

WORLD WAR III HAS BEGUN

THERE IS
ANOTHER
WAY



Read Öcalan's
proposals for
peace and
democratic society

World War III Has Begun

“Could it not be that the Third World War, which is so often talked about, is taking place within this unreal, virtual world? Is it not possible that the wars fought in the actual world are simply their manifestations?”

- Abdullah Öcalan, Capitalism

Introduction

Are we in a world war? Maybe the question should be, in a world system that thrives on environmental destruction and genocide, how can we say that we are not?

The Kurdish Freedom Movement has stated that WWII started after the fall of the soviet union in the early 1990's. Today everyone from the Pope to Georgia Meloni are proclaiming the world war. If we are living such a time in history then maybe the time has come to ask "what should we do about it?".

This brochure contains extracts from the books written in prison by the leader of the Kurdish Freedom Movement, Abdullah Öcalan. His theses on peace and democratic society are becoming more and more necessary each day to understand and confront the Leviathan we are facing.



"It's true that World War III is taking place in the Middle East in a unique way. However, certain particularities distinguish this war from classic military-political aspects. Although defining it as a **clash of civilizations** is correct, its content is often incorrectly interpreted.

Frequently, not enough attention is paid to its historical and social dimensions—what side particular forces are on and their methods and goals are not clear. Even though there is plenty of talk about various plans and projects, the war in question appears to lack a plan and to almost be running on its own steam.

We are, so to speak, faced with a war that aims to create chaos."
- Beyond State, Power and Violence

1. Describing War

Nation-State, Power and Fascism

From Democratic Civilisation Solution

The nation-state is not just any form of power. Its significance goes beyond being the most advanced form of state power. It is a state formation in the wake of which fascism developed. The hegemony of capitalist monopolism in the economy is only made possible by the expansion and organization of state power at the level of society. The nation-state is defined by this meaning. Fascism is the stage that this form of state reaches when it is at war internally with the oppressed and exploited social groups and at war with competing external powers. The difference between them is similar to the difference between the process of peace and the process of war. In both cases, political structures are liquidated. Power is homogenized like society. The homogenized society is consolidated as a homogenized power. The fascist state then expresses the maximum unity of the homogeneous society and the state. “One language, one fatherland, one culture, one flag, one nation” is its main motto. Obviously, it does not offer a solution for a reality as complex and diverse as the social nature but rather creates problems of enormous proportions. It is the process known as social cancer. It will either swallow up the whole of society or be cut out and discarded as a social tumor.

The lives of all the different cultures, ethnicities, languages, political structures, ideas, and beliefs that have accumulated throughout history are under threat. The more their resistance and coexistence with their differences unfolds, the more openly the fascist face of the nation-state comes to light. Even if they present themselves as socialist, states, movements, or parties that oppose social diversity and difference in this way cannot avoid becoming fascist. The nation-state is either built by such movements and parties or it builds such movements and parties. Even if bourgeois liberalism advocates a liberal understanding of the state (a minimal state) with antifascist and anticommunist slogans, it is

adopting a completely deceptive position. Liberalism itself is both the mother and father of the nation-state. The nation-state is the ideal form of state for liberalism, both in its formative and mature phases. Consequently, just as the reality of capitalism that produces fascism becomes one with the nation-state, so too does its reality that produces state socialism (real socialism).

The fact that more blood has been shed, that more massacres and genocides have been carried out in the national wars that have taken place worldwide over the last five hundred years than ever before in the history of civilization, especially in the last century, shows in an obvious and remarkable way that the nation-state and fascism do not represent a solution for society but rather form the huge and incredibly cruel seventh source of problems.

Industrialism and Fascism

From Democratic Civilisation Solution

Fascism as the war regime of the nation-state is a product of the circumstances of industrialism. In the history of capitalism, in the industrial age, where maximum profit is achieved, the escalation of civil war is inevitable. Maximum profit and maximum capital cannot be realized without a war against society. The nation-state of the industrial age must, by the law of maximizing profit, organize itself as a regime of civil war. That power permeates every pore of society in the nation-state represents the most generalized state of civil war, which is also the definition of fascism. At the same time, it is inherent to the nature of civil war that extreme nationalism expresses itself in the ideology of fascism.

