

THE ARAB-JEWISH CONFLICT AND A SOLUTION FOR A DEMOCRATIC MIDDLE EAST

Analysis of Abdullah Öcalan



**“The Arab-Jewish Conflict and
a solution for a democratic Middle East”**

Content:

Abdullah Öcalan: Manifesto For a Democratic Civilization

Collection:

Academy of Social Science Abdullah Öcalan

Translation and Design:

**Internationalist Commune Of Rojava
internationalistcommune.com**

April 2025

CONTENT

This brochure contains various texts from the defense writings of Rêber APO (Abdullah Öcalan), which deal with the origins of the Arab-Jewish conflict and with solutions for a Middle East of freedom, peace and equality. The various text sections were compiled by the Abdullah Öcalan Academy of Social Sciences in North-East Syria.

1. Origin of the Semitic people.....3

2. The formation of Arab and Jewish tribes.....4

3. The formation of the Arab nation states and Israel.....13


4. The Arab-Jewish contradiction.....20

5. Middle Eastern conflict and the solution of Democratic Modernity....21




1. ORIGIN OF THE SEMITIC PEOPLE

The ethical groups in the
Middle East around 3000 BC



Semitic culture in its early stage takes place around 2500 BC with the identities of Akkad, Babylon, Assyria, Canaan and Israel in written history. The Arab identity then appears as a name around 500 BC. The Sumerians gave the names such as Aramaic, Aramite and Apiru. There are many strong interpretations that say; Phoenicians, Palestinians and

even Israelis later merged into the Semitic culture and language. These people originate from coastal areas and are intertwined with the Aryan culture. There is evidence that those people lost their original culture in the process of the Semitic migrations.



2. THE FORMATION OF ARAB AND JEWISH TRIBES

The Arab and Israeli reality, which are both of Semitic origin are based on a series of events which open the way for a lot of tensions and contradictions and which date back to 4000 years ago. Semitic culture itself is said to have emerged between 9000 and 6000 BC in the Arabic Peninsula and spread to the East, West, South and North. The Arabic Peninsula where they settled had a more favorable climate from 9000 BC to 3000 BC. This favorable climate played a fundamental role in the formation of the Semitic tribes.

They were active throughout the peninsula, in North Africa, from the eastern Mediterranean to the banks of the Euphrates and the Taurus Mountains and very different Semitic dialects developed during this period. In the 3000s BC, increasing desertification and water scarcity accelerated the migration of tribes to more productive areas. In the emergence of the Egyptian and Sumerian civilizations, these tribes contributed with their labor force.

They were the first tribes to trade with these two civilizations and also among themselves.


Historically, the Sumerians called these tribes the Amorites (Westerners). The Egyptians called them Apiru (those who came from the desert, from which the word "Hebrew" comes from). The Amorites, became the dominant power in Sumer during the time of the Akkadians, Babylonians, and Assyrians. The Hebrews lived between the Sumerians and Egyptians.



At the same time when Abraham left the Sumerian region of Ur, of Riha, Moses left Egypt. There history is like a struggle for freedom from a slave civilization. This process, influenced by both civilizations, resulted in the emergence and development of monotheistic religions. The Jews' insistence on a national religion has led them to become a major transformative element in history.

with the renewal of the Abrahamic religion by the Prophet Muhammad. The conflicts that have been growing between them are due to their racial identity. The conflict between the Jews, who had become richer through trade, and the Arabs, who represented the last desert tribes, was intensified by the Islamic religion. This process began with Abraham.

The journey of the Prophet Abraham



Judaism, in this sense, has become a fundamental force of transformation and oppression in the history of humanity. From the day Judaism emerged until today they are playing this role. The Arabs, as the last generation of desert tribes, have made a great impact and emerged into the field of history

He led the revolt against the Sumerian cities, who were richer than the Hebrews. Moses led the same poor Hebrews against Egypt. Such conflicts have continued in modern Israel. With the Hellenes and the Romans, with the Babylonians and the Assyrians, these conflicts have never diminished.

