climate or environmental justice if people are being bombed and starving. We cannot care about ecosystems if entire countries are destroyed and entire peoples die of hunger.

In short, what is happening in Gaza is at the heart of our morality. Our conscience is now in Gaza. What is happening to the Palestinians is an extension and an attack on humanity as a whole.

I think you have explained very well why we are here. To tell the government of Israel that other people will come after us, until a humanitarian corridor is opened.

War of drones or war of nerves

25 September 2025, by Catherine Samary

Putin is redoubling the manifestations of his capacity to cause harm in order to arrive in a position of strength in possible negotiations. While Moscow may have neither the objective nor the military means to start a war against another country, Russia is increasing its incursions and threats — Poland, Romania, and the Baltic states being the first targets — and the war rhetoric is beginning to target Finland.

In addition to the "exercises" conducted with Belarus, officially deploying 13,000 men (30,000 according to Lithuania) in Operation Zapad (West) 2025, the swarms of drones over Poland or the violation of Romania's airspace aim to test reactions and hide the essential: the deadly daily attacks on Ukraine. In August, Russian forces killed at least 208 civilians in Ukraine and wounded 827 others. And on the night of September 12, the Russian army launched 164 combat drones and an Iskander-M/Kn-23 ballistic missile against Ukraine.

With drones, war at a lower cost

Resistance to the Putin-led invasion has initiated a new war of the 21st century: the drone war. Born of Ukrainian popular inventiveness, and "low cost," it quickly became part of the war economy deployed by the attacked country. Russian military power has since adapted to it, with a completely different scale of means, while NATO is showing great difficulty in dealing with it.

Anti-drone systems are used to protect infrastructure. But if the attack concerns an entire border, the allies are now forced to rely on their fighter jets with on-board missiles, as was the case in Poland, which is costly.

Adapting to changes

Western general staffs could resort to more rudimentary but innovative solutions, deployed today in Ukraine. Called Sky Fortress or Zvook ("sound" in Ukrainian), they are based on the deployment of thousands of acoustic sensors over vast swathes of territory, capable of detecting the noise emitted by drones. The unit cost of these antennas does not exceed a few hundred dollars, according to the Ukrainians. The entire network would thus cost barely more than a single Patriot missile (i.e. 3.4 million euros, for the most recent version). Ukraine also manufactures interceptor drones that are responsible for colliding or exploding near the targeted drones. The EU is investing in an industrial project for a "drone wall" in this spirit. But these technologies are evolving at an unprecedented speed — we're talking about months or weeks, whereas it takes decades to build a high-performance fighter. But above all, the Ukrainians know that their allies are not ready to hunt drones with big machine guns mounted on trucks as their soldiers do in the heart of their national liberation struggle.

18 September 2025

Translated by ***International Viewpoint*** *from* ***l'Anticapitaliste****.*

Finally, a general strike!

24 September 2025, by Gippò Mukendi Ngandu

It is difficult to estimate exact numbers on such an intense day of mobilisation for Palestine. It was a real mass event bringing together at last people from different generations. What is certain is that for years we have not seen such a flood of workers, together with students, pouring into major Italian cities such as Naples, Milan, Bologna, Turin, Brescia, Florence, Palermo, and Catania, as well as in another seventy or so cities.

The general strike called by the grassroots unions was not only successful, but exceeded expectations. Port gates were blocked in Genoa, Livorno, Marghera, Trieste, and Salerno. In Bologna, the ring road was occupied, while in Florence, the highway to Pisa and Livorno was blocked. The marches, on the other hand, multiplied throughout the day, and even in the evening, the streets of numerous cities were filled with new actions and blockades.

In reality, the level of participation is only surprising up to a point. Mobilisations against the genocide in Gaza and in support of the Palestinian people have grown over the last year to involve broad sectors beyond the usual left audience. For example we had seen this in the demonstration on June 21 in Rome. Furthermore, very broadly based campaigns have also grown over the course of the year, despite the fragmentation that has often characterized them.

The Global Sumud Flotilla initiative has undoubtedly acted as a unifying force, broadening participation to large sections of the population, as well as workers. From the end of August and early September, initiatives in support of the “flotilla” multiplied, as did indignation against the policy of genocide and ethnic cleansing. There has been growing outrage against the Meloni government, which continues to maintain commercial and military relations with Israel and is increasingly subservient to the strategic choices of Trump and NATO. Meanwhile, the call for a general strike has grown in many workplaces, and there is a greater willingness to mobilise in solidarity with the Palestinian people.

Grassroots trade unionism, which has always mobilised in support of the Palestinian people and against the genocide in Gaza, has supported called for a general strike, which was already in the minds of many workers. It is no coincidence that many CGIL members went on strike, particularly in schools, but not only there.

The CGIL, the main trade union confederation which is close to the PD (Democratic Party), however, missed an opportunity. Instead of supporting the large mobilisations and the general strike, it decided to plough its own furrow, building its own initiatives completely separate from the ongoing mobilization. Yet, significant associations such as ARCI (cultural) and ANPI (partisan veterans), other associations and NGOs supporting the Global Sumud Flotilla had decided to join the general strike.

Today’s general strike, while it did not bring all of Italy to a standstill, is a key moment for the building of a large movement in support of Gaza and the Palestinian people, as well as against the imperialist, war policies of Western governments and the Italian government. It also raises the question of developing European mobilizations and the need for a European general strike against governments complicit in genocide and advocates of rearmament.

23 September 2025

Translated by ***International Viewpoint*** *from* ***Sinistra Anticaptialista****.*

Hundreds of thousands protest against amnesty for Bolsonaro

24 September 2025, by Ana C. Carvalhaes

The spark that ignited popular anger was the approval by the Chamber of Deputies, the most reactionary congressional body in the country’s history, of an emergency regime for considering amnesty for those involved in the 2022-2023 coup. Added to this was the hasty approval of a Proposed Amendment to the Constitution (PEC) that would prevent investigations and punishments of any kind against parliamentarians during their terms of office – a measure quickly dubbed the "PEC da Bandidagem" (Banditry PEC). The vote on the two measures showed a score of approximately 350 (the sum of the extreme right and the traditional oligarchic right gathered in the "Centrão") against just over 150 votes against.

The reactionary offensive by the right wing in Congress was a response to the conviction of Bolsonaro and seven accomplices from the core of the 2022-2023 coup plot by the Federal Supreme Court on 11 September. Bolsonaro and his accomplices in the authoritarian coup attempt – which included a plan to assassinate Lula, his deputy, Alckmin, and magistrate Alexandre de Moraes – were

sentenced to more than a decade in prison. The trial and verdict were celebrated by democratic governments, social movements, and non-fascist media outlets around the world. But on the domestic front, the neo-fascists did not stand idly by.

Advantage over far-right demonstrations

Extremely careful counting points to the participation of more than 600,000 people in the demonstrations – a number that may increase as protesters in cities in the interior of populous states such as São Paulo and Minas Gerais are counted. Compared to the far-right (Bolsonaro) demonstrations held on 7 September – in defence of amnesty – last Sunday's democratic protests had a clear advantage, both in terms of numbers and quality.

Organized in less than a week by a de facto "coalition" of progressive artists and social movements – trade union federations, independent unions, homeless movements, black movements – after an explosion of indignation on social media, the demonstrations were more widespread nationally. The organisations that called for the protests were then joined by left-wing parties (PSOL, PCdoB, PT, UP), parties that are not so left-wing (PDT, PSB) and many people from the working classes.

The wave of protests marked a turning point in the central political dispute in the country, between the broad left and neo-fascism. Still with an important and threatening mass base, the Brazilian far right had been taking advantage, since August, of an explicit alliance, without any scruples of dignity, with the US government, to forcibly obtain the amnesty with which they intend to free Bolsonaro and his military friends and former civilian subordinates from prison.

At the 7 September rally in São Paulo, the far right even unfurled a 20-metre-long US flag on the avenue. While in the United States, Congressman Eduardo Bolsonaro, the former president's third son , was openly negotiating with the White House to increase sanctions against the country and the judges in the case against the coup plotters, in the Chamber of Deputies last week, the neo-fascists concentrated their efforts on negotiating with the right-wing leader of the house, Hugo Motta, for the rapid passage of the amnesty. In these negotiations, Bolsonaro's supporters took advantage of a common interest with the "Centrão" (protecting themselves from Supreme Court proceedings in cases of misuse of budget funds allocated to deputies*) to give birth to the ill-fated PEC da Bandidagem.

They miscalculated. While the government and its base, other left-wing parties and their electorate were more directly involved in the "conviction of coup plotters versus amnesty" debate, the threat of total impunity for "politicians" outraged and inflamed the anger of broader sections of the population. In a concise assessment on the pre-spring Sunday, one of the leading commentators on the powerful Globo communications network, Andrea Sadi, analysed: "Sunday's demonstrations against the PEC that shields parliamentarians from prosecution and amnesty left the Chamber of Deputies exposed. The demonstrations were a response to the approval of the Shielding PEC and the urgency of the amnesty bill."

First results

In addition to showing that it is possible to "break the bubble" of the democratic camp and attract people to the streets, the protests also had, according to other commentators in the corporate press, two important symbolic achievements in the recent history of this polarised country. With the "help" of Trump's imperialist attack on the country's economy and political sovereignty, the left has regained (at least for now) the Brazilian flag, which had been misused for more than ten years by Bolsonaro's followers. At the same time, it was the first time since 2013 that anti-corruption outrage in the state apparatus was led by the progressive mass movement.

The concrete result of Sunday's journey, beyond the recovery of the spirit of activism, can already be seen in the four right-wing MPs who publicly apologised for voting for the bills, in the apparent regret of at least two of the 12 PT MPs who voted with the right, and in the promises of the Senate president – who must assess the proposals according to the country's laws – that he will hinder the proceedings and, therefore, the approval of the two resolutions.

None of this – except for the renewed spirit to continue fighting – guarantees that Bolsonaro will serve his sentence of more than 27 years in prison, or that the offensive by the corrupt and potentially corrupt will be effectively defeated. If we consider the period since Lula's election against Bolsonaro, the social movement and the left have achieved an important draw in the streets and are in a position to turn the tide. But the struggle will be tough: the far right can count not only on the government of the most powerful country in the world taking consecutive measures against Brazil, the Brazilian government and the judiciary, but also on a not insignificant electoral card up its sleeve – a "tamed Bolsonaro", a neo-fascist with a controlled temper, in the guise of a good administrator, who is the governor of São Paulo, Tarcísio de Freitas.

The situation demands that street mobilisations continue. And it makes the political-ideological dispute and the concrete struggle of the workers of São Paulo against Tarcísio one of the central challenges of the coming months.

23 September 2025

Our eyes on the flotilla, not on the UN

23 September 2025, by Édouard Soulier

The assault on Gaza City is underway. The Israeli army is systematically destroying residential buildings, including iconic towers. Residents are being forced to gather a few belongings and flee within minutes. The aim is to make any return to normal life impossible in a city that is much older than Israel. The rest of the Strip is a giant graveyard. One study estimates that 200,000 people have been killed in Gaza over the past two years, 10% of the population. A massacre. A genocide.

A vain and poisoned recognition

Yet the UN General Assembly has endorsed the Franco-Saudi resolution on 'recognition of the State of Palestine', which also calls for an immediate ceasefire and access to humanitarian aid in Gaza. Among the countries that voted against it are, unsurprisingly, the United States, Israel, Argentina and Hungary. Despite appearances, this resolution actually marks a setback for Palestinian rights. It makes no mention of genocide or war crimes and is obviously not binding. Worse still, according to the analysis of the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs:

"… thanks to major commitments made by the Palestinian Authority and Arab countries for peace and security for all in the region. This roadmap involves an immediate ceasefire in Gaza and the release of all hostages; it involves the establishment of a viable and sovereign Palestinian state; it involves the disarmament of Hamas and its exclusion from the governance of Gaza; it involves normalisation between Israel and the Arab countries.

Thus, Israel's security is systematically invoked, but never that of the Palestinians. The 'peace process' depends on commitments made by the Palestinian Authority, not by Israel. The resolution demands the disarmament of Hamas and its exclusion from the governance of Gaza — in other words, Palestinians are stripped of their right to decide for themselves, and in reality the aim is to prohibit them from any armed resistance. The real purpose of this text lies in the carrot offered to Israel: normalisation with its neighbours.

Amplifying active solidarity

But even this normalisation will probably not be enough to stop Israel, which has shown its ability to be at war with everyone. After decimating part of the Yemeni government, Israel attempted to bomb the Hamas delegation present in Doha for ceasefire negotiations at the request of the United States. Not only does this literally torpedo the process, it is also a military intervention in a major ally of Washington. There is therefore no other prospect in the short term than Israel's headlong rush forward. Without a balance of power, without sanctions or military intervention against Israel, resolutions will have no impact. Israel, drunk with its impunity, has repeatedly stated that there will never be a Palestinian state.

The only solution is to increase Israel's political and economic isolation. Active solidarity demonstrations must challenge Israel and its impunity. Mobilisation is having an effect: it contributed to the cancellation of the Vuelta cycling race due to the participation of the Israeli team. This is a breach in normalisation and an example to follow. With dozens of boats and nearly 50 nationalities represented, the flotilla set sail again on 13 September. The incendiary attacks did not dampen their determination. The Global Sumud Flotilla will therefore become a focal point for the solidarity movement. We must be ready to demand that Western governments do not allow a massacre in international waters.

18 September 2025

Translated by ***International Viewpoint*** *from* ***l'Anticapitaliste****.*

When African dictatorships reach out to Trump

22 September 2025, by Paul Martial

South Sudan, Eswatini (formerly Swaziland), Rwanda and, most recently, Uganda, in addition to being dictatorships, have another thing in common: they have signed an agreement with the United States to this effect, which is part of Trump's policy of harassing immigrants.

'Considerable pressure'

The US Supreme Court, where conservative judges are in the majority, has validated the mass deportation measures in defiance of

international conventions that the United States has ratified: the 1984 convention prohibiting torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment, as well as the 1951 convention and its 1967 protocol, which prohibit the return of refugees to countries that do not respect human rights.

The first deportees to Eswatini have already seen their rights violated. The Southern African Litigation Centre has filed a petition because the absolute monarchy refused to allow them access to their lawyer.

The Trump administration's goal is to sign agreements with 58 countries, including 31 in Africa, to take in banned individuals. Yusuf Maitama Tuggar, Nigeria's Minister of Foreign Affairs, confirms that considerable pressure has been exerted on his country, which has nevertheless maintained its refusal.

A boon for dictators

The agreements remain secret. However, some have been leaked and are hardly reassuring. In South Sudan, ravaged by armed militias, President Salva Kiir, a party to a civil war that has already claimed tens of thousands of lives, made his demands known during the negotiations: the lifting of sanctions against one of the regime's three senior officials, the lifting of visa bans, the unfreezing of a US-based bank account, and support for legal proceedings against his main opponent, First Vice-President Riek Machar, who remains under house arrest.

As for Rwanda, where torture is commonplace in prisons, President Paul Kagame sees himself as a privileged ally of the Western camp. This allows him to be regularly elected with 98% of the vote and to continue his offensives against neighbouring Congo without fear of retaliation.

For the Ugandan president, in a country where homosexuality is punishable by death, signing the agreement with the United States is a guarantee: the certainty that the US administration will not be too concerned about the repression surrounding the presidential election, which will confirm a seventh term in office.

Whether it is the European Union, which uses African countries to outsource its borders, or the United States, which is trying to force them to take in 'some of the most despicable people', in the words of Secretary of State Marco Rubio, both are perfectly happy to accommodate despotic African regimes, to the detriment of the people.

16 September 2025

Translated by ***International Viewpoint*** *from* ***l'Anticapitaliste****.*

Trump Working to End Free Speech in US

21 September 2025, by Dan La Botz

Controlling TV

Last week Trump and his administration brought about the immediate and permanent firing of Jimmy Kimmel, a late-night comedian who engaged in scathing comic criticism of Donald Trump. Kimmel made a joke suggesting that Tyler Robinson, the assassin of rightwing podcaster Charlie Kirk, might be "one of them" and the far-right took umbrage. Federal Communications Commission (FCC) Chair Brendan Carr immediately suggested Jimmy Kimmel should be suspended. The FCC has no legal control over media content, but Carr implied that if the company did not comply, the network and its affiliates might lose its broadcasting license. So, ABC, the American Broadcasting Company, now owned by the Walt Disney Company, fired Kimmel who had about 1.7 million viewers each night.

In July CBS, the Columbia Broadcasting Network, now owned by Paramount Global, had already fired Stephen Colbert, effective May 2026 when his contract ends. Colbert, with three million viewers, is also a scathing comic critic of Trump, though CBS claimed he was being fired for economic reasons. Both networks, ABC and CBS, depend upon the FCC to carry out multi-billion-dollar deals, mergers and acquisitions in which they were engaged, that require its approval.

TV broadcasters had already yielded to Trump. In July of 2025 CBS parent, Paramount Global, paid $16 million to Trump for supposedly editing an interview with Kamala Harris, his rival for the presidency, in ways that benefitted her and disadvantaged him. And in December 2024 ABC made a $15 million donation to the Trump presidential library in payment for supposedly defaming him for remarks about Trump having been found libel in a civil suit for raping writer E. Jean Carroll. Both corporations were widely criticized for settling these specious suits.

Suing the Newspapers

Trump has also gone after print media. In July Trump filed a suit against The Wall Street Journal, News Corporation, and owner Rupert Murdoch for publishing an account of the birthday card that Trump sent to and signed for convicted pedophile Jeffrey Epstein. The Journal is fighting the suit.

And in September 2025, Trump sued The New York Times for $15 billion for defamation intended to harm him and his businesses before the 2024 election. A judge rejected Tramp's suit

and has given him a month to amend it.