The fact that war has become globalized in the age of industrialism was proven by the two world wars. The internal war is complemented by the external war. The fact that the most intense civil wars and other wars in history have occurred in the last two centuries—that is, in the age of industrialism—and that nationalism functions as the official religion can be explained by the relationship between fascism and industrial

capital. Genocide is a consequence of the totalization of the wars of this period (their encompassing of the whole of society). The fundamental social question of the age of industrialism, in the face of nation-state fascism as a form of war, is the development of the self-defense front of the oppressed classes, peoples, and nations.

Society's Militarism Problem

From Sociology of Freedom.

Militarism is the most advanced form of antisocial monopolism. It is not unrealistic to assume that the initial effort to establish authority over social nature to oppress and exploit people was the result of the analytical thought and action of a “crafty strongman” from a hunting tradition. Essentially, he attempted to establish his authority over two key groups: the hunters at his side and the women he was trying to confine to the home. Along the way, as shamans (proto-priests) and gerontocratic elements (groups of elders) joined the crafty strongman, the first hierarchical authority was formed in many societies in various forms. With the transition to civilization, the crafty strongman, and his entourage—now the official power—institutionalized themselves as the military arm of the state (the initial monopoly of the economy based on the usurpation of surplus product). The three successive dynasties of Ur that followed in the immediate wake of the priest-king period of Sumerian society reflect this development, and many other communities had parallel experiences. In the Epic of Gilgamesh, it is possible to follow step-by-step the way the kingdom was clearly detached from the goddess Inanna tradition (the tradition of goddess-priestesses) and the way priestesses were weakened and confined to houses (both public and private).

If we see Gilgamesh as symbolic of the first commander in history, we can better analyze the rise of the militarist tradition. This tradition's task was to hunt down people to meet the city's need for slaves. With the help of the collaborationist Enkidu, who is mentioned in the Epic of Gilgamesh, they hunted the so-called wild barbarian tribes (practitioners of the Humbaba religion) living in the north of present-day Iraq. It is

obvious that the tyranny of the city was the real source of barbarism and savagery. The word “barbaric” in the Greek cultural tradition was developed by the city as diversionary propaganda and a lie to establish ideological superiority. The rural tribes, which were weak and disorganized compared to the city, could not have been barbaric in the sense that official society claimed. The concept of barbarism is one of the most important diversionary lies in the history of civilization. The second task of the town bully was “security.” To this end, the most common method was to erect castles and ramparts and develop ever more powerful and deadly weapons. To do so, millions of people were enslaved, turned into serfs, or proletarianized, with those who did not accept their new status being killed, and, undeniably, all of this has been mirrored as history to us.

In keeping with its power, the military appropriated for itself the largest share of the economic value extorted, as is clear from the many historical expeditions with no other purpose than plundering. Furthermore, property was the basis of the state, and military conquest and seizure was clearly the source of property. Whoever conquered it owned it, declaring this to be a natural and inalienable right. It is the sum of property (especially land) and plunder (transportable possessions) that has been conquered and seized by the forces of power and the state. The principle that “all Ottoman land and people are the sultan’s,” for example, is nothing other than the continuation of this foundational tradition concerning the relationship between the state and military expeditions. Tradition was established in this way and sanctioned in every newly built state. This is why the military sees itself as the true custodian of the state, and, thus, of property. And, in defining itself as such, it takes this historical tradition into consideration. The fact that it is the strongest arm of the monopoly accords with the nature of power and the state. Indeed, the human power and weaponry it possessed was sufficient to achieve its goals. In this light, the fact that military coups are the response to the occasional efforts of the civil bureaucracy to increase its share of the monopoly is hardly surprising. The role of ideological and bureaucratic monopolies, also called the *ilmiye* and *kalemiye* classes, in the establishment of power and the state was unquestionably indispensable but not as decisive as the role of the

military. Even the most superficial examination of past and present power and state apparatuses confirms this.

First, what really matters for our purposes is that the military is the most advanced and decisive monopoly. The soldier and the army are not a source of glory, honor, and heroism (this is ideological propaganda meant to mask and distort the essence of things) but are an essential element of the monopoly of power. Their essence is economic. The army relies on the economy. It positions itself over it and at a distance from it, but, at the same time, takes the steps necessary to guarantee its income (salary) above all else. It is the monopoly sector that is the most difficult to oppose and the one that all other segments of the monopoly must compromise and share surplus value with, a practice that has an extensive historical basis and is, as such, a deep-rooted institutional tradition. In essence, it is the monopoly of the class (bureaucracy) that is most closely interested in economic development, but feels the most pressing need to keep its distance. To achieve this, it projects an image of itself as the power that is most remote from society, while in reality it is the monopolistic sector that has equipped itself with the most advanced economic and military weapons. Without a correct analysis of the military, we can neither fully understand what economic monopolism or power and state monopolisms are. The three of them comprise a whole. They feed on the same substance; the surplus values of society. In exchange they claim that they take care of society's security, education, health, and productivity. This is how statism—the ideological state—presents itself. But this is not the truth; the truth is as we just described it.