Throughout history, the mentality of the Jews has come from the power of this trade and the lessons learned from the conflict. After the Babylonians, Judaism suffered the greatest exodus (migration) under the Roman Empire in 70 AD and consequently spread throughout the world.

“These two groups, which can play an important role in the Middle East, need to come together in the dimensions of the Democratic Civilization.”

Because the Jews have a special sense of commerce, the societies in which they lived have always felt threatened by them and brought massacres over them. Most recently, with Hitler-German fascism, the creation of the state of Israel has become necessary. Yet, Israel is now imposing the genocide that the Germans committed on the Jews on the Arabs. The experience they gained by living between civilizations has paved the way for them to create strong values in the fields of science, art and economics. From the writing of the sacred books to many contemporary scientists and


artists and their works, Jews have played an important role. Both intellectually and spiritually, they have achieved such great power that the fundamental philosophies and institutions revolve around them.

The Arabs, like the last Semitic tribes of the desert, have been left behind. However, since they have spread throughout the Arabic peninsula and North Africa, they have achieved a certain extend in number and strength, in terms geography. In this situation, two groups of Semitic origin stand against each other, all over the world. They have become victims of the religion and nationalism they have created, the monsters they have created are now devouring them. Moreover, their only solution is to overcome their approaches connected to religion and nationalism. These two groups, which can play an important role in the Middle East, need to come together in the dimensions of the Democratic Civilization. The implementation of a deep secularism, which is part of this

democratization, is inevitable. For thousands of years, the destruction and regression that has been carried out in the name of religion must now be overcome with a religious reform. With the reform of religion, the success of secularism will both give strength to democracy and will take strength from it. Therefore it is necessary to overcome the ideology of nationalism. When both of these ideologies, nationalism and religionism, which deepen the contradictions

instead of causing conflicts between Arabs and Israel, will lead them towards a democratic unity and reconciliation, a development that will have an impact on the Middle East and the world. The reconciliation of Arabs and Israelis will be a unique step towards peace and democratic unity in the Middle East. With such a reconciliation the Middle East will gain new strength and will have a ripple effect on the world. The historical consequences of the Arab-Israeli reconciliation would indeed be very important.

The spread of Islam under the Prophet Muhammad and the caliphates



will be overcome, then the philosophies of unity and justice, linked to freedom and science, will prevail. These philosophical concepts at the heart of democratic civilization, will bring fundamental goodwill and peace. Such a development,

Other regional conflicts and will push them towards a democratic solution. In the 21st century, a peace linked to democracy among the Arabs, between the Arabs and Israel and the entire region will bring great economic and political development.

Arabic Islam, including its branches that have reached Africa, has been the cause of very serious wars and conflicts between the forces of state authority and the forces of the people throughout history. The Prophet Muhammad started this war while he was still alive. The religion of Islam (in terms of its ideological and political program) emerged as a product of the struggle between the poor parts of the Hashemites, to which Muhammad himself belonged to, and the chiefs of other upper-class tribes, who were more wealthy and of the same Hashemite ethnicity. After his death, the conflict became more intense. Due to this conflict, three of the first four caliphs, Omer, Osman, and Ali, were killed. Muawiyah, as the representative of the upper class, was able to implement his tendency towards a dynastic state, the Umayyad State, in this process. The rest remained as a social force, the supporters of the Ahl al-Bayt, supporters of the Family of Prophet Muhammad, and the radical, poorer, social forces, called Kharijites.

This is the first and most serious division of society, class, and state. This division grew and has continued to this day.

Islam, which strengthened and legitimized its rule through countless small states and empires, did so in the name of Islamic law and through the Sunni sect, while the opposing Islamic sects tried to defend their existence as Kharijites and supporters of the Ahl al-Bayt.



The Kharijites, as the poorest segment of society, increasingly became Bedouins, which meant that they increasingly became rural laborers and urban proletarian. For the Arabs, proletarianization manifested itself in Bedouinization and continues to this day. The Bedouins of medieval feudalism became the farmers and workers of modern capitalism, and thus have a common history. The supporters of the Ahl al-Bayt in a way represent the Arab middle class.