Pressuring the Universities

Trump has also campaigned to change the character of U.S. colleges and universities, arguing that they are antisemitic, promote LGBT and trans "ideologies," and that their diversity, equity and inclusion programs are racist against whites. He has said that higher education is leftwing, even Communist. He has cut hundreds of million in research funding and brought lawsuits to force universities to change their curricula and even their personnel, with some like Columbia knuckling under and others like Harvard resisting but also making concessions.

And Law Firms

Trump also went after law firms that had represented his opponents, using executive orders to deny them access to federal courthouses, to strip them of security clearances, and canceling contracts. Under such pressure, the firm Paul, Weiss agreed to provide $40 million in pro bono legal services to causes favored by the administration. A number of other law firms fought back and won court orders to stop Trump's harassment.

Trump now suggests that any broadcast media that criticize him should lose their licenses.

We will continue to exrecise free speech in America.

21 September 2025

Uprising or Dictatorship in Ecuador

20 September 2025, by Iain Bruce

On Friday morning, President Daniel Noboa announced plans to call a Constitutional Assembly to rewrite the Constitution - he'd been pushing for a series of reforms that would remove or weaken environmental and labour rights enshrined in the progressive Constitution of 2008, and allow him to invite U.S. troops to operate on Ecuadorean soil, supposedly in his 'war on drugs'.

Late on Friday night, President Noboa sent police to surround and evacuate the Constitutional Court as it deliberated on the constitutionality of his moves - it had recently ruled out of order several of his attempts in this direction.

Ecuador's social movements immediately called for a mobilisation on Saturday morning in defence of the Constitutional Court.

This latest standoff comes at the end of a week of mounting confrontation between the increasingly far-right government and Ecuador's social movements, with Indigenous communities in the lead.

Days of protest against a big mining project in southern Ecuador, which threatens the region's entire ecological balance, especially its water sources, culminated in a huge demonstration on Tuesday. Some 100,000 people marched through Cuenca, the country's third city. The government was forced to back off, suspending the project at least temporarily, while promising to press ahead with other big mining projects in communities like Palo Quemado and Las Naves, where both resistance and repression have been intense.

In parallel, the government announced the sharp increase in the price of diesel, as part of its deal with the International Monetary Fund. The reaction was similar to that of October 2019, when a fuel price hike triggered an Indigenous-led uprising. Strike action by transport unions was soon joined by Indigenous communities blocking highways and confronting the police. Students marched through the capital, Quito.

Repression has also increased. As the government continues to use its supposed war on drugs to justify its attacks on social movements, there have been gruesome reports of troops torturing detained activists. But the Indigenous movement has also been exercising its significant social power. When secret service agents apparently tried last month to run over Leonidas Iza - the former president of CONAIE and figurehead of radical resistance - they were promptly detained by the local community and submitted to Indigenous Justice, another right protected by the current Constitution. They were not harmed in any way, but they were subjected to several days of close questioning, in the course of which they revealed remarkable details of the security services' surveillance of social movements, including the use of infiltrators and fake journalists. As a result of the agents' detention, Leonidas himself is now being charged with kidnapping.

The same Indigenous social power was on display on Thursday when the new President of CONAIE, Marlon Vargas, announced the indefinite nationwide stoppage. With regional stoppages and road blocks spreading in the days before, President Noboa had declared a state of emergency in several provinces. Now, alongside the strike, Marlon Vargas declared a 'community emergency', meaning the army and police would not be allowed to enter any Indigenous community or territory.

This represents a significant shift in the balance of forces within the Indigenous movement. Only two months ago, Vargas was elected at the head of a coalition of centrist and overtly right-wing forces, promising to do business with the Noboa government and promote national unity. It seemed like a serious defeat for the radical forces in the Indigenous movement, led by Leonidas Iza. But in recent weeks,

reality has undermined that 'unity'. The Amazonian section of CONAIE, Confeniae, which Vargas once led, and several provincial federations, announced they were breaking off relations with the government. Local communities were already taking direct action.

Events have been unfolding quickly and it is still too early to tell whether the national stoppage will develop into a full-blown rebellion, the third in six years. Much will depend on what happens within the leadership of the Indigenous movement. Nor is it yet clear how far President Noboa - who retains significant support among parts of the population, even though his popularity has fallen - will go in riding roughshod over Ecuador's already weak democratic institutions. This is not yet a dictatorship, as some on the left have been suggesting. But it may be heading in that direction.

In any case, the people of Ecuador need international solidarity - Now!

20 September 2025

In Palestine as in international solidarity, we must turn to resistance

20 September 2025, by Salah Hamouri

Why does Interior Minister Retailleau want to dissolve *Urgence Palestine* and the *Jeune garde* organisation?

I think that *Urgence Palestine* and the *Jeune garde*, each in its own struggle, have built a fairly strong activist dynamic. These organizations brought another dimension, another way of thinking, a new political analysis and a new political commitment. They have recruited new people, a new generation of activists, and thus have been able to reach a part of French society. Urgence Palestine has succeeded in influencing political life in France in relation to Palestine.

I think that Retailleau is not alone, that there is pressure from the Israelis behind this offensive. Concretely, this followed a request from right-wing MPs who are linked to Israel, and who asked him to dissolve *Urgence Palestine*. [1] The same is true for Palestine Action in Britain, which lost its appeal on 5 July. [2]

There is pressure to remain in humanitarian solidarity, without commitment on political bases linked to the resistance and an international struggle.

What is the specificity of Urgence Palestine in relation to the traditional pro-Palestinian movement?

I think that its specificity is the place that some Palestinians have taken, and the role they have been able to play. In France as elsewhere, it is a place that had disappeared for some time. We believe that the Palestinian diaspora will have a very important political role to play in the future in the fight and in the resistance.

It is a role that must be organised, strengthened politically, because it is a role that the Oslo Accords wanted to eliminate. Since 1994, for 30 years, the aim has been to eliminate the role of the Palestinian diaspora. So today, everywhere, in France but also in the United States, in London, in Barcelona, a Palestinian generation has awakened. This Palestinian generation is the driving force behind all events from October 7 until today.

In London, several Palestinian movements play a key role. There is a Palestinian generation in France, with *Beitna* in Belgium, with the Palestinians of Barcelona who played a very important role even before October 7. There is an awakening in the diaspora to play a role and regain control on the political level.

There is currently a change of position in the movement regarding the assessment of the Oslo Accords.

In general, many Palestinians have said that Oslo is a catastrophe, the third catastrophe, this time signed by Palestinian hands. At the time, people didn't believe it, above all those who saw Arafat and Rabin shaking hands. But everywhere it was said that this would be the end of the conflict, that Israelis and Palestinians would live in peace, without seeing the fundamental issues – colonization, occupation – and without analysing the agreements signed. The second agreement, the Paris Agreement in 1996, which addresses economic issues, is the worst.

It was therefore an agreement claiming to be a peace agreement without giving back any rights to the occupied people. With Oslo, no fundamental rights were restored to the Palestinians.

Not to mention the nature of the Palestinian Authority...

Yes. When you accept the situation, there are two possibilities: either you are politically naïve, or you want to relieve yourself of a political commitment that can be expensive.

But today, no one can be naïve and not see reality. The people who remain stuck on the two-state issue and the Oslo Accords are therefore people who want to politically absolve themselves of the responsibility of really saying things as they are, both about the Palestinian Authority and about the reality of the genocide that is taking place.

Do you have any information on how people are trying to act, to resist, especially in the West Bank?

There are several issues, which are linked. In recent months, we have

seen a new phenomenon, the emergence of new armed groups linked to Israelis. They are implementing the same idea as the South Lebanon Army, they have created two militias in southern Gaza, those of Abu Shabaab, in Rafah and another in Khan Younis. [3] In an interview published in the Israeli newspaper *Yedioth Ahronoth*, Yasser Abu Shebab makes it clear that his collaborationist militias are supported by the Palestinian Authority, the Israeli army and the United Arab Emirates. They are coordinating to create armed militias linked to the occupier in Gaza. These are the same groups that have stolen humanitarian aid and are attacking the population.

But there is also a new phenomenon in the West Bank: even if the Palestinian Authority is weak, it wants to redefine the situation politically. There has been an attempt by personalities and large families who are linked to the occupier. They want to declare Hebron an independent state with direct ties to the Israeli occupier. This is not new. In 1978, there was an Israeli project, called *Rawābit al-Qurā* ("Village Leagues"), which aimed to bypass some mayors and work with others, especially the important mayors. They were collaborationists, the objective was to replace the PLO with these mayors, but some were killed by the organizations present in the West Bank. [4]

Today, we are experiencing the political end of the Palestinian Authority. It no longer has a social base. The Israelis are therefore looking for an alternative to control the Palestinian territories. They are well aware that the void can be filled. Or they manage to fill it with new collaborationists – so they look in different directions, big families, business. Resistance can be expressed, even if the political parties are weak. They know well that a popular movement can break out at any time in the West Bank. The Israelis are trying to avoid it because they know that the West Bank is the strategic area that must not be lost, because a move there can hurt them a thousand times more than Gaza. This is what we saw in the first and second intifadas.

We have also seen youth mobilizations in recent years, and new activist groups.

In 2021, when there was the attempt to destroy Sheikh Jarrah, a neighbourhood in Jerusalem, an offensive was launched, and this alerted the Israelis - the movement was unleashed everywhere in Palestine - in the territories of 1948, in Jerusalem, in the West Bank, in Gaza and in the diaspora. [5] It was the first time since 1948 that all five zones acted at the same time. I think 2021 brought the term "Palestinian people" back to the forefront. A political unity was formed around the resistance. This is what alerted Israelis, who understood the danger represented by the awakening of millions of Palestinians, in Israel, in Jerusalem, in the West Bank, which endangers all Israeli colonization.

What remains of this movement?

The Israelis suppressed this movement: thousands of arrests, years of imprisonment and the destruction that followed in the West Bank. I think that soon, something will happen again in the West Bank and in Jerusalem, that it will break out.

How will it work? What will be the trigger? We don't know. But the enormous repression, the advance of colonization, the destruction became unbearable. We see the flight in the north of the West Bank, the refugee camps in the north, what the army called Plan X. [6]

I think that people see the moment coming when there is no future, no horizon, no solution, neither human nor political. The moment when there is nothing left. And I think that we are not far from the outbreak of a great revolt.

Do you have any information on how the resistance exists in Gaza?

We have entered a guerrilla war, that's clear. But it does not have an organized, centralized command. There are resistance fighters everywhere, who have their experience, who are on their own ground, in the cities.

For example, yesterday there was an operation in Beit Hanoun, in the far north, near the border, a town that was razed to the ground at the beginning of the war 20 months ago. And yet there were 5 dead and 15 wounded on the side of the Israeli army. The Israelis know that the longer they stay in Gaza, the more casualties they will have.

Gaza is almost unliveable, two-thirds of the territory is occupied, only the centre is not. The Israelis; pretext for not occupying is that their prisoners would be in this area and that the risk of them being killed should not be taken. The reality is that they know that the longer they stay on the ground, the more casualties they will have.

Today, there are statements by Yair Lapid – candidate for prime minister – and former generals who say that the presence in Gaza will lead to many casualties in the Israeli army and that it is necessary to withdraw from Gaza, move towards a prisoner exchange – with Palestinian political prisoners – and try to find a solution.

I think that the resistance on the ground can continue for years, Gazans are well organized, they are resisting and there is popular support for this resistance.

But with a huge human impact. Some studies speak of hundreds of thousands of deaths. Do you have any echoes of what is happening in Jordan?

During the Israeli and US imperialist invasion of Iran, Jordan aided Israel. It hosts American, French and British bases. 3,000 American soldiers are stationed there.

They know that Jordan too, for the Palestinians, is a strategic place. The fall of the regime would create a huge political explosion in the region and in the world. It is the longest border with Palestine. The regime is weak, but it is held by the repression of the security forces. There have been thousands of arrests since October 7, in the population and also in the Palestinian refugee camps.

When the Red Sea was blocked by Houthi attacks, Jordan represented a

crossing point, with the "land bridge" opened between Israel and Saudi Arabia. Jordan has therefore played an important role in unblocking the Israeli economic crisis. This has been its role for the past 20 months.

For the rest of the mobilization, how do you see things?

It is difficult to anticipate what will happen. There could be a 60-day ceasefire very soon. Trump says he is committed to stopping the war, so we will see what happens.

For my part, I think that the challenge is to renew the PLO, on a revolutionary basis, and by allowing the entry of all political parties. We need a long-term program of struggle because there is no political solution today, we must first create a balance of forces, and it is up to the Palestinians to do that. We must return to a commitment based on resistance and, from there, change everything.

And in terms of solidarity mobilization?

In the same way, we must change our political language, turn to resistance. And then everything around the Palestinians will also change.

On the side of Urgence Palestine, and of the Palestinians in general, we have a political role to play in strengthening militant commitment and deepening political analysis: on the importance of resistance, on the importance of a deep, politically committed solidarity. It must not be limited to humanitarian solidarity; it must be politically and militantly committed. This is our role for the coming months and years.

Firsr published 31 August 2025

Translated by ***International Viewpoint*** *from* ***Inprecor****.*

Footnotes

[1] On 22 October 2024 National Rally MP Julien Odoul called for the dissolution of *Urgence Palestine*. On 29 April 2025 Retailleau announced his intention to dissolve UP and the anti-fascist collective *La Jeune Garde*. On 12 June, the latter was dissolved. A solidarity mobilization with UP has garnered the support of 250,000 signatories and more than 800 organizations. The dissolution of UP has not been pronounced to date.

[2] Palestine Action in Britain was banned following an action at a Royal Air Force base that involved spraying paint on military aircraft.

[3] The South Lebanon Army was a Lebanese militia that operated with the support of the Israeli army during the Israeli invasion of southern Lebanon in 1978 and 1982. Founded in 1976-1977, it was dissolved when the Israeli army withdrew from southern Lebanon in 2000.

[4] The Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), established on 28 May 1964 in Jerusalem, was the main Palestinian resistance organization. It is made up of several Palestinian organizations. The main one is Fatah, but there is also the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine (PFLP) and the Democratic Front for the Liberation of Palestine (DFLP). It was led by Yasser Arafat from 1969 until his death in 2004. It is currently headed by Mahmoud Abbas (Abu Mazen), who is also the president of the Palestinian Authority and the State of Palestine.

[5] The "Palestinians of 1948" are the Palestinians who, following the 1948 war that led to the creation of Israel, found themselves inside the Israeli state. There are about 1.7 to 2 million of them, or 20% of Israel's population. There are also 3.2 million Palestinians in the West Bank and, before the genocide began, 2.2 million in Gaza. There are also 6.4 million in the surrounding Arab countries and 760,000 in the rest of the world. That is about 14 to 15 million in total.

[6] Far-right Israeli government minister Bezalel Smotrich's Plan X aims to grab Palestinian land in the occupied West Bank. In 2024, 800 hectares were seized: according to the Israeli anti-settlement organization Peace Now, this is the largest seizure of land in Palestinian territory since the Oslo Accords.

The genie of class struggle comes out of its lamp in Nepal

19 September 2025, by Daniel Tanuro

Nepalese youth have been the spearhead and backbone of the mobilizations. The causes for their anger are well documented: monstrous social inequalities, poverty, lack of prospects, corruption of the "elites," nepotism of the three parties in power. The hopes born of the fall of the monarchy (2008) have not materialised. The two Maoist Communist parties, which were unified for a time and then separated again, have deeply integrated into the system, alongside the Nepalese Congress Party.

KP Sharma Oli, the prime minister ousted by the uprising, was a member of one of these two formations – the Communist Party of Nepal (Unified Marxist-Leninist). At first, he made fun of the youth mobilization. Failure. In a

second phase, his government tried to stifle the mobilization by imposing censorship on all social networks. Another failure. In a third phase, there was only repression: when the procession of peaceful students approached the parliament, the police deployed major means: tear gas, water cannon, rubber bullets and live ammunition. About twenty young people were killed, several hundred were injured.

Contempt, censorship and repression have set off the powder keg. Some media speak of "clashes in Nepal," but it is indeed a revolutionary uprising. As in Bangladesh, as in Sri Lanka, as in Indonesia, a fortuitous event suddenly releases an enormous accumulated social anger, which sweeps away everything in its path.

At the time of writing (13 September 2025), a precarious calm has been restored, but nothing has been settled. Little Nepal is the stake in the struggles for influence between its two big neighbours. KP Sharma Oli tipped the scales towards Beijing. Behind the scenes, India and China are manoeuvring, the former to increase its grip on the country, the latter to maintain it. Other powerful neighbours are watching closely, primarily Pakistan and Russia. In this troubled context, attempts to instrumentalize the protest movement are not excluded, on the part of India in particular.

The social movement seems to have been largely spontaneous. From a distance, prudence of judgment is required. However, there seems to be a consensus around the demands for the dissolution of the assembly, a clear break with the old system of corrupt parties and the aspiration for another development, democratic and social. It is obvious that this is not the direction in which the bourgeoisie, the army, Modi and Xi Jinping intend to go. A long-term perspective is therefore necessary, for which the youth movement and its allies will need to invent a democratic structure.

In the meantime, the autocratic cliques in power around the world are scrutinizing Nepalese events to learn lessons. Their goal is obviously to better protect themselves from the popular classes. There is no doubt that this examination is underway even in "our democracies," because their imperialist domination implies a constant vigilance on the forms of the uprisings in the countries of the periphery. But for the time being, the lessons of Nepal are being studied especially in China, for the simple reason that China is the big loser of the events.

For the Chinese Communist Party, the issue is not only foreign policy. Xi Jinping and his comrades know that discontent with corruption and inequality could shake the Chinese government as it did that of the Nepalese "Communists." Chinese power is much more solid, but the risk exists. It is therefore understandable that Beijing is calling as a priority, not to eradicate corruption in Nepal, but to restore "stability" there.