The military is the most sharply organized arm of capital and power. Thus, it follows that it is the institution that ultimately subjugates and cages society. The military has always been the power that has penetrated, controlled, and subjugated society regardless of the form of the state, but it reached its apex in the era of the middle class (bourgeois) and under nation-state monopoly. The defining characteristic of the nation-state is that in the name of creating an official army the rest of society was officially disarmed and the monopoly on arms was transferred to the state and the army. At no time

in history was society as disarmed as it has been under bourgeois rule. The reason for this extremely important development is the intensification of exploitation and the resultant rise of far-reaching resistance. Society cannot be ruled if it is not thoroughly and continuously disarmed, opened up to the infiltration of power, and subjected to constant surveillance. Society cannot be dealt with unless it is confined in the “iron cage” of modernity. In addition, society cannot be ruled if it is not confined and besieged by the media army of the global monopolistic financial age. Formation of the ideological-media monopolies, as well the bureaucratic-military monopolies, replicates the aspects of exploitation monopolies. Not only are they inseparably bound together, they also condition each other. The most recent major central civilization, the super hegemon, together with other regional hegemons, including all of their local collaborators, is based on militarism and a gigantic arms industry, both above and within society. The priority given to this monopoly over any other stems from its historical and current position. In this light, identification of militarism with the fascism of capitalist monopoly makes perfect sense.

Of course, during the era of natural society and throughout written history various forms of society have engaged in wholesale self-defense against the militarist evolution of civilization, developing a variety of forms of resistance and engaging in numerous uprisings, participating in institutionalized guerrilla and people’s defense armies, and waging great defensive wars, all based on a tradition of self-defense. Of course, defensive wars and militarist monopoly wars are not equivalent. There is a difference in both quality and essence. While one is anti-society, colonialist, corrupting, and destructive, the other favors and protects society and strives to free society’s moral and political capacity. Democratic civilization protects and defends society, engaging in systematic self-defense against the central civilization’s militarism.

2. There is Another Way

“There is no denying that a Third World War is taking place today. This war is more severe and longer in extent and duration than the first two.

The potential for self-renewal of the system in the region is neither present nor emerging. What is developing is decay and dissolution.

Under these conditions, the most likely way out is for democratic modernity, which is based on all cultural richness suppressed from the development of Sumerian civilization as the antithesis of the Neolithic to today’s capitalist modernity, to first develop into a thesis and then launch its offensive against the system as an antithesis.”

- Democratic Civilisation Solution



Democratic Solution Principle

From Roadmap to Negotiations

Civil society, democratized, will aim to become neither a state nor an extension of it. It does not seek fundamental changes within the state; instead, it seeks a functional democratic regime within society. It demands at most a democratic constitution from the state. But making a democratic constitution should be satisfactory, based on social well-being and not on the state. The opposite of the democratic solution principle is the imposition of power-centered and statist solutions. As a principle, democratic solution does not deal with power sharing—in fact, it keeps itself away from power. The more intense power gets, the further away one gets from democracy. If societies are arranged in the name of governments and states alone, then the resulting order will be antidemocratic because of the exclusion of social forces. If arrangements made by the ruling power and government are constructive, then it may pave the way for democratization, but it does not constitute democratization itself. The goal of democratic solutions cannot be the sharing of power or state resources. Getting hold of the state and becoming a part of the state cannot be the aim of democratic

solution. The democratic solution principle seeks fundamentally to constitutionally safeguard the peaceful coexistence of democratic institutions and state institutions. The two institutional entities have a legal legitimacy. Neither bases its existence on the denial of the other. Democracy does not need to eliminate the state; nor should the state dissolve democracy for its benefit. The extreme intertwinement of the two within the Western system transforms democracy into a showcase institution. One of the most urgent problems of democratization is to overcome this intertwinement and rearrange the coexistence of these two institutional entities. Just as democracy restricts the state, the state, as the accumulation of experience and expertise, functions as an umbrella to democracy. Democratic society will prevail in time. In brief, the peaceful but tense positioning of state and democratic institutions will lead to competition that will develop and strengthen the democratic society itself.