Its more marginalized parts, such as the radical Shiite and Alawite groups, continue to oppose the state and power, and its upper class continues to exist within the formation of many states. With these characteristics, from Morocco to India, not to mention Lebanon, Syria, Iraq, and today's Iran, those groups continue to exist as a social and power force throughout the Muslim geography. Formal Islam, which is a form of government, has also tried to continue its existence to this day with the norms of the

state (Sharia) and legitimacy (Sunni becoming a sect). The forces of the state and Arab society have been very fragmented, both historically and today, and are at war with each other. At the heart of this lies the deep and widespread separation of society and power. Even the common veil of Islam cannot hide and suppress this truth.

Despite many secondary elements, volumes of books can be written on these main elements. What we want to say is that Islam is not a local event that happened like a 'miracle in the desert', but rather is the product of strong historical and material conditions. Its strength and weakness are related to these conditions. It is not a synthesis of civilizations like the early Sumerians or the late Romans, but it's rather a movement of faith and morality. Muhammad himself is not a mythic personality like Abraham, Moses, and Jesus. Many of his characteristics are known. His message, the 'Quran', does not address a nation, tribe, or class, but appeals to all of humanity.

The concept that most often appears in the Quran is 'Allah'. This concept should be at the top of the list of theological research. Muhammad has been influenced by this concept a lot. 'Allah' is called the 'Lord' of all the worlds, that is, their master. This word and expression occur frequently in the Holy Bible. The word Allah

“The forces of the state and Arab society have been very fragmented, both historically and today, and are at war with each other. At the heart of this lies the deep and widespread separation of society and power.”

is such a wide concept that it has the capacity to unite the divinity of nature and the divinity of society with each other. This word contains 99 attributes. Each of these attributes expresses the influence of the unity of social and natural forces. It has many features that its adherents accept as 'eternal laws and commands', which are in fact very unclear. As much as these socially rooted characteristics are subject to change, also all the colours of nature can not be forced into strict laws.


This religious legislation of the Quran itself is a result of the strict legislation of the Jewish tribe. Later, in Islamic society, this understanding of legislation led to a great conservatism. Perhaps strict legislation has been useful for social progress in order to prevent tribal anarchy. But when one considers the constant social progress, then one understands how dangerous the harsh legislation of the Umma is.

Muhammad's strong faith in Allah reveals his metaphysical power. He sees and accepts the power of Allah over himself, so that, as we have seen from the Sumerians to Rome, he does not declare himself a god and does not fall into this disease. When we see the battle over the divinity of Jesus, Muhammad's position is even more advanced. His negative side is that he could not leave the strict position of Judaism. The price of this weakness and error is paid in in the war between Arabs and Israel. It is worth discussing whether material culture or ideological culture was of more importance in the society that Muhammad tried to build.

In Christianity, the moral elements have more weight. But in my opinion, a good balance has been made in Islam. Although its content is being seen as weak and controversial, one can evaluate the balance between ideological and material culture as a strong aspect of Islam. Muhammad himself expressed this in a Hadith: 'Work for the hereafter as if you were to die tomorrow, and for the world as if you were to die never.' It is well known that they opposed the Sasanians, Byzantines, and classical Rome, and even the systems of Nemrut and the Pharaohs and heavily criticized them. In this respect, he is a strong critic of civilization.

However, neither the material conditions of his time nor his ideological capacity are sufficient to explain his understanding of the "city". This is similar to the socialists of our time who cannot find an alternative. However, his call for a great morality shows that he is fully aware of the ills of the civilized society. In this respect, he is also a great reformer and even a revolutionary.

He doesn't accept a society without ethics. He prevents the development of a sick capitalist society by regulating monetary interest. With these characteristics, one can say that Muhammad is ahead of Christianity and Judaism. His anti-slavery tendencies are well known. He is very generous towards slaves and is in favor of their liberation. Although his attitude towards women is far from freedom and equality, he hates the deep-rooted slavery of women. From his marriages to many women and the presence of his concubines, we understand the existence of these two tendencies. He recognizes the difference between class and property in society, but acts as a social democrat, trying to prevent monopolies and social domination with high taxes.