According to the *Financial Times*, corruption prosecutions in China increased by 43% in 2024 compared to 2023 (nearly 900,000 cases). The regime gives a certain publicity to this repression, in order to give itself an image of integrity, even austerity. Nevertheless, the cancer of corruption apparently continues to grow. Moreover, Chinese billionaires are like the others: they generally prefer to flaunt their wealth rather than hide it, which can only excite the discontent of the popular classes. In short, corruption, nepotism and an explosion of social inequalities could also form a potentially explosive cocktail.

The comparison ends there. Because there is a significant difference between China and Nepal before the latest events: in China, social networks and society in general are very tightly controlled by the police apparatus of power. The so-called "neighbourhood committees" are branches of the regime. Together with surveillance technology, they allow for a degree of security control that is unprecedented in history. In this system, which even the STASI of the former GDR does not come up to, any critical element is immediately spotted and nipped in the bud, before it has had a significant echo on the web.

It is an open secret that the effectiveness of China's Big Brother arouses the discreet envy of the world's wealthy (see Trump, for example). However, Chinese stability could be more fragile than we think, especially among the younger generations. As a reminder, young Chinese men and women were on the front line of the protests against the ultra-repressive "zero covid" policy. It's a sign.

Napoleon is reputed to have said "you can do anything with bayonets, except sit on them." It is certain that Xi Jinping's surveillance devices gag the protest more surely than the Emperor's bayonets. But probably not to the point of opening an ice age of struggles for emancipation. The class struggles will prove to be stronger than the dikes that claim to contain them.

From the point of view of class struggles, the Nepalese case confirms three things: 1) the strategic importance of the struggles against corruption and nepotism (two phenomena intimately linked to the fact that the economic closure of neoliberal capitalism is carried out through the consumption of the rich); 2) youth is indeed "the flame of the revolution" (Karl Liebknecht) and the struggle can direct this flame to the left; 3) once the genie of mass democratic and social protest has come out of its lamp, it is very difficult to lock it in…

13 September 2025

Translated by ***International Viewpoint*** *from* ***Gauche Anticapitaliste****.*

La vuelta : They did not pass!

18 September 2025, by Brian Anglo

The image-cleaning product used in this case was a team called Israel-Premier Tech. It is owned by the Canadian-born, but Israeli resident, multimillionaire Sylvan Adams, who sees himself and the team as ambassadors for his country of adoption. In 2018, he was instrumental in getting the Giro d'Italia to start in Israel.

Pro-Palestinian solidarity in the Spanish State has a long history articulated mainly, but not exclusively, by the Solidarity Network against the Occupation of Palestine (Rescop). Over the past two years, there have been constant, massive mobilisations throughout the country involving even the smallest towns and villages.

Taking advantage of the momentum built up, the movement decided to target Israel-Premier Tech. This began in Catalonia on stage 5 when a relatively small group of demonstrators blocked the road and managed to hold the team up for a short while during a time trial.

As the race moved around the country, almost each stage saw an escalation of the disruption, in spite of a number of arrests, and the demand for Israel-Premier Tech to be thrown out of the competition became stronger. Although the race organisers ignored this, the team eventually dropped "Israel" from its name and put on new jerseys.

This was nowhere near enough for a movement that was having a real impact, not just on the race itself, with stages forced to end several kilometres before the scheduled finish line, but also in the media, on public opinion and even on the Spanish government.

By the time it came to the final stage, which was supposed to be little more than a placid ride round Madrid followed by a prize-giving ceremony with the local authorities enjoying a photo opportunity and publicity for the city, numerous points on the route were already swarming with protestors ready for action.

An attempt to avoid the demonstrators by re-routing the riders had little effect. The roads along which they were due to pass were overrun and the organisers had to call the whole thing off… 55 kilometres short of the programmed finish.

It's true that Israel-Protech was not expelled from the race, but the disruption inflicted, the reputation damage caused and the political repercussions ensuing were rightly seen as a victory for the solidarity movement and hence as a springboard for further action, including around the Global Sumud Flotilla.

Adapting the "¡No pasarán!" (They shall not pass!) of Madrid's defenders against the fascists during the Civil War, it was now possible to say "¡No pasaron!" (They did not pass!).
The next day, the Spanish government, under pressure also for failing to keep its promise to decree an arms embargo on Israel, was obliged to say it supported the actions taken during the Vuelta.
Members of Anticapitalistas (the Fourth International organisation in the Spanish State) played a considerable part, but this was above all a sustained, collective effort that drew its strength from the involvement of tens of thousands of people.

Next year's Tour de France, with Israel-Premier Tech billed to take part, is due to begin in Barcelona. Plenty of time to prepare a hot reception if necessary.

Gaza and Global Neofascism

17 September 2025, by Gilbert Achcar

One of the most worrying characteristics of the current neofascist era is that it includes, in addition to the countries of continental Europe, the two Western countries that confronted the fascist axis in the last century in alliance with the Soviet Union: the United States and Britain. As the neofascist transformation of the US regime, overseen by Donald Trump and his acolytes, becomes more evident day after day, London witnessed last Saturday the largest rally organized by the far right in British history. This came against the backdrop of public opinion polls indicating that the far right, led by Nigel Farage, is leading the Labour and Conservative parties.

Yet, it is no coincidence that the representatives of the political "center" in both countries, Joe Biden in the United States and Keir Starmer in Britain, have distinguished themselves by their support for Israel's genocidal war in the Gaza Strip. The current government of Benjamin Netanyahu, which oversaw this genocidal war and received unconditional support from both men for long, is the most extreme right-wing government in the history of the Zionist state. Indeed, it is the most extreme right-wing government in our current world, uniting the neofascist Likud Party with even more right-wing parties, most notably the neo-Nazi groups of Itamar Ben-Gvir and Bezalel Smotrich, who openly favor authoritarian rule and ethnic cleansing.

Western governments' support for the Zionist genocidal war in Gaza was part of a gradual banalization of the far right by the "centrists". It was preceded by the latter's adoption of the former's positions on immigration, which led to the acceptance of far-right racism as a legitimate ideology. Western support for Israel's invasion of Gaza, in stark contrast to the position of the same Western governments toward the Russian invasion of Ukraine, undermined the last vestiges of credibility held by Western liberal powers regarding respect for international law and adherence to rules-based international relations. The latest to point out this discrepancy was the Spanish Prime Minister, who went the furthest among Western governments in his turnaround and criticism of the Zionist government, calling for a boycott of Israel in international competitions, just as Russia was boycotted, in order to avoid the duality that invalidates all standards.

While the Western "center" supported the Zionist far-right government, the latter did not respond in kind, however. Instead, Netanyahu and his allies directly contributed to reinforcing the Western far right at the expense of the "center". This was not limited to Netanyahu's support for Trump's presidential campaign at the expense of the latter's Democratic rivals, despite the unlimited support provided by their president, Biden, for his war. The Israeli government did also whitewash the Western far right, obliterating its history which saw antisemitism as a fundamental ideological pillar before replacing it with Islamophobia. The current alliance between the Zionist state and the Western far right relies on hostility toward Islam and Muslims as a shared ideological foundation.

Thus, Netanyahu and his allies have continued to exert efforts to strengthen the Western far right. An instance of that is the so-called International Conference on Combating Antisemitism organized by the Israeli Ministry of Diaspora Affairs in Jerusalem last March (it is worth noting that the same minister, Amichai Chikli, has praised the recent British far-right demonstration in London). The conference brought together the most prominent forces of the Western far right – not only neofascist forces such as the French National Rally party led by Marine Le Pen, but also even more extreme tendencies such as that represented by Le Pen's niece, who until last year co-led the Reconquête party of Éric Zemmour (who was invited to address the London far-right rally alongside Elon Musk, the most notorious neo-Nazi of our time).

The benefit Israel derives from this extreme right-wing international alliance is that these forces have become the most ardent defenders of the Zionist state in general and the Netanyahu government in particular. This was illustrated by their leaders, such as Britain's Farage and France's Le Pen, standing up to criticize liberal Western governments that have announced their intention to recognize the State of Palestine. This resembles Netanyahu's recent reliance on the US far right, aligned with Donald Trump, to counter Joe Biden's very timid attempts to moderate the Zionist regime's expansionist ambitions and curb the genocidal war it is waging.

16 September 2025

Translated from the Arabic original published in Al-Quds al-Arabi for the author's blog.

Kirk Assassination Puts the Left in Danger

16 September 2025, by Dan La Botz

Kirk was assassinated by a single rifle shot while speaking at Utah Valley University in Orem, Utah. Within two days, Tyler Robinson, a 22-year-old student, turned himself in to the police and was charged with the murder.

Following Kirk's killing, President Donald Trump in a national address stated, "For years, those on the radical left have compared wonderful Americans like Charlie to Nazis and the world's worst mass murderers and criminals. This kind of rhetoric is directly responsible for the terrorism that we're seeing in our country today, and it must stop right now." Laura Loomer, who influences Trump, wrote, "We must shut these lunatic leftists down. Once and for all. The Left is a national security threat."

Kirk was a devoted follower and friend of President Donald Trump who saw his organization Turning Point USA as the youth group of the MAGA movement. In 2024, the group mobilized young people to vote for Trump, helping him to win the presidential election.

Kirk was a white Christian nationalist who routinely suggested that Black people, especially Black women, were intellectually inferior. He argued that Jews were responsible for the Great Replacement of white Americans by people of color. He said that women should reject feminism and submit to their husbands. He believed that LGBT people violated God's Biblical law. While claiming to be an advocate of free speech, Kirk's Turning Point USA maintained a "professor watchlist" aimed at driving progressive professors out of academia. He stated that Muslims would kill every Jew on earth. He said that Palestine did not exist and asserted that claims of starvation of children in Gaza were fake news. He dismissed climate change, falsely claiming there was no scientific consensus on its cause.

Tyler Robinson, grew up in a Christian, Republican family in Utah. He was an excellent student, like video games, and had become interested in politics, but was apparently not a member of any organization. He reportedly confessed to the murder, but if he is the murderer, we don't know why he killed Kirk.

But we have some clues. Some unfired cartridges found near the rifle used in the shooting had been engraved: One read, “Hey fascist! Catch.” Another read, “Bella ciao,” a lyric from a song of the Italian anti-fascist resistance of World War II. So, perhaps Robinson had become an anti-fascist who wanted to kill the leading youth organizer of an American fascist movement. If so, we think he made a terrible mistake.

We socialists have always rejected individual acts of terror, such as assassinations. First, large organizations or social movements are not likely to change direction or to be stopped by the killing of one person. On the contrary, the murder of a charismatic and popular leader like Kirk could create a martyr around whom people will organize.

Second, assassination leads to repression such as we are witnessing now, as rightwing agitators, politicians, and the government take advantage of the murder to call for a purge of leftists in America.

We on the left, as well as progressives and liberals, are in danger. Even before Kirk’s killing, Trump was sending troops to American cities. Several right-wingers on social media now call for a civil war. Leaders of armed, violent groups like the Oath Keepers and the Proud Boys have called upon their members to mobilize. We will have to be vigilant and to organize to defend our organizations and our rights, while continuing to oppose Trump, the Republicans, and the far-right.

14 September 2025

Peace remains elusive in DRC

15 September 2025, by Paul Martial

From the outset, observers were cautious about the end of the conflict, due to the establishment of two parallel and closely linked peace processes.

Two peace agreements

The first, sponsored by the US, is an agreement between states, the DRC and Rwanda. It was signed on 27 June. According to the actors themselves, it is falling behind schedule, particularly on the issue of the withdrawal of Rwandan forces from Congolese territory. It is conditional on the DRC armed forces (FARDC) taking out the FDLR, a militia composed of former génocidaires whose danger is overestimated by Rwanda, which considers them an existential threat.

The second agreement, still under discussion, is the Doha agreement, this time between the DRC and the M23/AFC militia, which is heavily supported by Rwanda. It has conquered a large part of the eastern territory of the country by occupying the main cities of Goma and Bukavu. The talks are stalling. The Congolese authorities are demanding to regain their authority over the entire territory, while the M23/AFC is talking about co-management of the region. Although the M23 was initially a strictly military rebellion, it has transformed itself into a political force with the addition of the Alliance Fleuve Congo (AFC), led by Corneille Nangaa.

Parallel regime and rise of militias

This militia quickly set up a new administration to manage the conquered territories. Governors were appointed, courts were established and, more recently, a police force was created with the hiring of new civil servants. Traditional leaders opposed to this new power were removed and sometimes physically eliminated. The other thorny issue is the demobilisation of the M23 forces. These combatants are demanding to be integrated into the army. Tshisekedi, the president of the DRC, categorically refuses, considering that such integration would be a sword of Damocles hanging over his regime.

To wage war against the M23/AFC, the Congolese government has made extensive use of numerous militias operating in the region. They operate under the generic name of Wazalendo (patriots, in Kiswahili). Officially, their members have the status of ‘armed defence reserve’. In reality, the Wazalendo enjoy a great deal of independence and consider that they are not bound by the commitments made in Doha, as they were not involved in the discussions. The latter had asked to participate in the meetings, but the refusal of both the Congolese government and the M23/AFC resulted in the demands of these armed groups being ignored. The first skirmishes between Wazalendo militias and the FARDC are already appearing. The most recent took place in Uvira, causing the deaths of a dozen people.

Contrary to Trump’s claim that he has ended a thirty-year war, the conflict continues, forcing civilians, victims of abuses perpetrated on all sides, to flee into exile.

11 September 2025

Translated by ***International Viewpoint*** *from* ***l’Anticapitaliste****.*

10 September: building a mass movement to break with Macron and his world

14 September 2025, by Antoine Larrache

The French media and the government may try to downplay the success of the day, but it is a success that shows the resources of the working class in France. According to the Ministry of the Interior, there were 430 actions (compared to two to three thousand on the first days of the Yellow Vests), including 157 blockades mobilizing 29,000 people. But we can already say, at this hour, that 15,000 people demonstrated in Bordeaux, about 30,000 in Toulouse (compared to 120,000 at the height of the mobilization on pensions), 600 in Belfort, at least 200 in Angoulême, at least 10,000 in Rennes, and 5,000 in Brest.

In Paris, ther were many actions: blockades of several main entrances to the city, gatherings at République, Gare du Nord, Châtelet, and Place des Fêtes. Most of the Parisian blockades were broken up by the government, which mobilized 80,000 gendarmes and police officers, although some picket lines, where there were a substantial number of strikers, held out. Everywhere, the presence of many young people was noted. A total of 175,000 demonstrators (250,000 according to the CGT) were announced by Retailleau, who had "predicted" 100,000. In the evening, general assemblies were to be held to discuss the next steps of the movement.

A successful day

It can be said that, for a semi-spontaneous movement, it was a great success. It was triggered by a wide variety of individuals and movements, then the radical left wing became involved (France Insoumise and the far left, certain CGT federations, Solidaires and local trade unions, etc.), while the major trade union confederations called for a day of strike action on 18 September. At the end of August and beginning of September, assemblies brought together hundreds of people under the banner of rejecting Macron and austerity, particularly following the announcement of the intention to renew last year's budget, which will have disastrous consequences for public services and social security, and to remove two public holidays, the 8 May [anniversary of the end of the Second World War in Europe] and Easter Monday. In the demonstrations, these slogans were combined with calls to reject the far right and increased military budgets, and to show solidarity with Palestine.

The government collapsed on Monday 8 September when Prime Minister Bayrou called for a vote of confidence in the National Assembly, which rejected it, with only 194 votes in favour and 384 against. President Macron's appointment of Defence Minister Lecornu as Prime Minister on Tuesday 9 September sounds both like a provocation and an admission of immense weakness. It is a provocation because how can one appoint to this position someone who represents both the continuity of all governments under Macron and the transfer of social budgets to militarism? It is also an admission of weakness, showing how difficult it is for Macron to find politicians willing to carry out his policies.

The coming weeks will be very important; anything could happen. If the working classes and the left are not determined enough, it will be the right and the far right that will come out on top during this period of semi-vacation from power. We may see an agreement between Le Pen and Macron to govern and accelerate the anti-social and racist offensive. Or a "government of experts" that will push through this policy with the National Rally, which will let it do so and bide its time until the 2027 presidential election.

Building a movement to win

Conversely, the working class can influence the situation, provided it takes an offensive stance. This requires several conditions.

The first is not to be content with a minority and radical movement. It is essential to build the movement: in the coming days, increase the number of tours of departments, workshops, etc., distribute leaflets, and prepare for a mass strike. The 18th could be a turning point towards a general strike against the government's policies.

The second is to have clear objectives, slogans that respond to the economic and social situation and the current issues: cancel the debt, increase wages by €400, provide funding for public services, return to retirement at 60, ban redundancies, restore the rights of the unemployed, grant freedom of movement and settlement and equality to foreigners, stop war policies and in particular complicity with the genocide in Palestine.

The third is to answer the question of power. It is not enough to get rid of Bayrou and Lecornu; Macron must be removed. This cannot happen within the framework of the current institutions, which are undemocratic and have failed. We need a government of change, a government of workers, their organisations, trade unions and left-wing parties, to initiate a policy of radical change with the existing order.

This is what anti-capitalist activists can defend in this movement. Through their newspapers, their leaflets and their interventions in assemblies. Activists must defend the unity of the movement – that is, of the entire social and political left, from the grassroots to the top – and its construction on concrete objectives, both in terms of

demands and in terms of democratic and militant organisation (general assemblies, picket lines, leafleting, etc.) and an orientation that allows for confrontation with a ruling class that will stop at nothing short of massive, sustained mobilisation. Certain bourgeois circles already see the far right and repression as a recourse against the social movement. We must win in order to avoid a radicalization of anti-social, racist and warlike attacks, and to break with neoliberal capitalism.