The Principle of Self-Defense in Democracies

From Roadmap to Negotiations

No living beings, not even single-celled organisms, are without self-defense. This has been scientifically proven. No human society can exist without self-defense. Wars arise from the distorted understanding of self-defense systems of civilizations. Democratic societies and their free individuals face huge defense problems when trying to protect themselves in class-based civilizations. Primitive societies not only had conflicts amongst one another but faced deadly dangers posed by nature. Thus, at any given time and place, self-defense has been the foremost important duty. Self-defense is a priority against the elements of capitalist modernity, due to the monopolist oppression and exploitation of the nation-state, capitalism, and industrialism against economy, ecology, and democratic society (including its free and equal individuals). The absence of self-defense not only results in wage enslavement, it paves the way for all kinds of unemployment, disease, and degeneration. Worse still, it carries numerous physical and cultural genocides within itself. Modernity in general compels society and individuals, but it also requires democratic societies and free individuals

to defend their own existence. If they fail to defend themselves, they will lose not only their freedom but their existence. The monopolist elements of modernity, in order to sustain themselves, threaten the freedom and existence of society and the individual. Later they deplete the environment that is vital for life itself. The depletion of the environment is a type of genocide. Democratic society and free individuals must find remedies not only for revolutionary and evolutionary developments but also for the problems of self-defense. The structural crisis of modernity has placed self-defense at the top of all other problems. Each community must be not only an economic, ecological, and democratic unit but also a unit with its own self-defense. Each equal and free individual may have to live in one or more communities that are economic, ecological, and democratic—and in a corresponding number of self-defense units. Nourishment, reproduction, and protection are the three indispensable conditions of living for all living beings, including human society.

Society's Peace and Democracy Problem

From Sociology of Freedom

Any paradigm or social science will only be of use if it is based on an analysis that takes into consideration the issues raised here and develops responses. Otherwise, there will be nothing to distinguish it from traditional or liberal rhetoric (the art of words that conceal domination). The general conclusion I have reached is that the source of social problems lies in the combined effect, domination, and colonization of the oppressive and exploitative monopolies. They exploit social nature (society's existence) and in particular the economic resources that generate surplus value. The problems do not arise from nature (first nature) or any social factor (second nature).

Societies cannot survive without social morality and politics, which are factors necessary to their existence (their social fabric) and for addressing society's common affairs. The natural state of society, its existence, cannot be immoral and apolitical. If a society's moral and political fabric has not properly developed or has been undermined,

distorted, and paralyzed, then it can be argued that society is occupied and colonized by various monopolies, capital, power, and the state among them. To sustain this sort of life is a betrayal of and alienation from its own existence; it is to exist like a herd, like goods, commodities, and possessions under monopoly domination. Under these conditions, society has lost the natural essence and proficiency of a natural society or become obsolete. Such a society has been colonized or, even worse, has become property in every way, leaving itself to decay and poverty. There are numerous societies that fit this definition, both historically and currently. Those that have decayed and been annihilated far outnumber the survivors.

When a society can no longer create and run institutions that provide meaningful moral and political guidance, that society has succumbed to oppression and exploitation. It is in a “state of war.” It is possible to define history as a “state of war” waged by civilizations against society. When morality and politics are dysfunctional, there is only one path open to a society: self-defense. A state of war is nothing more than the absence of peace. As such, only self-defense will make peace possible. A peace with no self-defense can only be an expression of submission and slavery. Liberalism today imposes on societies and peoples peace with no self-defense. The unilateral game of democratic stability and reconciliation is nothing but a fig leaf on the bourgeois class domination achieved by the armed forces. It is nothing but a covert state of war. The major plank in capitalist ideological hegemony is the idea that a true peace is a peace that requires no self-defense. “Sacred concepts” have been used throughout history to express this idea. Religions, in particular civilized religions, overflow with an abundance of such concepts.

Peace is only possible and meaningful if society can defend itself and protect its moral and political character. Peace, particularly the peace that Michel Foucault worked so hard to define, could in this way acquire an acceptable social expression. Peace understood in any other way is nothing but a trap and an implicit state of war on all peoples and communities. In capitalist modernity, the word peace abounds with pitfalls. Using the word without correctly defining it has many

drawbacks. Let us redefine peace: peace is neither the complete elimination of the state of war nor stability or the absence of war under the supremacy of one party. There are different parties to any peace, and the complete dominance of one party over another does not and cannot denote peace. Furthermore, weapons will fall silent only when there is acceptance of the functioning of society's moral and political institutions. The three conditions mentioned immediately above must be met for principled peace. Any other peace would be meaningless.