The success of the first actions was considered miraculous and increased Muhammad's belief in himself. His work in Medina is very important from our point of view.

The place that is known as a mosque, took on the role of a council and democratic gatherings. Initially, all social problems were discussed in meetings in the mosque and solutions are sought there. The mosque continued to play this role until the death of Muhammad. Rituals of worship (prayer, fasting, donation) are also carried out within the framework of educational activities with the aim of strengthening the personality. Such steps are inherent in the nature of Islam and no one can deny this. It is quite clear that even under the religious veil, the entire moral and political

society is revitalized and developed with a powerful dynamism. Therefore, if we are to speak of a true Muhammadan Movement, a Muhammadan Islam, we must say that it will be based on a democracy in which people can directly participate and build a moral and political society and solve their problems. As is known, the Prophet Muhammad went too far with some of his actions but he himself was also unsure about them. In the matter of the Jews and the Qibla, because of the cooperation of the Jewish tribe of Qurayza with the Quraysh aristocracy, he massacred all this tribe's men. If a right solution had been found in this matter, perhaps the Arab-Hebrew conflict would have been resolved at that time and Islam would have expanded even further.



3. THE FORMATION OF THE ARAB NATION STATES AND ISRAEL

One of the main sources of tension in the Middle East is the process of the simultaneous establishment of Arab nation-states and Israel. When the UK began operations against the Ottoman Empire in the early 19th century, it used Arab sheikhs as a tool to break down the gates of the fortresses of the Ottomans. In the Balkans, it used Orthodox religious scholars of Greek origin to support the establishment of a Greek nation-state, thus hastening the disintegration of the Ottoman Empire in the Balkans. In the south of the Empire on the Arabian Peninsula, which had a strategic position on the road to India, the same

strategy was applied by supporting Arab nation-statehood through Muslim religious scholars, i.e. through sheikhs representing the upper hierarchy.


At the same time the British tried this in Kurdistan by engaging with sheikhs of religious orders in Sulaymaniyah (mainly Naqshi and Qadiri). The UK also gradually expanded its control over the southern part of the Shah Empire of Iran. This process of taking control in the Middle East began with uprisings, and resulted in mandate regimes after the First World War, and with fully integrated nation states after the Second World War.



In the meantime, the Ottoman Empire was being liquidated. A power vacuum arose in the region or rather it was created. The UK could not immediately establish itself as a colonial power in the region, as it had done in India. But it did not leave an opponent power either. It tried to form the Republic of Turkey and the Arab mandate regimes in the same political context (the main topic

Turkish republic on the agenda. But this did not change anything on the basis of the state. In short time, the Arab mandate regimes had become like all the other nation states. They had taken on the names of republics or monarchies, but these names did not change their essence as nation states. The rapid emergence of Israel also developed at the same time as this process. To add to what

The Middle East after the Sykes-Picot Agreement in 1916, after WW II



of discussion at the Sivas Congress was between the British or US mandate) and at the same time (1920). The radical position of Mustafa Kemal Ataturk had already brought the issue of the

has been said in previous sections about the Jewish tribe, the roots of Israel are based on these tribes and their ideologies (Jewish ideology, monotheistic religions and nationalism).

Israel itself is a natural consequence of the nation-state wars that broke out in the 1550s, centered around Amsterdam and London, and which resulted in the emergence of the modern state. These wars turned Europe into a lake of blood for about four hundred years.

“But let us not forget that the forces that created Israel and the forces that created the twenty-two Arab nation-states are just the same. In other words, their relations and conflicts with Israel are camouflaged.”

In the state-building of a nation Jewish intellectuality and its capitalists have always played a leading role. They believed that with the division of the Catholic, Orthodox and Islamic Empires, the Jews would achieve their freedom and that in this process Jewish nationalism would establish a Jewish-Israeli state based on Zionist ideas. These efforts, before and after the First World War, were carried out with conviction, intellectuality and organization.