10 September 2025

Translated by ***International Viewpoint*** *from* ***l'Anticapitaliste****.*

Trump's Lisa D. Cook Firing: Use of Racism in Power Grab

13 September 2025, by Malik Miah

For some time, Trump has been railing against — and threatening to fire — the Chairman of the Board, Jerome Powell. Because the Fed has been setting the basic interest rate not to his liking, Trump's drive is to take it over and eliminate its independent status.

But he fired Cook, the only Black Governor, instead. She was the first Black woman to serve on the Board of Governors.

The day after Cook was fired the White House released a photo. It showed Trump, his cabinet and other officials giving a thumbs-up to the firing of Cook. Of the 24 people in the photo only one was Black.

Cook sued Trump with her lawyers contesting the firing as political interference. On September 9 a preliminary injunction temporarily blocked Trump's decision but the administration immediately announced its intention to challenge the injunction at the U.S. Court of Appeals. This swift response is an attempt to see her gone by the time the Fed meets next week.

Black Reaction

Many in the Black community responded angrily. They say Trump's effort to oust Cook fits a pattern of purging non-white voices from the higher ranks of government leadership.

As LaTosha Brown, co-founder of the organization Black Voters Matter, noted:

"His goal is to get control of the Federal Reserve and for that to no longer be an autonomous, independent body. But what he does recognize is that in America everything is about race. It is as lethal as a nuclear bomb."

Race and economics (class) always intersect in the United States. That's the case whether people are buying a home or seeking available job opportunities.

Who Is Lisa D. Cook?

Cook is a former economics professor whose research focused on racial disparities, the history of financial institutions, and crises in financial markets and innovation.

Cook taught economics and international relations at Michigan State University. Previously she was on the faculty of Harvard University's Kennedy School of Government. She was a Marshall scholar who received degrees from Oxford University and Spelman College, a historically Black women's college in Atlanta.

Cook dedicated much of her scholarship to examining how racial discrimination and targeted violence created barriers to economic advancement for African Americans. She also advised the Nigerian and Rwandan governments on banking reforms and economic development.

In other words, Cook is a well-respected and qualified economist and scholar. As business and economic experts told CNN, the Fed benefits greatly from having leaders with diverse professional and personal backgrounds.

Saqib Bhatti, co-founder and executive director of the Action Center on Race & the Economy, noted that in making the case for Cook's nomination, only two of 417 Federal Reserve staff positions were Black while 318 of them were white. He concluded, "That's a really big problem."

In 2022 Cook was confirmed to the Fed's Board of Governors by the Senate in a party-line vote to fill an unexpired term and later appointed for a term ending on January 31, 2038. Republicans have argued that she was unqualified and found her research overly focused on race. Democrats brushed off such critiques but refused to call out the racism of the opposition.

A member of the Board of Governors can only be removed for cause. The alleged "cause" was an error she supposedly made in mortgage applications before she was elected to the Fed. It has nothing to do with her qualifications or performance on the Board.

Powell said Cook remains on the Board unless legitimate cause is validated for her firing. If she is removed, Trump will be in the driver's seat in taking over the Board. He has two votes already and with the resignation of Governor Adriana D. Kugler on August 8 Trump has nominated Stephen Miran, head of the White House Council of Economic

Affairs, to finish out that term. Miran is considered the architect of Trump's tariff policy. And if the Fed's decisions on interest rates are dependent on Trump's (or any subsequent president) wishes, it raises unknown consequences for the U.S. and global economy.

Reporters found that at least two members of the Trump Cabinet have similar discrepancies on their mortgage applications. The charge against Cook not only serves to get rid of someone who didn't vote the way Trump wanted but pushes back racial justice and undermines the long-term gains of African Americans.

The Fed was established in 1913, but there was not a person of color on the Board of Governors until Andrew Brimmer, a Black man, was appointed in 1966. The first woman to serve on the Fed's Board was Nancy Teeters, appointed in 1978. Cook, the first Black woman, was appointed almost fifty years later. Like all members, she has a 14-year term.

Hatred for Diversity

Trump's attempt to fire Cook comes as his administration has more broadly tried to dismantle diversity, equity and inclusion (DEI), efforts across the federal government. Earlier this year, Trump fired Gwynne Wilcox, the first Black woman to serve on National Labor Relations Board, and Gen. Charles Brown Jr., a Black man who was the chair of the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the country's armed forces.

Trump's even pressured private-sector companies and institutions — often successfully — to end DEI programs. He is using the government's purse to bludgeon universities into dismantling attempts to equalize the playing field.

Trump, and other white nationalists argue that merit is the basis on which people should be judged. And then they put their fingers on the scale by launching campaigns of misinformation and even slander. For example, Trump claimed former President Barack Obama, the first Black President, was not born as a U.S. citizen (the "birtherism" lie) and therefore was not eligible for the office. The lie becomes Trump's truth.

Last In, First Out

Typical for Blacks in all jobs, Cook is the last hired and first fired.

While Cook refused to resign and filed a lawsuit asserting that Trump has no power to remove her from office, Trump's Justice Department initiated a criminal investigation of her. She is an obstacle to be removed.

Activist LaTosha Brown explained to the Guardian why Trump picked Lisa Cook:

> He picked her because he is betting that, in an industry that is probably 90% or more white male, his odds of removing her are greater than the odds for removing others from the board. That in itself is rooted in the history and how insidious racism is built into the fabric of how we see people of color in this country.

Trump also dismissed Carla Hayden, the first Black person to serve as librarian of Congress, after a reactionary advocacy organization accused her of being a "radical."

Trump says he acts on his instincts no matter the facts. He seeks a return to the founding of the country where only European settlers were "real" Americans. Cook is clearly being fired because of racism.

In defending Cook, racism must be a central part of the argument. But Democrats, who oppose Trump, just want to focus on the independence of the central bank.

In Defense of DEI

While many liberals and even some on the left are quiet about DEI, it is crucial that DEI and wokeness be defended from the right's racist attacks.

Why is that?

Diversity is a way to say the country is not only white, in fact non-whites will soon be a majority. To say diversity should be reflected in society's institutions is not complicated. Yet Trump calls it "reverse discrimination" against whites, especially white men.

Equity is a call for fairness and equality. The Black-led civil rights movement saw the fight was to end legal segregation, but much more was necessary. That's why the 1963 March on Washington was about jobs and freedom. Affirmative action can help close the gap between oppressed minorities and the majority white population.

Inclusion is simple: Let Blacks and others finally be accepted for their skills, knowledge, and abilities as equals. Lisa Cook has incredible expertise, but Trump and other right-wingers deny it.

Trump and his white nationalist base reject DEI (also called "wokeness") and threaten to criminalize those who support full equality.

In his second term, Trump has managed to pick only one Black person to serve in his cabinet: Scott Turner, secretary of housing and urban development. In fact, in judging the Trump cabinet, we can say it's one of the most unqualified group of people ever picked. As Rashad Robinson, a civil rights leader and former president of the group Color of Change, explained:

> We live in a very diverse country, a country with many different types of people that come from many different backgrounds, and the president exhibits his values by who he puts in office.
>
> "This is not simply that Donald Trump has put only one Black person in his cabinet. It's that Donald Trump has gone out of his way to find some of the most unqualified and ill-equipped people to put in those jobs as a way to actually avoid having to put Black people in his cabinet.

We should keep in mind that in this country the exploitation of the working class and the oppression of Blacks and other people of color are intertwined aspects of capitalist rule.

The Lisa Cook battle of a successful Black woman who is a professional economist is important for the working class, Black community, labor movement and the socialist left.

Trump's sexism and racism can be defeated by opposing what can be easily seen as a blatantly unfair attack.

*Source: **Against the Current**.*

Nepal protests have deeper roots

12 September 2025, by Alex de Jong

In an article for *Himal Southasian*, Roman Gautam pointed out the influence of other uprisings; 'when Sri Lankans rose up in 2022 to boot out the Rajapaksa regime', Nepalis 'took notice. Then came Bangladesh and its July Revolution last year, with Sheikh Hasina and the entire political system around her in the public's sights'. And in footage of protests in Nepal, the same skull & bones flag that became a symbol of Indonesian protests can be seen.

The initial trigger was a ban on social media, something many people who run small businesses rely on. Social media such as Whatsapp and Messenger is also line of communication with the millions of Nepali migrant workers abroad. About 7.5 percent of Nepal's population lives abroad and remittances account for over a quarter of the country's GDP, more than official development assistance and foreign direct investment combined. The large scale migration is driven by poor prospects at home, where almost one in four young people is unemployed. Viral recordings of the children of politicians enjoying lavish lifestyles added fuel to the fire.

Under such conditions, protest against a social media ban quickly widened into one a movement against the corrupt and unaccountable politicians held to be responsible for a lack of prospects. And then on September 8, police opened fire, killing 19. Among the dead were children still in their school uniform. This kind of violence was carried out by a government led by a self-declared communist, K.P. Sharma Oli of the Communist Party of Nepal (Unified Marxist–Leninist) or CPN (UML). Anger escalated into outrage. A day later, Oli stepped down and the social media ban was lifted but this was too little to late.

The discrediting of the Oli-led coalition of CPN (UML) and the Nepali Congress is not limited to those two parties. Tellingly, on Tuesday the house of opposition politician and former prime-minster Prachanda was also attacked. Like Oli, Prachanda is a self-declared Communist; he is the chairman of the Communist Party of Nepal (Maoist Centre). CPN UML, Nepali Congress and Maoist Centre are the three major political parties in the country. Since 2008, Nepal has had 13 governments, with these three parties cycling in and out of power.

Decline and collapse of a revolution

This is not the first time in recent history that Nepal has seen a mass uprising. In 1990, popular protests ended monarchical rule in Nepal and the country became a multi-party constitutional monarchy. The CPN UML, which began as a left front participating in this movement, then estlibshed itself as one of the country's major political parties.

Despite its name, there is little communist about this party's ideology. In the early nineties, its Secretary General Madan Bhandari formulated the party's approach, the 'theory of people's multiparty democracy'. This was essentially a continuation of the party's previous Stalinist stagist theory of revolution. It maintained the old conception that before any kind of socialism would be possible, there needed to be a phase in which, in alliance with so-called 'national capitalists', capital accumulation would be developed. Bhandari's formulation added that this 'New democratic' phase would be achieved through electoral means, via parliament, and respect political pluralism. In what became the CPN UML's foundational documents Bhandari, who died in 1994, stressed that New Democracy is 'not different in socio-economic structure and production system'. It would be a 'basically capitalist production system', to be achieved by the 'working people and common people'.

Much of Nepali politics in the nineties were characterized by competition between the CPN UML, NC, a nominally social-democratic party, and the Hindu-nationalist, monarchist Rastriya Prajatantra Party. Much of the criticism the parties directed at each other revolved around accusations of corruption and nepotism, rather than political ideology. One difference was in international orientation: NC was historically seen as pro-India while the CPN-UML 'admires the great achievements of building socialism with Chinese characteristics' by the Chinese Communist Party. Despite such differences, all three of these parties at different times formed (government-)coalitions in the years between 1990 and 2005 when the king assumed executive power.

Part of the tragedy of Nepal is that Prachanda's Maoist movement arose as revolutionary movement that promised an end to social and economic stagnation and to break the dominance of the established parties. In 1996 the Maoists presented the government, at that point led by the NC, with a 40-point list of demands

that included land distribution, a system of unemployment benefits, health care and education as well as an end to caste-based discrimination and autonomy for marginalized regions. When their demands were not met, they launched an armed struggle against the Nepali state.The Maoist 'people's war' gathered strength around the turn of the century when the Maoists controlled large parts of the countryside. As the insurgency grew, Nepali king Gyanendra, who was also the commander of the army, concentrated power in his own hands.

But by doing so, the king antagonized most of the political parties, including the Nepali Congress and CPN UML. In April 2006, a mass movement broke out in Nepal's cities. Named Jana Andolan II or People's Movement II after the 1990 movement, the protests led to the stripping of all powers from the king and reinstatement of parliamentary rule. The Maoists in the meantime had come to an agreement with the opposition parties and committed themselves to a negotiated end of the armed struggle. Their goal now was 'multiparty competition within a stipulated constitutional framework', as Prachanda put it. On November 21, 2006, the Maoists announced the end of their insurgency and the dissolving of the political organs it led in the country side. The Maoists then joined the interim government.

During the people's war, the Maoists emphasized that their immediate goal was to 'build a new type of national capitalist relations, oriented towards socialism'. When speaking in 2001 with a reporter from The Washington Times, Baburam Bhattarai, their main ideologue at the time, implored him to 'please note that we are not pressing for a "communist republic" but for a bourgeois democratic republic.' This strategy was similar to that of CPN UML but differed on how to achieve the preparatory phase of 'national capitalism', either through elections or armed struggle.

In 2001, Bhattarai also declared there was 'absolutely no possibility' of the Maoists turning into a 'parliamentary party' and thereby 'betray the revolutionary aspirations of the masses'. But this is exactly what happened after 2006. As successful as they had been on the battlefield, in the institutional arena the Maoists were first outmaneuvered by the established parties and then quickly assimilated.

The progressive character of the draft constitution was steadily whittled down. It did not take long for the Maoist leadership to fall apart and start accusing each-other of corruption. Even money that was meant to go to the former fighters who were to be integrated into the national army went missing. The change in lifestyle of someone like Prachanda was indeed conspicuous. Some radical groups left the party, but those offered little more than a repeat of the old dogmas and a promise of something few people want; a return to the people's war at some future point.

Musical chairs

Once the new constitution was introduced, it did contain some progressive changes, such as the country becoming a secular republic. But other democratic provisions, such as more political power for marginalized regions in a federal system, were not or only partially implemented. For many working Nepalis little changed in their daily lives.

Since 2008, Maoists were prime-minsters of Nepal four times: Bhattarai once, Prachanda three times, most recently from 2022 to 2024. At different times, the Maoists formed coalitions with each of the main parties of the recently collapsed government. In 2018, the CPN UML and the Maoists, parties that not long before had been at each-other's throat, even went through a short-lived fusion. The failure of this fusion, like other splits from the CPN UML and the Maoists in 2021, was largely caused by disagreements over positions. A cynic might say that almost 20.000 people died in the people's war so that the Maoists could join the political game of musical chairs.

With many of the country's fundamental problems unresolved, it is no surprise that right-wing forces are making a comeback. Earlier this year, Nepal saw substantial protests of monarchists. Restoring the kingdom is a minority position but the monarchists are energized by the obvious failure of CPN UML, NC and Maoist Centre. The 'resurgence of pro-monarchy activities', as one Nepali journalist put it, 'is reflective more of the old guard trying to cash in on widespread public frustration rather than a show of support for the discredited institution'. There are rumors that right-wing, monarchist forces have also been stoking the recent violence. Likewise, fingers are pointed at India and Hindu nationalist forces that would like to see Nepal's status as a Hindu state restored and Nepal's foreign orientation shifted away from China to India. That such forces are attempting to benefit from the current situation is quite possible. Obviously these kind of manouvers were made possible in the first place by wide-spread anger and disappointment.

The legitimate anger over corruption can be a step towards social radicalism. But there is also a risk of such energy being captured by more conservative forces, as the fate of other anti-corruption protests shows. Especially among urban middle-classes and NGO- activists, neoliberal notions of 'good governance' locate the root of poverty and underdevelopment not in imperialism and capitalist exploitation but in the failure to 'uphold the rule of law'. The feeling that 'they are all corrupt' can fuel the desire for a strong man, for an outsider who will 'drain the swamp'.

Protest movements can bring down a government but taking power to actually change the course of society is another thing. Anti-corruption agencies are not enough when what is at stake are matters like land reform, minority self-determination, workers rights and fighting the rule of capital. The cases of Sri Lanka, where popular revolt led to a government that is essentially continuing neoliberal policies, and Bangladesh, where after the July 2024 uprising, it is the right-wing that is set to grow are sobering examples. But it would be a grave mistake to draw from this the lesson that the left should abstain from such protests, or even worse support

governments whose blatant corruption and incompetence has led them to lose popular support. History is made when the masses enter into action. Socialists need to be part of such struggles in order to be able to point to a better way.

11 September 2025

The Indonesian Protests Are a Revolt Against Oligarchy

11 September 2025, by Michael G. Vann

A woman strikes a police officer with a bamboo stick as police push back students during a protest outside the parliament building in Jakarta on August 28, 2025. (Bay Ismoyo / AFP via Getty Images)

Jakarta is burning. So are Makassar, Bandung, Surabaya, Mataram, and other cities throughout Indonesia. Discontent that started as outrage over the lavish perks of lawmakers evolved swiftly into a searing indictment of police brutality, elite privilege, economic precarity, wealth disparities, and democratic erosion.

The horrific death of a young man named Affan Kurniawan at the hands of the police pushed Indonesia over the edge. At the moment, it is unclear how far things will fall. But even Indonesia's authoritarian president, Prabowo Subianto, is making concessions to the massive outburst of social anger.

Dark Indonesia

As the fourth-largest nation in the world and (at least for now) the world's third-largest democracy, Indonesia has grappled with the legacies of authoritarianism and free-market discipline since the people power revolt that overthrew Suharto's dictatorial New Order.

Over the past week, diverse acts of dissent, long simmering beneath the surface, coalesced into violent mass actions across the archipelago. With unprecedented ferocity and velocity, thanks to social media, thousands upon thousands of disillusioned citizens erupted in defiance.

Tension have been building through 2025. In February, a series of student demonstrations across Indonesia challenged Prabowo. Organized under the hashtag #IndonesiaGelap or #DarkIndonesia, the protesters opposed a range of policies, including massive budget cuts, the role of the military in domestic governance, nepotism, corruption, and a controversial free school lunch program.