Let's elaborate on these conditions; first, a complete disarmament of the different parties is not on the table, but the conflicting parties must vow not to attack one another regardless of the dispute. Military superiority will not be pursued. All sides must accept and respect the right of the other to maintain the means necessary to ensure its security. Second, the ultimate superiority of one party over the others is not at stake. While it is possible to achieve stability and quiescence under the rule of the gun, this cannot be called peace. Peace is only on the agenda when all sides agree to stop the war without one of the parties achieving armed superiority, regardless of whether they are right or wrong. Third, again regardless of the positions of the various sides, they agree to respect the moral (conscience) and political institutions of societies when addressing the problems underlying the conflict. This is the framework of what we call a "political solution." A cease-fire that does not include a moral and political solution cannot be called peace.

Democratic politics is a central issue for a principled peace. When society's moral and political institutions are functioning, the natural outcome is the process of democratic politics. Those who want peace must understand that peace can only be attained if politics based on morality play a part. To attain peace, it is essential that at least one side acts on the basis of democratic politics. Otherwise, the sole result will be a "peace game" played in the interests of the monopolies. In that situation, democratic politics plays a vital role. Only dialogue among democratic forces can stand up to power and the state forces and achieve a meaningful peace process. Without such a peace, even if the warring parties (monopolies) silence the weapons for a time, the state of war continues. Of course, there is war fatigue and economic difficulties

arising from logistical needs, but as long as these difficulties can be resolved, the war will continue until one side attains unchallenged superiority. The silencing of weapons in this context cannot be called peace but, rather, a cease-fire that portends a fiercer war to come. For a cease-fire to lead to genuine peace the three conditions we have outlined must be met.

On occasion, the side engaged in self-defense (the side in the right) may attain conclusive superiority. This doesn't change the three conditions for peace. As was seen with real socialism and many legitimate national liberation struggles, immediately establishing your own rule and state to secure stability cannot be called peace. This is just replacing an external monopolistic force with an internal force (state capitalism or a national bourgeoisie). Calling it socialism does not change the basic sociological reality. A principled peace is not something that can be attained by the superiority of power and the state. If power and the state, whatever they call themselves (bourgeois, socialist, national, non-national) do not share their advantages with the democratic forces, then peace will not be on the agenda. In the final analysis, peace is the conditional reconciliation of democracy and the state. History overflows with stories of the many attempts at such conditional reconciliations. There have been principled examples that have endured and others that have collapsed before the ink dried on the treaty. Societies do not only consist of the establishment of power and the state. No matter what restrictions are placed on society, unless it is completely annihilated, it will continue to live in keeping with its own moral and political identity. Although not a focus of written history, this is the essential reality of life.

Society should not be seen as a narrative about power and the state. On the contrary, seeing society as the decisive nature would contribute to the formation of more realistic social sciences. No matter how big or wealthy power and states may become, including capital monopolies (like the pharaoh and Croesus) or their present-day beast-like heirs (the new Leviathan), they can never eliminate society. Because, in the final analysis, it is society that determines them, and those who are determined can never replace those who determine them. Even the

present rulers' spectacular and unsurpassed media propaganda cannot obscure this fact. At the end of the day, they are the most miserable and pitiful of forces playing at being giants. In contrast, human society cannot be stripped of its meaning as the most wonderful creation of nature. The system of democratic civilization—our main paradigm—is a system in which society, both in its historical and present form, is interpreted, scientifically explained, and reconstructed.

Freedom for Öcalan

- Political Solution to the Kurdish Question



Since October 10th 2023, the global campaign ‘Freedom for Öcalan, A Political Solution for the Kurdish Question’ has brought together unions, social movements, political parties, elected officials, artists, intellectuals, activists, and millions of Kurds and their supporters. The main aim is to end the isolation of Kurdish leader Abdullah Öcalan by allowing his lawyers and family to visit him, and ultimately secure his freedom. In doing so, the campaign strives to make a just and democratic political solution to Turkey’s century-old Kurdish question possible by enabling Kurdish leader Abdullah Öcalan’s participation in a renewed dialogue.

Over the last 3 years, the campaign truly became a global movement. Peoples around the world rose up, joining together in calling for the freedom of Abdullah Öcalan, while working to bring his ideas of democracy, women’s liberation, and ecology to life through our struggles.

- Read more at: ocalanvigil.net
- Brochure composed by Academy of Democratic Modernity: democraticmodernity.com