With the nationalism of the weakened Republic of Turkey, built on the ruins of the Ottoman Empire, and in the atmosphere in which a large number of minimalist Arab nation-states emerged, the Jewish-Israeli nation-state, the goal of the Zionist ideology, was officially proclaimed in 1948. The Republic of Turkey, as if to prove its pro-Israel nature, became the first nation-state to recognize the state of Israel.

The establishment and proclamation of Israel is no ordinary event. When the hegemonic powers transformed the Ottoman Empire and the Shah Empire of Iran into weak and dependent nation-states, Israel emerged from the vacuum of power as the ultimate hegemonic power of Capitalist Modernity. Israel has been established as the nucleus of hegemony and this is one of its very important features. This means that the more other nation-state powers in the region recognize the existence of the hegemonic power of Israel, the more legitimate they will be;

if they do not, they will be brought to the line through wars until they recognize Israel. The Republic of Turkey, Egypt, Jordan, and some Gulf countries are among the states that first recognized Israel, thus they were accepted as legitimate nation-states and were incorporated into the system. Israel and its allies continue to wage war against the

properly understand the hegemonic foundation of capitalist modernity in the Middle East, one cannot properly understand why 22 Arab nation-states were established. One cannot understand the capitalist modernity that was established in the Middle East through right-left, religious-sectarian, ethnic and nationalist

The emergence of the Israeli state



countries who did not accept Israel. The war with the Arabs, in the context of the Palestine issue, and the wars with other Islamic countries, in the context of the Gulf issue, are closely related to Israel's hegemonic presence in the region. These wars, conflicts, conspiracies, and massacres will continue until Israel's hegemony is recognized. If one does not

interpretations of history because it was developed by the petite bourgeois independence movement of the nation-state. In this context, in order to understand the Arab problem in its true current form first of all one must understand the establishment and construction of the hegemony of capitalist modernity in the Middle East.

The problems of no society or state can be solved by using a mentality that holds onto the 'glorious construction of the nation-state'. Therefore, the Arab problem is not only a problem with Israel and cannot be explained solely as an Israel-Palestine problem.

The main and deepest problem of Arab societies is, first of all, their fragmentation into twenty-two nation-states. These twenty-two states cannot play any other role than that of agent organizations of capitalist modernity. Their very existence is the fundamental problem for the Arab peoples. In this context, the Arab problem is a problem related to the formation and construction of Capitalist Modernity in the region. The problem they have with Israel is with it being the hegemonic power of Capitalist Modernity in the region. But let us not forget that the forces that created Israel and the forces that created the twenty-two Arab nation-states are just the same. In other words, their relations and conflicts with Israel are camouflaged. Since they

inherently share the same hegemonic system, these conflicts, no matter how strong, will only have a meaning if they dare to go beyond Capitalist Modernity. You will remain in the hegemony of capitalist modernity but you will not recognize Israel!

“Political Islam in the last two hundred years cannot play any other role than that of masked agents of capitalist hegemony.”

Masked and fake diplomacy emerges from the denial of this fact. Whether it is radical Islam, soft Islam, or Shiite Islam, all Islamic nationalist approaches that seek to replace Capitalist Modernity are nothing more than a huge fraud. Since this Islamism has been a branch of the nationalism of Capitalist Modernity since the beginning of the 19th century, it has nothing to do with Islamic civilization, it is a special tool

of capitalism in the Islamic countries of the Middle East. Political Islam in the last two hundred years cannot play any other role than that of masked agents of capitalist hegemony. It has been cultivated and put into action because it is linked to Capitalist Modernity. Indeed, in the last two hundred years, these Islamic movements have played no other role than to deepen the social and national problems in the Middle East, which confirms the reality that was mentioned.

Therefore, there are ideological and political obstacles to communalism and democratic nationalism. Cultural Islam is a different matter, and its preservation within this framework has a meaningful and positive aspect.

If it does not go beyond the framework of capitalist modernity, the Arab-Israeli and Palestinian-Israeli wars will be like a camel-elephant or cat-mouse war. The result is that, for centuries, wars whose outcome is clear from the start are being fought and exhaust the energy of the Arab peoples. If these wars we are talking about had not been started, an Arabian Peninsula worth ten times of Japan's wealth could have been built solely on oil revenues.