The youth movement joyously embraced a punk DIY aesthetic and adopted Sukatani's "Bayar, Bayar, Bayar" ("Pay, Pay, Pay") as their anthem. The mixed-gender duo's song blended punk, goth, and retro New Wave sensibilities in a raucous condemnation of police corruption.

While these demonstrations eventually dissipated, the pessimistic sentiment of Dark Indonesia spread. Many spoke about leaving their homeland. The hashtag #KaburAjaDulu, or "Just Run Away First," went viral, reflecting widespread dissatisfaction among young Indonesians faced with weak domestic job opportunities and career prospects.

Prabowo and his administration reacted harshly, dismissing the trend, mocking the youth, and suggesting that it was part of a conspiracy. The opposition MP Charles Honoris countered by describing the hashtag as "a wake-up call, not a reason to label young people as unpatriotic or discourage them from returning. . . . Instead of reacting negatively to this trend, the government should focus on strengthening worker placement and protection programs."

Rewriting History

In May, minister of culture Fadli Zon, a long-term Prabowo sycophant and rabid Sinophobe, appalled many Indonesians when he announced that he was writing a new national history. The project was an obvious exercise in the whitewashing of Suharto-era human rights violations. Zon then made dismissive remarks about the mass rapes of Chinese women during the chaotic last days of the New Order, implying that rumors had exaggerated the extent of these well-documented crimes.

The 1998 anti-Chinese violence was part of a strategy to redirect popular anger away from Suharto and toward a reliable scapegoat. Prabowo, then a high-ranking general and Suharto's son-in-law, was dishonorably discharged for his role in kidnapping, torturing, and disappearing activists. In a committee hearing, opposition politicians Mercy Chriesty Barends and Bonnie Triyana publicly condemned Zon for trying to erase these crimes from the record.

Faced with dissent from various directions, Prabowo decided to unite the nation by literally rallying around the flag. As August 17 would mark eighty years since Sukarno's declaration of independence, he ordered everyone to fly the red and white national flag in an act of patriotism. Flags and patriotic light displays quickly went up all over the nation's 17,000 islands, weeks ahead of the date when communities would normally decorate for the holiday.

But then, something strange happened on Indonesia's infamously busy roads. Truck drivers who were frustrated with long hours and burdensome regulations refused to fly the national flag. In a cheeky act of dissent, they flew the "One Piece flag," a modified piratical Jolly Roger from a popular

Japanese anime. After images of the truckers went viral on social media, the flags began to appear everywhere.

Prabowo was furious. In an act of pettiness comparable to Donald Trump's various obsessions, Indonesia's coordinating minister for political and security affairs, Budi Gunawan, warned of criminal consequences (such as five years in prison or a US$30,000 fine) for those who dared raised the comical skull and crossbones adorned with a straw hat. The absurdity of Prabowo's overreaction only fueled flag sales.

In contrast, the Speaker of Indonesia's House of Representatives, Puan Maharani, suggested a more conciliatory approach to the good-natured protest: "These expressions can be in the form of short sentences like 'Kabur Aja Dulu,' sharp satire such as 'Dark Indonesia,' political jokes like 'Konoha country,' [another anime reference] and new symbols like the One Piece flag and many more that are widely circulated in the digital space."

As well as being the first female Speaker, Puan is the daughter of Indonesia's first female president and the granddaughter of Sukarno, its first leader after independence. She reminded her listeners that democracies must allow dissent and criticism.

Flash Point

As Independence Day neared, frustration with the government took a violent turn in Central Java's Pati Regency. Between August 10 and 13, at least 85,000 people poured into the streets to reject an outrageous 250 percent increase in land and building taxes. What began as a protest against regressive taxation metastasized into demands for the resignation of Regent Sudewo and the rollback of multiple unpopular local policies.

An indignant Sudewo taunted the demonstrators but soon found himself overwhelmed with popular anger. When he called in riot police — the infamous Brimob, or Mobile Brigade — to rescue him, he and the officers were pelted with garbage and chased from the town center. After several days of clashes between protestors and Brimob, the local legislature canceled the tax hike and began the impeachment of Sudewo. This rare victory empowered the activists in Jakarta.

By most accounts, the celebrations for Hari Merdeka, marking eighty years since Sukarno and Mohammad Hatta's declaration of the end of Dutch rule, were large and joyous events. Admittedly many activists chose not to take part. Prabowo hosted a massive celebration at the Istana (the neoclassical presidential palace, formerly the headquarters of the governor of the Dutch East Indies), complete with military parades, honor guards, and a cavalry procession but also multiple coordinated dance routines with soldiers, officers, bureaucrats, and oligarchs joining in. Non-VIPs turned out for a large parade and aircraft flyovers around Monas, the national monument.

A week later, on Monday, August 25, the mood in the national capital was dramatically different. A dam broke when revelations surfaced that the 580 members of the House of Representatives had been receiving a monthly housing allowance worth 50 million rupiah — over US$3,000, or nearly ten times Jakarta's minimum wage — on top of their salaries and other benefits. Student protesters, incensed at such grotesque displays of entitlement, moved to storm the parliamentary compound. Riot police unleashed tear gas; students retaliated with stones and set fires beneath an overpass. Roads were blocked, and the city convulsed.

The protests quickly widened and deepened. On August 28, labor unions joined the fray. Thousands of students, workers, and green-jacketed motorcycle rideshare (ojol) drivers marched demanding a halt to outsourcing, higher minimum wages, and protection from mass layoffs. The confrontation with police escalated into full-blown street battles. Using tear gas and high-pressure water cannons, Brimob battled protestors in the areas around parliament, spreading to malls, expressways, and train stations, and paralyzing Central Jakarta.

Uprising

A horrific death dramatically increased the stakes. On Thursday evening, outside Indonesia's House of Representatives, an armored police vehicle struck and then proceeded to run over Affan Kurniawan, before fleeing the scene at high speed. The twenty-one-year-old victim was working as an ojol, an exhausting and dangerous low-wage job. The death was caught on video and immediately uploaded to social media. In a similar way to the 2020 police murder of George Floyd, the heartbreaking video went viral, producing sorrow and rage.

Suddenly the uprising spread out of Jakarta. More than twenty-five cities from Aceh to Papua became theaters of revolt. Protesters in Medan burned tires and erected barricades; in Pontianak, student leaders were arrested (then released on condition that they promised not to repeat their actions). In Makassar, a blaze engulfed the local parliament building, killing three public servants and injuring five in a horrific spectacle.

Youth in Lombok also burned the regional legislature, while in Surabaya, the governor of East Java's offices were looted and set ablaze. In Yogyakarta, the provocation culminated in the burning of an integrated driving-license service building — a defiant act of symbolic resistance, even as the region's sultan sought to quell tensions through dialogue. The violence echoed across Java, with buildings torched, police posts destroyed, and malls shuttered.

In most cases, the police completely lost control of the situation. Out of anger or panic, scores of officers responded with seemingly indiscriminate violence. Tear gas, water cannons, and gunfire has become common in all major cities and some smaller towns. There have been thousands of injuries, many serious, throughout the country. More deaths have been reported, and sadly more are expected as the violence does not seem to be abating after almost a week.

With evidence of police misconduct and acts of mass defiance being uploaded to social media, TikTok temporarily shut down its services in a vain effort to slow the rapid escalation and stop the spread of misinformation. Yet on all social media platforms, rumors are spreading of agent provocateurs encouraging the crowds in order to justify police violence.

In an all-too-familiar antisemitic trope, Russian media speculated that George Soros was behind the unrest. Left-wing activists have pointed out that attacks have focused on PolRI, the national police force and spared the army (Indonesian National Armed Forces, TNI). Considering the long and at times violent TNI-PolRI rivalry, it is possible that some elements within the military might use this opportunity for their own purposes.

Others note that as the unrest is tarnishing the reputation of both Prabowo and the House of Representatives, failed 2024 presidential candidate Anies Baswedan has the most to gain. Considering his past opportunistic use of Islamic identity politics, mass mobilizations, and Sinophobia to destroy the careers of rivals such as Basuki Tjahaja Purnama, the point is worthy of consideration.

Conciliation and Coercion

On Saturday, the violence continued. Multiple police stations in Jakarta and elsewhere came under attack, including groups throwing stones but also Molotov cocktails. The East Jakarta police station was burned to the ground. Social media was filled with hundreds of videos of skirmishes, some with alarming acts of violence.

In Jakarta's wealthy enclaves, hundreds of people forced their way into gated communities and attacked the homes of particularly notorious politicians. Eko Patrio, who had posted messages on social media mocking the demonstrators, had his house looted. Videos showed people carrying chairs, lights, suitcases, studio speakers, and mattresses out of the house.
Lawmaker Ahmad Sahroni's home was invaded and vandalized, the perpetrators making off with luxury bags, a large safe, a television, fitness equipment, a piano, and a life-size Iron Man statue. Finance minister Sri Mulyani Indrawati's home was ransacked. Echoing the plot of the recent film Mountainhead, the attack on her residence may have been sparked by an AI-generated video of her allegedly ridiculing public school teachers.

Faced with a swarming revolt, President Prabowo canceled a scheduled trip to China to directly confront the crisis, expressing condolences and promising investigation. In a dramatic change from his response to similar unrest in 1998, he immediately visited Affan Kurniawan's family and professed deep regret.

On Sunday, August 31, he delivered a mostly conciliatory speech that promised to eliminate excessive parliamentary stipends and other benefits. However, he did also encourage police to hunt down miscreants: "The rights to peaceful assembly should be respected and protected. But we cannot deny that there are signs of actions outside the law, even against the law, even leaning toward treason and terrorism."

The state is cracking down on the demonstrations. Jakarta alone witnessed over a thousand arrests. With thousands more detained elsewhere, one wonders how the overburdened police and courts will handle due process. National police and the military were staged to restore "order" — a shorthand term increasingly used to justify suppressing dissent. Social media continues to document the heavy-handed tactics.

Usman Hamid, executive director of Amnesty International Indonesia, rejected the president's speech as insensitive and missing the point. He urged Prabowo to seriously consider the people's complaints.

Crisis Snapshot

The 2025 protests have thus become a snapshot of a broader crisis: austerity measures hitting civil institutions, the elite's inexorable enrichment, and the underlying fragility of Indonesia's democratic fabric. Citizens — notably youth, laborers, and gig-economy workers — posed a blunt question: Who exactly is this government serving?

These uprisings lay bare the fundamental contradictions of Indonesia's political economy: the gap between the ruling class and the governed, the collusion of austerity and excess, and the simmering resentment of a generation that is seeing its future mortgaged.

The state's twin impulses, concession and crackdown, expose its insecurity. Victories in Pati or the softening of rhetoric in Jakarta do little to change the structural tensions. If unchecked, the backlash could accelerate a collapse of democratic accountability. Neighboring countries such as Thailand, Cambodia, and the Philippines offer object lessons on the fragility of democracy.

In this sense, August 2025 is not just another cycle of protest. It is potentially a turning point at which Indonesia's civic spirit collided, head-on, with elite impunity. How will the state respond? Repression or reform? Indonesia's future has never been less clear.

4 September 2025

*Source **Jacobin**.*

Côte d'Ivoire: Exclusion of main opponents in presidential election

10 September 2025, by Paul Martial

For the past thirty years, presidential elections in Côte d'Ivoire have been the source of serious political tensions that have led to violence, such as during the 2020 election when more than 85 people were killed, not to mention the hundreds injured. The elections of 25 October do not seem, alas, to be an exception to the rule.

The opposition out of the game

The major element of the crisis is the exclusion from the electoral list, for various reasons, of candidates such as Charles Blé Goudé, former youth minister, Guillaume Soro, former prime minister, and above all the two main opponents: the businessman Tidjane Thiam, of the Democratic Party of Côte d'Ivoire (PDCI), and the former president Laurent Gbagbo, leader of the African Peoples' Party (PPA-CI). These bans on running remove all credibility from the election and could generate political tensions, aggravated by the community dimensions linked to the establishment of these leaders in their regional strongholds.

This fragility of the electoral process can also be explained by other grievances: the fourth term of the current president, Alassane Ouattara, made possible by the constitutional change of 30 October 2016 that he initiated to circumvent the ban on more than two successive terms; an electoral list of eight million people out of a total of more than twelve million potential voters; a discredited independent electoral commission; a justice system considered to be at the orders of the government.

Mobilization for voter inclusion

The first protests took place on 9 August in Abidjan, the capital, where thousands of demonstrators, mainly from the PDCI and the PPA-CI, took to the streets. This success will probably encourage opponents to keep up the pressure. Especially since an organization like the PDCI, founded by Houphouët-Boigny, who ruled Côte d'Ivoire for more than three decades, has strong roots throughout the country. On the other hand, the government, as usual, will override it and will not take the risk of a political opening leading to an inclusive electoral framework.

On the strength of his economic success, which is certainly real but very unequal, with persistent inflation, unemployment and weak health infrastructure, Alassane Ouattara has opted for a forced passage. For these elections, the state's resources will be mobilized for its campaign. Already, a wave of repression is falling on opponents, especially those of the PPA-CI, who are particularly targeted. Thus, executives of this party such as former defence minister Moïse Lida Kouassi or ex-ambassador Boubacar Koné are in police custody. In Côte d'Ivoire, as in most African countries, elections have only one purpose: the preservation of authoritarian power under a democratic veneer.

4 September 2025

Translated by ***International Viewpoint*** *from* ***l'Anticapitaliste****.*

Trump Wants a More Militaristic, Bellicose America

9 September 2025, by Dan La Botz

Trump has been practically begging to be awarded the Nobel Peace Prize, claiming that he has ended six or seven wars in countries around the world. He says he has brought about peaceful relations between Israel and Iran, Rwanda and Democratic Republic of the Congo, Armenia and Azerbaijan, Thailand and Cambodia, India and Pakistan, Egypt and Ethiopia, and Serbia and Kosovo. Yet, despite his claim, none of those conflicts has actually been settled. And he has done nothing to bring peace in two of the most serious conflicts: Russia's war on Ukraine and Israel's war on Gaza.

The self-proclaimed president of peace has engaged in a number of spectacular violent and warlike acts. During his first term as president, on January 3, 2020, Trump ordered a drone strike that killed Iranian Major General Qasem Soleimani near Baghdad International Airport in Iraq. The assassination was not approved by the U.S. Congress and did not have the approval of the Iraqi government, and the United States was not at war with Iran. And on June 22, 2025, during the Israeli-Iran war, the U.S. Air Force and Navy attacked three nuclear facilities in Iran, though there was no declared war on Iran.

Last week, Trump authorized an attack on what he called a "Venezuelan drug boat" supposedly operated by the Tren de Aragua cartel, though the U.S. government offered no evidence of the claim. The boat was destroyed and 11 crew members were killed in an action in the Caribbean that was in clear violation of the law of the sea and international human rights law. The U.S. Congress had not sanctioned the attack. Republican Senator Lindsey Graham praised Trump for his illegal and violent attack, writing on social media, "The sinking of this drug-laden ship is the ultimate — and most welcome — sign that we have a new sheriff in town." Trump, his Secretary of State Marco Rubio, and his Secretary of Defense Pete Hegseth promised more such attacks on drug smugglers.

The U.S. Navy has increased its presence in the Caribbean where it now has eight warships, an attack submarine, and several surveillance planes. Venezuela's president, Nicolás Maduro has stated that the United States is preparing an invasion of is country. Karoline Leavitt, the White House press secretary, recently stated that Maduro's government is illegitimate and Trump has just doubled to $50 million the reward for the arrest of Maduro who he accuses of being one of the world's biggest drug dealers, working with cartels to flood the United States with fentanyl laced with cocaine. War with Venezuela? Maybe. And since taking office, Trump has suggested he would use military force to take over Greenland and to take back Panama.

For months Trump has been authorizing unpublicized military attacks in regions around the world. The Armed Conflict Location and Event Data Project (ACLED), reported this month that since Trump's return to the presidency, the US has carried out 529 air attacks in 240 locations across the Middle East, Central Asia and Africa. This number is close to the total of the 555 attacks launched by the Joe Biden administration over his entire term from 2021 to 2025.

But Trump not only wants to use the military abroad, he is also preparing to make war on the American people. He now plans to send troops to Chicago as he has to Los Angeles and to Washington, D.C., Trump posted: "Chicago is about to find out why it's called the Department of WAR."

Trump has evolved into an aggressive dictator both abroad and at home, and it will be up to us to stop him.

7 September 2025

State Neglect and Corporate-Driven Development Deepen Rural Devastation: Punjab faces unprecedented flood challenge

8 September 2025, by Farooq Tariq, Qammar Abbas

The Pakistan Kissan Rabita Committee (PKRC) expresses deep concern and outrage at the ongoing devastation caused by the 2025 floods across northern regions in Punjab Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Gilgit-Baltistan, Kashmir & Sindh. Once again, it is peasants, small-scale food producers, sharecroppers, landless workers, and rural women who are paying the heaviest price for a crisis they did not create.

Massive Losses, Unequal Burdens

Since late June, unprecedented monsoon cloudbursts and glacial hazards have triggered deadly flash floods and landslides. Entire villages were swept away within minutes in Buner and Swat; South Punjab's cotton, rice, and mango crops stand submerged; and in GB, terraces and irrigation channels have collapsed.

More than 1100 lives have been lost, hundreds remain missing, and thousands of homes, roads, and bridges destroyed. National figures confirm over 10,000 livestock deaths. For small farmers, the disaster has wiped out their seed stocks, crops, and animals—destroying both immediate harvests and future planting.

A Disaster Made by Climate Injustice and State Neglect

Pakistan contributes less than 1% of global greenhouse gas emissions but is once again on the frontlines of climate collapse. These extreme floods are climate-amplified, fueled by warming-driven intense rainfall and glacial lake outburst risks.

But the scale of destruction is not "natural." It is the direct result of decades of state neglect, broken priorities, and neoliberal policies. Instead of investing in early-warning systems, embankments, and flood-resilient rural infrastructure, successive governments and the military elite have diverted resources to mega-canals, corporate farming zones, export crops, built housing societies on the path of rivers and military-led agribusiness projects under the Green Pakistan Initiative.

Ravi Urban Development (RUDA), a maga housing scheme on oblast 100,000 acre of land on both sides of River Ravi, played an important part

in drowning almost 1/6th of Lahore under water. The land from small farmers was acquired forcefully using a colonial law that still exists.
These choices leave peasants unprotected while public wealth is funneled into corporate schemes. Relief and recovery measures remain slow, top-down, and exclusionary, once again abandoning the rural poor.

The 2025 floods are not an accident of nature. They are the outcome of state neglect, elite greed, and global capitalist exploitation. Each time, it is peasants and rural workers who lose everything, while those responsible enrich themselves. Relief alone is not enough. What is required is justice: redistribution of land and resources, recognition of peasant rights, and a decisive break from fossil fuel–driven, corporate-controlled models of development.

Pakistan Kissan Rabita Committee (PKRC) calls on all progressive forces—political parties, labour groups, women's movements, and international allies—to stand with peasants in demanding a new social contract rooted in land, popular agrarian reforms, food sovereignty, dignity, and climate justice.

31 August 2025

Gaza: An undeniable genocide, a criminal complicity

7 September 2025, by Édouard Soulier

The summer was hellish for Gazans: in addition to extreme temperatures, without drinking water, hygiene products, food, evacuation orders, bombings, systematic destruction, tent cities and hygiene problems. Nearly 500 people have died of starvation since famine was declared by international bodies, including the UN. "Humanitarian" distribution areas remain deadly traps. Words fail to describe the horror. Witnesses are also lacking: Israel is targeting journalists. The emblematic Anas el-Sharif was murdered along with four colleagues, bringing the number of journalists killed to more than 210 — a world "record". Israel also used the double-tap technique, which involves aiming twice in the same location within minutes of each other to kill evacuation workers and journalists.

Genocidal propaganda and practices

The massacre at the Nasser Hospital is an example of this. Israel first spoke of a "tragic mishap," then claimed to be targeting a "Hamas camera." Israel claims to "limit civilian casualties" but a report by its own services reveals that 83% of Palestinian casualties are civilians. Israel funds far-right influencers to deny the famine in Gaza, while members of the government make explicitly genocidal remarks. Finance minister Smotrich calls for the destruction of the people of Gaza and has announced the de facto annexation of a large part of the West Bank, the E1 area, which will nearly cut the territory in two. Defence Minister Katz spoke of "dark catastrophes" and "curses on the firstborn" in Yemen, just before assassinating half of the Houthi government. Israel is still bombing southern Lebanon, violating the ceasefire and refusing to sign one for Gaza despite Hamas' acceptance of all its conditions. Israel has become the enemy of all the peoples of the region.

Fierce resistance

If Benjamin Netanyahu refuses the ceasefire, it is to continue invading Gaza and emptying the territory of its Palestinian population. But on the ground, this battle is far from being won for the occupying army. The various armed groups are effectively coordinated. Israeli human and material losses are piling up, and Netanyahu is having great difficulty in obtaining reinforcements. Disarming Hamas remains an unattainable goal. In August, all the warring factions affirmed their determination at a conference in Cairo. International popular resistance is not to be outdone: demonstrations have continued throughout the summer, pressure on Western governments is strong, and the resignation of half of the Dutch government over the Palestinian question is a sign of this. Several European countries are considering renegotiating their trade agreements with Israel. The new Sumud flotilla, which set off from Barcelona and Marseille this weekend with dozens of boats and 44 countries represented, illustrates this international solidarity. These initiatives are a point of support that must be expanded.

Persistent international complicity

The main Western states remain complicit with Netanyahu. The United States has revoked the visas of all Palestinians invited to the UN General Assembly in New York at the end of September, where a "historic" declaration of recognition of the Palestinian state by the last states that have not yet done so is to be delivered. This insult adds to the humiliation of seeing a Palestinian state recognized without recognition of the genocide. Two years after its beginning, massive initiatives must revive international solidarity. In France, around the government crisis and the mobilization of 10 September, questioning a government complicit in a genocidal state must be a central

issue. *3 September 2025* *Translated by* ***International Viewpoint*** *from* ***l'Anticapitaliste***.

Türkiye: From the Kurdish movement to mass mobilizations

6 September 2025, by Uraz Aydin

Can you explain what the PKK is and its main orientations, and what differentiates it from other left-wing or nationalist political groups?

The founding of the PKK must be seen in a context of politicization and radicalization. The 1960s witnessed a development of the workers' movement and revolutionary radicalization, particularly among the youth. But it was also a decade of awakening of Kurdish national consciousness. This Kurdish national politicization was largely achieved within the Workers' Party of Turkey (TIP), which was the main political actor in the workers' movement of that decade. It was towards the end of the 1960s, but especially after the amnesty of 1974, when the thousands of Turkish and Kurdish activists detained since the military intervention of 1971 were released , that Kurdish revolutionaries began to found their own independent organizations . [1]. The PKK was founded in the wake of this, but relatively late. Although the organization's official history dates its origins back to 1973, the founding congress was not held until 1978. Before that, it was a core group of students and especially teachers gathered around Abdullah Öcalan. They called themselves the "Revolutionaries of Kurdistan" but were better known as "Apocu" ("Apo's supporters" - short for Abdullah). Thus, from the very beginning, Öcalan's personality had a central influence.

At the programmatic level, nothing specific differentiated it from the multitude of other Kurdish radical left organizations that advocated armed struggle for an "independent, unified, democratic and socialist Kurdistan" in a stagist perspective. [2]. But in the meantime, weapons were mainly used to defend against attacks by the fascist far-right "Grey Wolves" or in the fratricidal war that reigned within the revolutionary left. The PKK was one of the two main groups that did not hesitate to use weapons against other rival Kurdish (and Turkish) groups, but it was not alone in this. Thus, before the 1980 coup d'état [3], the PKK was a Kurdish revolutionary organization among others.

What justified the launch of an armed struggle strategy against the Turkish state in 1984?

In fact, it was mainly after 1984 that the PKK began to take root among the Kurdish plebeian and peasant population. Let's go back a little. Öcalan left Turkey in 1979 during the state of emergency, but before the coup d'état. This was a decisive element in the construction of the organization. He thus had time to establish contacts with Palestinian resistance groups in Syria and Lebanon, to prepare the conditions of exile for his militants, conditions that would also be those of a real military apprenticeship. After the coup d'état of 1980, Apo thus called on his militants to return clandestinely to Syria. They were trained in the same camps as the Palestinians in the Bekaa Valley in Lebanon under Syrian occupation. Some would participate in the resistance against the Israeli invasion of Lebanon. The PKK lost several dozen members, which also gave it a certain legitimacy.

The PKK launched the armed struggle in August 1984... because Öcalan considered that his army was now ready. The question of military combat as a method for the liberation of Kurdistan had been justified, not by conjunctural conditions or relationships of forces, but on a programmatic level, since 1978.

The offensive against the Turkish state was planned as early as 1982 but was postponed several times. Moreover, Öcalan was operating in the Middle East, where alliances and adversities between various states and Kurdish national movements (from Iraq and Iran) constituted a highly shifting terrain. This unstable context also weighed on the conditions of the struggle. The alliance he formed with Barzani's group, dominant in Northern Iraq, a movement he previously considered feudal and reactionary, was, for example, decisive in building his camps in the mountains on the Turkish border and thus being able to launch his guerrilla war. Thus, while all the other Kurdish and Turkish groups tried to preserve their forces in exile, in Syria but especially in Europe, the PKK was the only one to engage in a real armed struggle. The legitimacy it gained through its offensives allowed it to recruit more and more, despite the significant losses of fighters suffered in the field.

40 years later, does the announcement of the dissolution not appear to be a failure, on the military and political levels?

I think that military objectives had already been non-existent for several decades. If for the Öcalan of the party's founding and of the 1980s, any objective short of independence (various forms of autonomy, federative entities, etc.) was reactionary, the leader of the PKK had begun to revise his ideas from the beginning of the 1990s, particularly after the fall of the bureaucratic dictatorships. As we know, he would eventually come to criticize the nation-state form.

Öcalan had already attempted negotiations in 1993. After his arrest in 1999, he began to advocate a completely new direction, much to the surprise of PKK leaders and activists who were preparing to escalate the war and suicide attacks. This new direction aimed to end the armed struggle in favour of a permanent ceasefire, to pave the way for a political solution. He thus unquestionably renounced the strategic objective of an independent Kurdistan. Two further negotiation processes followed in 2007-2009 and 2013-2015, which unfortunately failed. However, the creation of the autonomous zone of Rojava in northeastern Syria must also be interpreted within this military and political framework. The existence of an administrative structure linked to the PKK on the Turkish border constitutes an important achievement for the organization, against the Turkish state and vis-à-vis its historical competitor in northern Iraq, the Barzani clan and its Kurdistan Democratic Party.

Where are we today in the new talks?

It should be clarified that the Kurdish movement is not only an armed movement. The PKK has managed to form a massive movement of several million people, with various civil structures that have sometimes developed with autonomous dynamics, despite the authoritarianism of the organization. Today, the civil-democratic base seems to be much more important and effective in its fight than the armed structure in terms of the objectives to be achieved for the Kurdish people. So, while there are certainly highly questionable aspects such as its authoritarianism, its excessive fetishism of the leader, the arbitrary internal mass executions (especially at the turn of the 80s and 90s), the dozens of indiscriminate attacks… it must be recognized that this movement, over time, has very strongly contributed to the consolidation of a national consciousness of the Kurdish people, and has largely anchored it on the left, with feminist, egalitarian values, and fraternity between peoples. From a historical point of view, this is an important asset.

At the level of the negotiations, everything started with the unexpected call from the far-right leader and main ally of Erdoğan, Devlet Bahçeli , on October 22, 2024, for Abdullah Öcalan to come and speak in parliament to declare the end of the armed struggle and the dissolution of the PKK. After a period of very opaque negotiations between the Turkish state and Öcalan, with the participation of a delegation from the DEM Party (a left-wing reformist party from the Kurdish movement) and the leadership of the PKK, the founder of the organization, from his prison on the island of Imrali, in the Marmara Sea, announced in a letter on February 27, 2025, that the PKK was to dissolve.

We don't know what the debates were within the organization. There had already been tensions between Apo and the organization's Presidential Council in previous negotiations. Therefore, it is difficult to imagine that the PKK leadership would have quickly agreed on a process declared so abruptly. The organization's leadership strongly emphasizes that the entire process must be led by Öcalan, which can be perceived as a desire not to take direct responsibility for it.

The disarmament of the PKK certainly constitutes an important basis for a demilitarization of the Kurdish question, even though the Erdoğan regime will undeniably try to steer this process according to its interests and in particular to break the alliance between the Kurdish movement and the bourgeois-democratic opposition led by the CHP [4] ,criminalized by the regime. However, we still do not know what democratic advances the Kurds will be able to benefit from with the dissolution of the PKK. A parliamentary commission will probably be formed to determine the measures to be taken. These should include, in a first step, the release of political prisoners (linked to the Kurdish movement), the withdrawal of the guardianship (*kayyum*) of Kurdish municipalities and the return of mayors to their functions, the reinstatement of "peace academics" to their work and the possibility for Öcalan to freely lead his movement, to be able to communicate with the outside world, to receive visits, etc.

According to the Kurdish movement, other, more structural reforms should follow, concerning the status of their national identity and culture within Turkish society, which would require a new constitution. Erdoğan is planning to change the constitution in order to be able to run in the next elections. Will it be a constitution that will guarantee rights to the Kurds while consolidating the autocratic nature of the regime? The question is controversial, but we are not there yet.

Another issue is the order in which the steps will be taken. Will the state wait until the complete surrender of arms is complete before implementing the supposed democratic reforms, or will the two processes overlap? It seems that Erdogan is opting for the first option—which is difficult for the PKK

to accept—while Bahçeli seems more realistic on this point.

What political developments has Turkey experienced since the movement against the imprisonment of Istanbul Mayor İmamoğlu ?

After March 19, we witnessed a social mobilization the likes of which we hadn't seen in a long time. Millions of citizens took to the streets to defend elected mayors, the right to vote, democracy, and freedom. Although the movement was extremely heterogeneous, there was a notable radicalization, particularly among university and high school students.

As is often the case after spontaneous outbursts, the movement's momentum faded after a while. However, momentum persisted for a while thanks to boycott campaigns against certain capitalist groups that supported the AKP. But in the absence of sustainable social struggle bases, platforms, and coordination capable of prolonging resistance—aside from occasional calls for meetings launched by the CHP—it can be said that today the movement has lost its momentum in the streets, even though indignation remains very much present.

But the regime continues its crackdown on the CHP, with successive waves of arrests in various Istanbul municipalities. Eleven mayors are currently detained awaiting trial. A final "anti-corruption" wave has been launched against the former CHP mayor of İzmir and his staff (a total of 160 people in custody). Today is the hundredth day since İmamoğlu 's arrest , and the indictment is still not ready. This clearly shows the extent to which the Erdoğan regime is acting in a completely arbitrary manner. Furthermore, there is also a legal attempt to split the CHP. A trial has been opened for alleged irregularities at the 2023 CHP congress, at which Özgür Özel , the new party chairman, was elected – a leader who, since İmamoğlu 's arrest, has pursued an opposition policy of unusual firmness for the CHP.

However, Kemal Kilicdaroglu, the former party chairman (and former presidential candidate, who lost to Erdogan in 2023), has suggested, in a spirit of revenge, that he could take over the party leadership if the congress were to be cancelled. He also claims that he believes the mobilization that began on March 19 was pointless, that it is a matter between Imamoglu and the judiciary. Thus, there is a clear and public tension between Kilicdaroglu's team and those of Özel and Imamoglu . For the time being, the trial has been postponed until September.

What is the state of the labour movement today?

The labour movement's trade union organizations played virtually no role in this protest movement. The working class did not identify with the movement. A significant portion of it remains receptive to Erdoğan's propaganda, despite a dramatic deterioration in purchasing power over the past several years. And so far, very little effort has been made (particularly by the radical, anti-capitalist, revolutionary left) to make people understand that the democratic question and the social question are intimately linked.

Democratic aspirations must be fertilized with class content. The "proletarian shock" of which Ernst Bloch spoke is still the main thing missing from the fight against the regime. This is the most important, historically decisive, and difficult strategic task facing the revolutionary left. It is about breaking the cultural-religious divide, the maintenance and deepening of which is the AKP's main weapon, and replacing it with class polarization.

But to return to the weakness of unions in the movement, there are several reasons for this. First of all, the rate of unionization is low in Turkey, at only around 15 per cent. And it must be taken into account that this percentage only includes "declared " workers , therefore not those who work illegally. Thus, the actual level of unionization is even lower.

Moreover, the largest union confederations are conservative and right-wing nationalist. Some are fully in the AKP fold. So we shouldn't expect any strikes from them, especially in the current political climate. DISK and KESK are the most left-wing confederations. But here, as elsewhere, the links between unions and their members are not always very organic, and there are serious doubts that workers will participate massively in these strikes. Especially since this can represent a serious risk of losing one's job, given that the laws, and even the Constitution, no longer mean anything in this country. For several years, every strike has been banned ("postponed") because it would undermine national security.

However, in June 2025 there was a strike of 23,000 workers at the Izmir city hall, with a main, very legitimate demand: to obtain wage increases and equal pay with colleagues who do the same work. The strike was led by the Genel-Iş union linked to DISK, organized mainly in the CHP city halls and in strong collusion with them. The strike lasted only less than a week and the workers obtained significant gains at the end of it [5]. But the rank and file of the CHP and the "white collar" fraction of the working class reacted to this strike in a very negative way: "you are playing into the hands of the AKP by weakening our city halls", "why are garbage collectors demanding the same salary as doctors?" This reaction has shown us once again how solidarity and class consciousness always need to be rebuilt even (and perhaps especially) in times of mobilization against a dictatorial regime.

What is the mood among the population regarding the wars waged by Israel?

Anti-Zionism is, by all accounts, a position shared almost unanimously by the population. But there are some difficulties in building a united movement in support of Palestine and against the Israeli offensive against Iran. Erdoğan's Islamist and nationalist regime naturally adopts an anti-Israeli stance and organizes large rallies in solidarity with Palestine. But it has been shown that trade with Israel and financial and military relations with Tel Aviv continue! Recently, Selçuk Bayraktar , Erdoğan's son-in-law and manufacturer of the famous Turkish drones, announced the creation of a joint venture with Leonardo, an Italian company criticized for its arms sales to Israel and targeted by protests in several cities around the world. Moreover, the Kürecik radar system, in the NATO military base in Malatya province, is directly integrated into the Israeli defence network. Therefore, Erdoğan's anti-Zionism is more rhetoric than concrete facts.

Another difficulty is that the Kurdish movement rarely mobilizes on the Palestinian issue. Relations between the Kurdish movement and the Palestinian resistance—whether Öcalan and Arafat, the PKK with the PLO, or Hamas—have been marked by tensions and disagreements since the 1990s. More recently, Cemil Bayık, one of the PKK leaders, had criticized Hamas's methods during Operation Al-Aqsa Flood and declared that the Palestinian and Jewish peoples must find ways to live in brotherhood. But a more circumstantial reason undoubtedly lies in Washington and Tel Aviv's support for the YPG (included in the SDF), [6] seen as an ally in Syria. Öcalan had also strongly criticized this situation. During his meeting with the DEM delegation on April 21, 2025, he stated, speaking of the SDF, that "Israel has formed its own Hashd al- Shaabi" (pro-Iranian militias operating in Iraq).

Can there be a new convergence between the Kurdish movement and the opposition, despite Erdoğan's manoeuvres?