The important conclusion that one can draw from this observation is that the system of the nation-state in the Middle East is not, as it is claims, a source of solutions to fundamental social and national problems; on the contrary, it magnifies, aggravates, deepens them and makes it impossible to solve them.



The Nation-State does not solve problems, it creates problems. Moreover, the same system brings not only the states of the Middle East against each other, but makes the societies fight each other to exhaustion.

“No other example can demonstrate the true, bloody face of civilization's solutions of power and state domination better than the Arab-Jewish question.”

The reality of Iraq confirms this observation very well. Here, we cannot blame Capitalist Modernity alone. Leftist (Real Socialism) and Islamic ideologies and political organizations that emerge as liberators and problem solvers are at least as responsible as the transformative elements of Capitalist Modernity. For about a hundred years, none of the programs and methods they have proposed to their peoples

have been successful. They have only served to establish Capitalist Modernity in the region. We cannot deny the role of these facts in the ideological and political organizations of Arab Nation States. The problems of the Arabs are not insoluble.

The problem can be analyzed in such a framework. To increase their share of the state and society within the same system they create coordinated wars, and try to achieve results with this. Including the Palestine Liberation Organization, the Arabic nation states have been trying this method of war for the last fifty years and aimed for these results. With agreements like Camp David, they want to complete this framework sooner or later. But this way only deepens the problems of Arab society and pushes it towards radical solutions. Such a way can satisfy the oligarchic Arab nation states, but it cannot answer the economic and democratic demands of the people.

4. THE ARAB-JEWISH CONTRADICTION

This contradiction cannot be resolved because in history it was created by the civilization system itself, and in the present and recent history by modernity itself. As long as Islam and Judaism are not freed from the connection between power and the state, they cannot be reconciled. As long as they insist on being forces of power and the state, both forces will find their existence today, as in history, in destroying each other. The histories of power are constructed in this way. Modernity continued this process by further intensifying and solidifying it. Some are crushed under the tripod (capitalism, nation-state and industrialism) and this is called the solution. In the five hundred year history of Capitalist Modernity there are innumerable such solutions.

It is inevitable that this problem, which has been affecting the region very negatively for a hundred years, causing great suffering and loss, will continue with the current prevailing approach and will have even more corrosive effects.

No other example can demonstrate the true, bloody face of civilization's solutions of power and state domination better than the Arab-Jewish question. Worse still, the forces of Capitalist Modernity, in the construction of which Jews played a major role, have committed a genocide against Jews that has "singularity and uniqueness." There are really very few examples that can demonstrate the final solution or the hopelessness of Modernity as well as this genocide, which was planned in advance.



5. THE MIDDLE EASTERN CONFLICT AND THE SOLUTION OF DEMOCRATIC MODERNITY

In Middle Eastern culture, conflicts and their solutions to it continue to have their place in global culture. The issue that one should focus on is the phenomenon of central authority. At the root of social conflicts is the phenomenon of authority, and this is a scientific determination. Therefore, the solution must also be made within the framework of authority. We have stated at length that the system of centralized civilization has played a leading role in Middle Eastern culture for five thousand years and more. Central civilization is associated with centralized authority. In a way, civilization goes hand in hand with centralized power.

A centralized civilization of five thousand years has always meant centralized power. The spread of power and its centralization are one of the issues on which the dominant understanding of history focuses on. In other words, the hegemonic center and its spread to its peripheries are the fundamental dialectics that this understanding of history follows. According to this, hegemonic powers are always re-established after a deep crisis. Since every hegemonic system is established with a new power and technique of production, when these techniques and power become obsolete, they will inevitably be overcome and left behind.



New powers and techniques of production generally emerge in the periphery of the previous hegemonic center. In the relations of the periphery, techniques of power and means of production that have been overcome give rise to new forces. When old forces fail to renew themselves and become stagnant, these new forces attempt to impose themselves on the old hegemonic power.