It should be remembered that the convergence between the Kurdish movement and the secular bourgeois opposition worked especially well for the elections. These two opposition forces needed each other to triumph over the regime's forces, both at the municipal and presidential levels. Ultimately, this was not enough to overthrow Erdoğan in 2023. It is very difficult to predict what the relationships of forces and the dispositions of each of these elements will be by the next election, scheduled for 2028 but which will most likely take place earlier. Will the peace process continue with all the instability and atmosphere of war that reigns in the Middle East? What state will the CHP be in after this immense attempt to criminalize it? Ekrem Will İmamoğlus be free and, above all, eligible to unite the opposition against Erdoğan?

But I think the key is to forge structures capable of guaranteeing the continuity of struggles against the regime in various areas. Whether it is the fight against the opening of olive groves to mining, the women's movement, the housing crisis – which has become a major problem – the LGBTI movement, or the mobilization of parents against the commodification and Islamization of education, the fundamental objective for the revolutionary left must be to create structures, coordinations and committees in all these fields, to be prepared for the next mass social and/or democratic mobilizations, to prevent this dynamic of combat from evaporating in the space of a few weeks.

4 July 2025

Translated by ***International Viewpoint*** *from* ***Inprecor***.It is an updated version of the one conducted for the Swiss site **SolidaritéS** .

Footnotes

[1] The memorandum of March 12, 1971, marked a "Turkish-style" military coup, in which the army, without directly seizing power, imposed an authoritarian government under the pretext of restoring order. This intervention aimed to crush the burgeoning labour and student movements, establishing a brutal repression against the revolutionary left. However, with the rise to power of Bülent Ecevit in 1973, an amnesty was proclaimed, allowing the release of many left-wing activists imprisoned after the coup.

[2] Our current considers as "stagist" the idea that the revolution in dominated or feudal countries should be achieved in two stages: first the national or bourgeois revolution, which would constitute a democratic capitalism independent of imperialism, and secondly the social revolution. To this conception, we oppose the theory of permanent revolution, which indicates that the two stages must be combined to succeed.

[3] On September 12, 1980, the military seized power, citing clashes between left-wing and right-wing nationalist political groups. This coup d'état destroyed the gains of workers' and popular struggles, established a bloody military dictatorship, and laid the foundations for authoritarian neoliberalism in Türkiye.

[4] Cumhuriyet Halk Partisi, Republican People's Party, created in 1923 by Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, member of the Socialist International and associate member of the Party of European Socialists.

[5] A retroactive 30 per cent wage increase for the first six months of the year and a 19 per cent increase in July. Inflation is above 35 per cent a year in Türkiye, according to official figures.

[6] The People's Protection Units (Kurdish: Yekîneyên Parastina Gel) form the armed wing of the Kurdish Democratic Union Party (PYD) in Syria. The SDF is the Syrian Democratic Forces, which includes the YPG.

What if Genoa wasn't an anomaly?

5 September 2025, by Marco Bertorello

What happened in Genoa in recent days was something rather anomalous, not to say exceptional. A growing movement of international solidarity began with the collection of food supplies and culminated on Saturday evening with a huge march accompanying the departure of the four boats that will participate in the Global Sumud Flotilla. It will attempt to bring humanitarian aid to Gaza and break its isolation.

This is a very partial, immediate account of what happened in my city, which I believe is worth reflecting on. Music for Peace (MfP) is an association that has been collecting food and aid in general for years for people in conflict zones, from Palestine to Sudan, to mention perhaps the most significant, and for the city's poor. It decided to participate in the flotilla by collecting food aid. Together with MfP, among the first promoters were the dockworkers of Calp (Collettivo autonomo lavoratori portuali, Autonomous Collective of Port Workers). After years of protests against Saudi ships passing through to bring weapons for the war in Yemen, the recent actions against the Chinese ship that was supposed to deliver war material to Israel and yet another Saudi ship, represented a quantum leap.

In both cases, in fact, the dockworkers, with growing public interest, managed to prevent the passage of weapons through the port. That same attention has grown exponentially in recent days. After the MfP appeal to collect 40 tons of food to send to Gaza, the city mobilized in an way we have not seen for some time. Trade unions, neighbourhood committees, associations, scouts, sports clubs, and many individual citizens queued up in front of the Music for Peace headquarters. The collected material reached nearly 300 tons, so much so that the promoters had to call a stop because there was no more space to store the food. Some of the volunteers who showed up to pack and load the food were turned away because there were too many of them and they were getting in the way.

In this climate of growing mobilization, the Saturday evening march took place at 9 p.m. on a Saturday at the end of August. The police said there were about 40,000 people. The city now has less than 570,000 inhabitants. It was a size that I had not seen in Genoa since the G8 summit almost 25 years ago. It was a mix of citizens of all generations, with a rather low average age, which is rare for an old city like Genoa. The organizers had asked people to bring only Palestinian flags. Peace flags were spontaneously added to these. An almost futile appeal: what other flags could represent this people at the moment?

At the end of the march, a former member of parliament from the Democratic Party said: "If this demonstration had been organized by the PD and CGIL, there would have been two hundred of us." Maybe not two hundred, but perhaps not more than a 1,000.

The mixture of spontaneity and grassroots organization was evident. The decisive factors in such a large mobilization was the concrete goal of aid, as well as the political aim of truly contesting a genocide that too few recognize. People who had not taken to the streets in a long time, chanted "Free Palestine" and sang "Bella ciao." There were many improvised signs, which were accurate and ironic, as often happens when a mobilization is widespread among large sections of the population. It was a huge march for Genoa, which tells us what had been brewing for some time, at least on this issue, and of the desire or willingness to return together to the streets, to protest, to mobilize in the flesh.

This was a procession with an unusual route. Starting from the MfP headquarters, it went along the elevated road, which is always closed to pedestrians, and arrived at the old port. In the distance, higher up, where trains emerge from two long tunnels, train drivers sounded their horns to greet the demonstrators. On the other side, by the sea, the dockworkers of the GNV shipping group, having finished their evening shift loading ferries, greeted them with their horns. In short, there was a widespread atmosphere of support, which reminded me of the support received in Corso Torino and Corso Sardegna during the last G8 march, the one following the clashes that had set those very streets ablaze. I recall the surprising show of support from the residents who threw water from their windows to cool the demonstrators during those scorching and tragic days of July 2001.

The epicenter these days, however, has been the MfP headquarters, a place between Sampierdarena and the city centre. A place surrounded by traffic, workshops by day and prostitutes by night, now dominated by the arrival of the superstore Esselunga. place that, in its (r)existence A place that, in its (re)existence as a social space within a busy traffic junction, has managed to attract thousands of people from all over the city.

It was impressive to see so many people gathered in such an unusual place. MfP has been organizing its parties there for years, but Saturday's turnout was undeniably higher than usual.

The march, here is a video, ended in the Old Port, in front of the boats ready to depart. There were many speeches behind a giant Palestinian flag hoisted on the masts of the boats. The audience was large, despite the late hour and the long walk. Among the most appreciated was that of the main animator of Music for Peace, Stefano Rebora, his voice worn out from the fatigue of the last few days. He was followed by port historian Riccardo Rudino, who announced that if the action in support of the Palestinian people is hindered, then the dockworkers will not only block weapons for Israel, but will block everything destined for that country. [1] Mayor Silvia Salis emphasized that a city awarded a gold medal for the Resistance cannot fail to support those who resist.

The representative of the Genoese Curia spoke about how, since the G8 summit in this city, people believe that another world is possible. The finale was left to the artist Pietro Morello, who asked everyone not to remain silent and invited them to sing Bella ciao one last time. Finally, the boats departed, announced by fireworks set off by the Calp dockworkers and followed by an excited and grateful crowd who watched them sail away as far as they could see.

I am writing this article not only because I am excited (you can tell, right?), but precisely because I don't get excited easily. I think it was an important moment for my city. I don't know what it might mean for the future and for other cities, but it seems to me to be a possible barometer of the social climate. I hope it is not just a passing anomaly. In difficult times, there is always room for the unexpected, the surprising - in short, for humanity.

1 September 2025

Translated for **International Viewpoint** by Dave Kellaway from **Jacobin Italia**.

Footnotes

[1] Novaramedia, 2 September 2025, "Italian Dockworkers Threaten to 'Shut Down All of Europe' If Gaza Aid Flotilla Is Blocked".

Storm in a Coffee Cup – a catalogue of global warming effects

4 September 2025, by Phil Hearse

So what's behind this decision – a substantial markdown on the £3.9bn Coca-Cola paid in 2018? The main driver is the spike in prices for customers, caused largely by the climate crisis, which has badly hit producers in Brazil, Vietnam and Colombia.

The increases at chains like Starbucks, Pret a Manger and Costa have been dramatic. Prices in coffee shops are hard to pin down because "premium" city-centre outlets tend to charge more, and transport hubs such as airports and major railway stations much more still. Starbucks lists a tall latte at £3.65, but that price is hard to find. In city centres, it's likely closer to £4.50, and in airports well over £5.

For office and shop workers – those full-time employees with a generous six weeks of holiday – buying coffee on the way to work now costs around £900 a year. True, you can linger in Starbucks and make a coffee last for 90 minutes or more. But not if you're dashing to work.

Climate change is the main factor driving up prices, but another is the rise in fertiliser prices, caused by disruption to Russia's exports – yet another way Putin's war in Ukraine has shaken the global economy. On top of that comes disruption to supplies through the Strait of Hormuz, caused by Houthi attacks on shipping in solidarity with the people of Palestine.

Climate change's impact on coffee reads like a catalogue of global warming effects. Brazil, the world's largest producer of Arabica beans, has suffered major frosts, droughts and storms. Frosts in particular wiped out young trees that take 20 years to replace. Vietnam's Robusta crop – the main bean used in instant coffee – has been battered by storms and droughts. Colombia's crop has suffered similar misfortunes. Experts estimate that by 2050, 40% of land currently used for coffee will be unsuitable for cultivation.

Costa Coffee is said to be in talks with Apollo Global Management, a vast private equity group with holdings across multiple industries, which also owns Waggamama. Its three founding partners have allowed financial giants like BlackRock and Vanguard to take minority stakes.

What might Apollo see in Costa? Perhaps a stripped-down operation that keeps only prime sites – such as central London and airports – where premium prices can be charged. The rest of the estate could be sold off piecemeal. Another option might be to use some outlets to become part of its Wagamama restaurant chain.

Deals of this kind are typically bad news for staff, who often see jobs disappear and conditions worsen. Not that the current situation is brilliant. Full-time baristas in the main coffee chains earn just above the national minimum wage – round £18,000 a year on a 37.5-hour week. That figure looks

impossible to live on when the average rent for a one-bedroom flat in London is £1,500 a month, with two-bed flats averaging £1,900. In fashionable areas, rents are higher still.

For young people living alone – or even with a partner who isn't earning much more – the cost of living is crushing. Two consequences follow: mounting personal debt, as people rely on credit cards for everyday spending; and at the sharpest end, homelessness, particularly among low-skilled, middle-aged men.

Coca-Cola's retreat from coffee reflects a shift in strategy towards "healthier" drinks. Coffee overtook tea in Britain in the late 20th century, ending a 200-year reign. Now, regular consumption of "premium" coffee – anything beyond instant – looks set to become increasingly the preserve of the middle classes.

2 September 2025

*Source: **Anti*Capitalist Resistance**.*

Return from Ukraine

3 September 2025, by Bjarke Friborg

Could you introduce us to Enhedslisten (Red-Green Alliance), its history and political orientations?

The Red-Green Alliance (Enhedslisten) was founded in 1989 as a united front of several radical left traditions in Denmark, notably the Left Socialists, the Communist Party, the Trotskyist SAP (Fourth International) and a Maoist group. After initially struggling to cross the 2% electoral threshold, the Red-Green Alliance entered parliament in 1994 and has since become an important parliamentary and extra-parliamentary force of the Danish left.

Today, the party combines a strong ecosocialist and internationalist profile with an emphasis on growing social inequalities and general questions relating to the working class. We systematically criticise capitalist austerity and an ecological transition that is too slow and incoherent in the face of climate catastrophe. The party works closely with popular movements, trade union activists and remains a pluralist organisation with strong internal democracy. Since 2011, we generally obtain 5 to 7% of the vote nationally, and in the last local elections in 2021, we obtained 24.6% of votes in Copenhagen, making us the most popular political party in the city.

In recent years, debates have taken place around questions such as the EU, NATO, Ukraine and Palestine. Some accuse us of having "betrayed our principles" because we now present socialist candidates to the European Parliament instead of advocating exit from the EU, because we support arms deliveries to Ukraine, even if they transit through NATO, and because we defend a free Palestine whilst condemning Hamas as a far-right terrorist group. However, for the majority of party members, we are simply defending coherent and practical international solidarity in favour of workers', women's and minorities' rights.

The Red-Green Alliance is strongly committed in favour of Ukraine and more particularly in favour of the Ukrainian left. What is the political meaning of this commitment and how does this translate concretely?

From the beginning of the large-scale invasion, we have maintained that this is a question of fundamental solidarity with people who resist oppression and imperialist aggression. The Russian invasion is clearly an imperialist war of conquest, and Ukraine's right to self-determination must be defended, which, in practice, includes military support. This does not mean, however, that we support the Ukrainian government, the oligarchs or corruption.

On the contrary, we collaborate with the Ukrainian left, trade unions and civil society organisations that fight not only for national independence, but also for democracy, social rights and workers' control. In collaboration with the Green party Alternative, and since 2023 via the Danish Institute for Parties and Democracy (DIPD) [1], we have obtained direct financial aid for the progressive organisation Sotsialnyi Rukh (Social Movement). Thanks to this support, they have been able to open social centres in Kyiv, Lviv and in the industrial city of Kryvyi Rih [2], in the east of the country. We are always impressed by the work of these activists, which unequivocally confirms that Ukrainians are not simply pawns on the geopolitical chessboard, but rather the actors of their own struggle for liberation.

Do you think there is a Russian threat to Europe? How do you characterise it?

It is obvious that Russia is itself a European country, and a large one. However, if you are referring to the European Union and allied countries such as Norway, as well as other neighbouring countries of Russia, the threat posed by Putin's regime is undeniably very real. Not necessarily in terms of "tanks entering Paris", but certainly as a threat to democracy, sovereignty and the principle that borders cannot be changed by brute force. As a left organisation, we oppose Russian imperialism just as we have opposed American and NATO imperialism: not by supporting one bloc against another, but by defending peoples' right to self-determination and supporting democratic and progressive forces in Russia and its client state, Belarus.

How do you articulate a policy of popular defence alongside your social emancipation policy? And how is this perceived in the "left" in general?

For us, the key concept is that of popular defence – a democratic defence based on citizens and anchored in civil society, and not a militarised state apparatus serving the interests of corporations, the arms industry and imperialist interventions in Africa, Central Asia or elsewhere. Defence is not limited to weapons and armies, but concerns the collective capacity of people to organise and protect their communities.

Some on the left see this as a contradiction, but we maintain that it is coherent: opposing militarism does not mean ignoring the necessity for peoples to resist aggression. The alternative to popular defence consists of leaving the field open to authoritarian powers.

Faced with the Russian threat, the Western left has found itself helpless. Its mostly obsolete anti-militarist traditions place it in insoluble contradictions. On the one hand it denounces the military-industrial complex and rearmament but on the other it demands arms deliveries for Ukraine. It denounces NATO but remains silent on military alliances between Russia and China. And says nothing about the extraordinary armament effort of the latter. How do you approach these defence and therefore also military questions both at the level of your country and at the European level?

The left has always been divided on security questions, but Russia's large-scale invasion of Ukraine has clearly brought about a new rebalancing and rejection of certain dichotomies. For us, members of the Red-Green Alliance and the Nordic left in general, there is no contradiction between military support for Ukraine, and criticism of NATO and of the arms industry. We firmly condemn Russian aggression, but we also oppose massive [western] military reinforcements based on arbitrary objectives set by Donald Trump.

At the same time, we call for the socialisation of the arms industry, the prohibition of EU arms exports to countries such as Israel and China, and a global security architecture based on mutual disarmament, cooperation and popular sovereignty – and not on a new arms race.

The Danish Red-Green Alliance website

During the last conference of the Danish Red Green Alliance, which dealt notably with defence questions, the SAP (Danish section of the Fourth International) criticised the Alliance for "not having a defence policy radically different from that of the parliamentary mainstream" and therefore aligning yourselves with bourgeois parties. What do you have to say to this accusation?

The conference approved a new defence and security policy that supports the provision of arms to Ukraine and the strengthening of territorial defence of Denmark, Greenland and the Faroe Islands [3], whilst rejecting a general strengthening of military capabilities, an international arms race and granting military powers to the EU. This clearly distinguishes us from all other parties represented in parliament. Regarding the SAP, the group has mainly warned the Red-Green Alliance against any illusions about reforming NATO or the EU. These two organisations are composed of imperialist states pursuing their own interests, and any military strengthening will ultimately serve these interests rather than international solidarity or protection of democracy in countries such as Moldova and Georgia. I understand and respect this criticism, whilst emphasising that the SAP has always supported arming Ukraine and does not explicitly oppose investments in civil preparedness or better protection against hybrid warfare and cyber attacks.

Further information

On the other hand, some members of the Red-Green Alliance proposed an alternative declaration that rejected without distinction any type of investment linked to the idea of territorial defence, whilst de facto abandoning Ukraine and warning against "choosing sides" in a war that is "equally" a proxy war. I am pleased that this declaration was rejected.

Denmark's armed forces are unusual. There is a non-commissioned officers' union which is a member of the workers' confederation LO. What do you think of the functioning and organisation of the Danish army?

In all Nordic countries and in the Netherlands, soldiers and officers have trade unions with collective bargaining rights and elected representatives. The unions are integrated into the labour market system, but their role consists of representing subordinates as employees, which differs from the democratic popular control over armed forces envisaged by the Red-Green Alliance.

Historically, relations between the Danish left and the main military union HKKF (Union of Soldiers and Corporals) have alternated between cooperation and tensions. In the 1970s, the so-called "red soldiers" movement among conscripts challenged military hierarchies, NATO and Danish defence policy, demanding better conditions and more democratic influence. The HKKF, which represents professional soldiers, adopted a more moderate and loyal position, which some members of the left judged too close to the system, even though collaboration was established on practical questions such as housing and working hours. Today, the HKKF functions as a traditional trade union focused on wages and working conditions. It should be noted that in 2018, its president was the chief negotiator for 180,000 civil servants on the brink of a general strike. Danish soldiers join demonstrations in uniform and support social media campaigns, notably through posts by personnel deployed in Afghanistan brandishing solidarity slogans.

From this point of view, following your recent trips to Ukraine, what can you tell us about the Ukrainian army? Both in terms of its social composition (essentially working class) and its functioning, the Ukrainian army is surprising. We know that there exists within it, for example, an LGBTQ military

union or that unionised workers in uniform are in permanent contact with the trade unions of which they are members.

As part of a Red-Green Alliance delegation, I met several progressive civil society organisations and trade unions in Ukraine that all demonstrated strong commitment in favour of the defence effort and army performance. This included general and targeted support for soldiers, specific groups and units, as well as veterans. From a left perspective, I find the Solidarity Collectives particularly remarkable because they channel direct aid to anti-fascists, trade unionists and eco-activists on the front, with support from a vast international grassroots network.

Beyond their humanitarian efforts, they also participate in artisanal drone production which has clearly become an important element of international solidarity efforts. Further information. These forms of civilian and military interactions are very different from the situation in countries like Denmark, but they are of course entirely understandable whilst missiles continue to rain down on Ukrainian homes, farms and cities.

Fundamentally, this reflects the fact that Ukraine's defence clearly does not rest solely on a permanent army composed of professionals and conscripts, but on a popular war effort, with the army being composed of ordinary workers, trade unionists, students, LGBTQ people and volunteers who fight for their communities. As a result, there exists an extraordinary degree of interaction between civilians and the military, with activist networks and non-profit organisations providing everything from medical supplies to home-built drones.

The mainstream media tends to highlight sophisticated Western weapons and financial aid worth several billion dollars. However, what often goes unnoticed are the popular fundraising campaigns and self-organised production networks that support Ukrainian resistance daily. At the same time, soldiers still do not benefit from essential rights, even in wartime. There are no transparent rules regarding rest, demobilisation or rehabilitation, and official trade union organisations are prohibited. However, new initiatives have emerged to fill this gap. Initiatives such as the LGBTQ Military Union of Ukraine or the "Invisible Battalion" (which focuses on women in war) have gained prominence, whilst the progressive organisation Sotsialnyi Rukh has set up its own helpline and provides free legal aid to soldiers, veterans and their families.

More information

Do other left parties in Scandinavia and Northern Europe more or less share your positions? How do you collaborate or envisage collaborating?

The Red-Green Alliance collaborates closely with left parties in the region – the Swedish Vänsterpartiet, Norwegian Rødt and the Finnish Left Alliance, as well as with movements in Iceland and the Baltic countries [4]. We do not always agree on all tactical questions, but we all recognise that solidarity with Ukraine is indispensable and that we must redefine left security policy for a new era. Our objective is to build a Nordic and European network that links support for Ukraine to a broader, socialist, feminist and ecological vision of security, beyond militarism.

27 August 2025

*Interview conducted by **Michel Lanson** and **Patrick Le Tréhondat** for the Bastille Network (France). Translated for ESSF by Adam Novak.*

Footnotes

[1] The Danish Institute for Parties and Democracy (DIPD) is a Danish organisation that provides support for democratic development and party cooperation internationally

[2] Kryvyi Rih is a major industrial city in central Ukraine, known for its iron ore mining and steel production

[3] Greenland and the Faroe Islands are autonomous territories within the Kingdom of Denmark

[4] The Baltic countries - Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania - gained independence from Soviet rule in 1991 and joined NATO and the EU in 2004

More pay, but less union democracy - A complicated strike victory at Air Canada

2 September 2025, by David Camfield

Flight attendants at Air Canada (AC) and Air Canada Rouge, around 10,500 workers, went on strike from August 16 to early in the morning on August 19. The workforce is 70 percent women and mostly young—three-quarters of them have under five years of seniority. They are members of the Canadian Union of Public Employees (CUPE) because AC was once a federal Crown Corporation (a publicly owned company) that was then privatized.

Workers had been on strike for only a few hours when the Liberal federal government intervened. The jobs minister told the Canada Industrial Relations Board (CIRB), the federal labor board in whose jurisdiction workers in air transport fall, to direct the union to end the strike and order

that the dispute be resolved through binding arbitration. This intervention was widely expected, since the Liberals have done this before on several occasions, using Section 107 of the Canada Labour Code.

On most of those occasions, union officials simply complied, but this time they didn't. The workers stayed on strike.

CUPE National President Mark Hancock tore up the CIRB back-to-work order in front of a cheering crowd of strikers at Toronto's Pearson Airport. The message from CUPE's top officers and those of CUPE's Air Canada component was clear: The only way the strike would be settled would be through negotiations. This was undisguised defiance of the order under Section 107, whose legitimacy CUPE officials rejected.

Hancock said he was willing to go to jail if that's what it came to. This can happen. CUPE National President Grace Hartman did time in jail back in 1981 for not ordering Ontario hospital workers who were on an illegal strike to return to work, and Jean-Claude Parrot of the Canadian Union of Postal Workers was jailed in 1978 for not telling members to respect a back-to-work law passed to end a postal strike.

The strike was absolutely solid, which was no surprise because the strike authorization vote had been 99.7 percent in favor, with a 94.6 percent turnout. Flight attendants were strongly in support of the key union demands: significant wage increases to make up for all the erosion of the buying power of their wages under the previous contract—which had been a ten-year collective agreement!—and an end to the unpaid work that'd long been accepted in the industry. This work is just part of the job for flight attendants, who have only been paid for the time the plane is in the air, not for any time they spend on the plane while it's on the ground, before or after a flight.

Although the strike completely grounded AC flights, and was disruptive for travelers, there was a lot of sympathy for the flight attendants. CUPE officials had laid the groundwork for this with effective public communications efforts focused on the issue of unpaid work. Members of other unions and other pro-union people started to join the picket lines. For many active union members, leftists, and, I think, lots of other working-class people, seeing Hancock tearing up the back-to-work order and insisting that the strike wouldn't end until the union had negotiated an agreement was electrifying. For anyone who's been dismayed by the federal government's use of Section 107 to snuff out strikes and worried about how that gives the idea to provincial governments that they could add similar provisions to the provincial labor laws that cover about 90 percent of workers in the Canadian state, CUPE drawing a line against the back-to-work order was really inspiring.

The Canadian Labour Congress, the equivalent of the AFL-CIO in the U.S., put out a statement on August 17 demanding that the order be withdrawn. It pledged financial and other support for the strike, and "unwavering solidarity" if the government took legal action against CUPE. No surprise that it was vague about what action that commitment would translate into, but it was still unequivocal support for a law-defying strike. And it called on the government to pledge not to use Section 107 against a strike again and to remove that section from the law as soon as parliament next sits.

The strike continued into Monday, August 18, with bargaining suspended, but that evening it was announced that the union's bargaining team would be meeting with Air Canada. Early in the morning on Tuesday, they announced a deal had been reached and the strike was over. CUPE's statement made it sound like a great victory had been won:

> Flight attendants at Air Canada and Air Canada Rouge have reached a tentative agreement, achieving transformational change for our industry after a historic fight to affirm our Charter rights. Unpaid work is over. We have reclaimed our voice and our power. When our rights were taken away, we stood strong, we fought back—and we secured a tentative agreement that our members can vote on.

That's how most people who supported the strike are thinking about the outcome, but it didn't take long before facts came out that paint a different picture.

The tentative agreement that flight attendants will be voting on only gives them a choice between ratifying the deal and rejecting it, in which case wages will be settled by arbitration, but everything else that was negotiated will end up in the collective agreement anyway. That's not at all how the collective bargaining process works in the Canadian state. Unionized workers have the right to vote to accept or reject a tentative agreement in its entirety, unless binding arbitration is being used to determine outcomes. But in this case, very unusually, and because the CIRB had declared the strike was over in legal terms, workers have been presented with a ratification vote that doesn't allow them to actually reject the deal. CUPE officials have agreed to a settlement that denies workers that right and prevents them from going on strike again to fight for a better deal in this round. They didn't win a negotiated tentative agreement that workers could accept or truly reject, which would have treated the back-to-work order as a dead letter, let alone force a withdrawal of the order.

Workers have been presented with a ratification vote that doesn't allow them to actually reject the deal.

As for what's in the four-year tentative agreement, there are wage increases. For people with under five years of seniority, it's 12 percent in the first year, and for the rest, it's 8 percent. After that, it's 3 percent, 2.5 percent, and 2.75 percent. And there is partial ground pay, for an hour or just over one hour per leg of a flight, depending on the width of the plane body, with percentages rising from 50 percent of the hourly pay rate this year to 70 percent in 2028. Those are gains, absolutely, but that doesn't mean that unpaid work is over or that this is a

transformational change.

The ratification vote is ongoing, from August 27 to September 6, online and by phone, and I expect that some won't vote at all because of their disappointment, anger, and resignation from knowing that even if they reject the deal, they won't be allowed to fight for a better one. But because expectations were high, maybe a majority will vote no. Although it's hypothetically possible that flight attendants could reject the deal and then go on a wildcat strike that defies the law and their union officials, I don't think that's going to happen. There would have to be really strong organization among rank-and-file workers outside of the official union structure, with confident militant rank-and-file leaders, preconditions that seem doubtful right now.

All in all, I think the outcome is a partial and complicated win. Workers won real gains in pay, but they don't have the right to reject a deal and fight for a better one. What's happened seems unlikely to be a big deterrent to the federal government using Section 107 to end strikes in the future.

It's worth pointing out that negotiating a deal that workers don't have the right to actually reject had advantages both for the company and for CUPE officials. The company got a guarantee that the strike wouldn't resume, and union officials got insulation against rank and file pressure to fight for a better deal and lead more strike action.

Also, the outcome of a deal that workers can't genuinely reject is bad for union-building. It's not democratic. It took the decision about whether the deal was good enough out of workers' hands. This isn't going to encourage the most militant workers who were really inspired by striking to get more involved in the union.

A bigger victory was definitely possible. Air Canada was completely grounded. They were losing a lot of money, so they were under a lot of pressure. Management was completely unprepared for what happened. They expected the federal government would intervene and then CUPE officials would tell workers to comply with a back-to-work order. During the strike, CUPE put out an online graphic with a quote from an interview that AC's CEO Michael Rousseau did with BNN Bloomberg on August 18. Rousseau said, "Well, we thought, obviously, that Section 107 would be enforced, and that they wouldn't illegally avoid Section 107."

If the strike had gone on longer, I think CUPE could have won a much bigger win for flight attendants and for the working class as a whole. Even if they hadn't forced the government to rescind the order, they could have won a deal with bigger gains that ignored the back-to-work order—a deal that workers could ratify or truly reject. That would have been an amazing precedent. And if there had been sympathy job action by any airport workers or any workers at WestJet, which is AC's main competitor, like slowdowns, calling in sick, or not crossing picket lines, other employers would have been freaking out behind the scenes and leaning on AC to settle. I don't know if any sympathy action would've happened if the strike had lasted longer, since it's illegal and most workers today have no experience of doing it, but it's not impossible that at least a little bit could have happened, especially if the government had moved to punish CUPE for defying the law.

So why did CUPE officials end the strike the way they did? For the top people at CUPE National, I think the main goal was to negotiate a settlement with some gains for flight attendants. They didn't want to have everything decided by an arbitrator. After the government intervened, that was still their overriding goal. Winning a political victory against the use of Section 107 against strikes, which would have been a victory for the working class as a whole, was secondary. Once they forced AC back to the bargaining table, they dropped that objective and focused on the main goal.

Why did they do that? Above all, they're committed to collective bargaining. That legally-regulated, tightly-controlled process is at the core of what the layer of full-time union officials, both elected officers and staff, do—that, along with handling grievances, which is how disputes over workers' rights in collective agreements are dealt with in between rounds of collective bargaining.

I think the top leaders at CUPE have shown that they're prepared to support militant action if that's what it takes to preserve conventional collective bargaining. That makes them different from the heads of many other unions. Blatant government intervention with back-to-work orders and back-to-work legislation undermines conventional collective bargaining. So they're sometimes willing to support workers challenging it or even lead that challenge, as they just did. They're willing to sometimes use militant tactics to fight for goals that aren't radical.

We need to remember that defying the law can lead to massive fines for unions. That can damage unions as institutions, even threaten their ability to operate. For the union officialdom of full-time officers and staff, that's a different kind of problem than it is for rank and file union members, because they depend on the union machine in order to keep on functioning as officials. So once CUPE's top officers saw a path to getting a deal that would end the strike and put an end to the threat of big fines or charges against them for defying the law, they went for it.

A knowledgeable CUPE person put it to me this way: "You have to hand it to National for playing their cards so well—they effectively posture as bold militants to the membership and public, while effectively containing struggles within status quo parameters. They get their cake and eat it too."

This isn't the first time they've done it. In 2022, when CUPE's Ontario School Board Council of Unions (OSBCU) was in bargaining and then was hit with pre-emptive provincial legislation to stop them from striking, they defied the law and struck anyway. Organizing toward sympathy strikes to support OSBCU started to happen. As soon as the provincial premier said he'd withdraw the law if the strike

ended, CUPE National officials and other union officials put pressure on the president of OSBCU to accept the offer and go back to bargaining without the power of striking workers and their many supporters as leverage. And that's what happened.

From a distance, the outcome of the Air Canada strike can easily look like what CUPE National said it was. So lots of people probably think it was simply a tremendous win. That will encourage union activists to use it as a positive example. They can say, "Look, CUPE defied the law and won, that's what we should prepare to do if we have to." That's good. It's good that flight attendants showed you can have a strike that's popular and that defies the law and wins, even though it causes inconveniences for lots of people. It's good that Hancock tearing up the back-to-work order was all over the news.

But what actually happened wasn't what it looks like from afar. To me, what happened confirms that we can't rely on the union officialdom to fight to win in a consistent way, even when the officials are more militant. Union members who want unions that are really militant, democratic and solidaristic need to organize themselves on their own and work to change our unions. We need to build caucuses, groups of members who take to heart what the Clyde Workers' Committee said in Scotland back in 1915: "We will support the officials just so long as they rightly represent the workers, but we will act independently immediately they misrepresent them."

For more on this strike, check out episode 57 of the podcast Victor's Children.

30 August 2025

Source **Tempest**.

Trump Fires Top Officials, Seizes Control of American Cities

1 September 2025, by Dan La Botz

First, he fired Bureau of Labor Statistics Commissioner Erika McEntarfer, claiming she had "faked" jobs numbers to make it look like Trump's economic policies were failing; then he fired Lisa D. Cook, a governor of the Federal Reserve Bank, the U.S. central bank, accusing her of mortgage fraud; and finally, he fired Susan Monarez, the director of the Centers for Disease Control because she resisted Health Secretary Robert F. Kennedy's anti-scientific and dangerous health policies. No other president has carried out such firings of the heads of what have been virtually sacrosanct institutions that regulate our economy and protect public health.

While carrying out such political assassinations at the highest level of government, Trump has also asserted his power on the streets of American cities. When Angelinos protested against Trump's immigration raids and round ups, leading to confrontations between protestors and L.A. police, Trump federalized the National Guard, sending two thousand guardsmen to L.A. as well as 700 U.S. Marines, and many ICE agents in June. Both L.A. Mayor Karen Bass and California Governor Gavin Newsom called the military occupation of part of the city unnecessary and authoritarian.

In mid-August, Trump declared a "crime emergency" in the nation's capital and took control of the Washington, D.C. National Guard and the city police department. On August 8, Trump sent hundreds of Federal officials from other agencies, such as the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), to begin patrolling the streets of Washington. While Washington has areas with high crime rates, in fact murder and other violent crime rates have been falling. Since Washington, D.C. is a federal district and not a state, he is constitutionally empowered to take control of the city. But he has also promised to send Federal agencies and troops into other cities: Chicago, New York, Baltimore, and Oakland, all governed by Democrats.

As Trump announced that he would be sending National Guard troops and federal agents to California, the state's governor, Gavin Newsome brought suit in federal court and won a temporary restraining order. He said, "The President's action to turn the military against its own citizens threatened our democracy and moved us dangerously close to authoritarianism. We will continue to stand up for our democracy and the rights of all Americans."

In Illinois, both governor J.B. Pritzker and Chicago Mayor Brandon Johnson condemned Trump's plan to send U.S. troops, saying it was unnecessary and a threat to American democracy. Some 19 Democratic Party governors have also asserted that they don't want Trump sending soldiers and federal police to their states. Trump's troops and agents make little contribution to policing, but they lay the basis for a future military coup.

"No Kings Day," the peaceful protest across the United States, on June 14, 2025, was the largest protest on one day in U.S. history, but in August protests abated.

The Democratic Socialist of America (DSA), the country's largest socialist organization with 80,000 members, held its convention in Chicago last month. DSA's many caucuses—left, right, and center—wrangled over procedures and passed a resolution in support of Palestine, but there was little to no discussion of American politics and the question of how to stop Trump.

But fall is now almost here and we can expect larger protests as students go back to their campuses and people go back to work. We will be in the streets with millions of others.

31 August 2025