This process takes place through conflicts and war. The old power centers do not want to be easily defeated. If the new power center wants to survive and become stronger, it must replace the old center. The crisis itself emerges because such periods are marked by a constant war. A hegemonic power does not become stagnant on its own, and a new power can not develop fully until it confronts the old hegemonic system. Many such transformations have occurred in Middle Eastern culture and civilization systems. The growth and spread of cities, classes and states, the rise and

fall of feudal lords and empires, the establishment and fall of dynasties, have always been linked to these tensions between center and periphery. To read history correctly, we must grasp the dialectic underlying all these processes.

How did the center of hegemonic power emerge? This is the key question of historical dialectics. For hegemony to be achieved, local centers of power must first be formed. Generally, these are feudal lords outside the cities, tribal and clan hierarchies, and city-states. Once local centers of power are formed, they begin to fight among themselves to increase their share of the surplus on which their existence depends.

The fight over surplus raises the question of borders. The boundaries of property on land which were left over from previous periods of clans and families are transformed into the boundaries of local powers.

As they grow, their boundaries also expand and as a result, the boundaries confront each other. Each power grows within boundaries without facing any obstacles. What leads to this growth are the techniques of power (new weapons, means of transport) and new productive means of production. Constantly increasing of power is the condition of the so-called primitive accumulation. Just as capitalist capital cannot survive unless it constantly increases its accumulation, local authorities cannot survive unless they increase their power. When the expansion of borders into empty spaces is complete, when different powers come into contact with each other,

then war or a period of crisis break out. When the local forces come in such a situation where they cannot increase production anymore, they cannot maintain their power and enter a period of crisis. Due to the increasing bureaucracy, the tribes and dynasties become more and the population increases. Power, like a growing cancer cell, wants to spread to all other social spheres. This is also seen in living cells, when the cells want to protect themselves the war of self-defense begins. In the first wars of the Sumerian city-states and dynasties one can see this process in an interesting way. In today's Iraq, the same process continues

Sumerian city states between
3000 and 2000 BC



in a very clear way. In the process of local power struggles, parties either annihilate each other or one party defeats the other. A new hegemonic center is formed around the victorious dynasties or states. The entire infrastructure as well as ideological and political structures, are reorganized with material production techniques and their spiritual properties.

“Both hegemonic and local authorities have always been established at the expense and the destruction of the original and natural communal order of villages, tribes and clans, and even the self-government of cities.”

The new hegemony sanctifies itself and proclaims itself as a god. Either it adapts the old religion to its own interests, or it turns it into a sect and shows its own differences. The new hegemony perpetuates itself with a religion or mythology for it wants to immortalize itself ideologically.

The central civilization system of the Middle East, over a period of five thousand years and more, has always centered itself on this dialectical basis and solved crises in this way. Each process of internal conflict and war has resulted in a growing central authority. Because of this results the Middle East has always been able to remain a central civilization system. Increased centralization has not only come at the price of weakened local authorities. In general, it has always seized the right of self-governance of communities, has always destroyed the natural democratic order of tribes and families both in its center and in its peripheries and even outside. The power center has taken away their right of self-governance, made them depend on itself and has thus strengthened its own hegemony. Both hegemonic and local authorities have always been established at the expense and the destruction of the original and natural communal order of villages, tribes and clans, and even the self-government of cities.

Hegemonic central authority has always been established against local democratic authorities. In the culture of the Middle East and in the increasing weakening of the democratic spirit and mind, the hegemonic authorities of thousands of years have played a decisive role. In the culture of authority in Europe, because it is based on a recent history, the tendencies of the Democratic Nation have always been strong. In the Middle East, because the opportunities and possibilities of communal authority have vanished, the opposing religious

and sectarian schools that have emerged have shown a deviant democratic practice. When the hegemonic tradition shifted to Western Europe in the 16th century, the economic and political crisis in the Middle East took on a systematic character. Islamic hegemony under the Ottoman Empire began to decline from the end of the 16th century onward, while European hegemonic power began to grow. One must think of hegemonic power as a system. In one region, it declines and falls into crisis while in another region it grows.



As time passes it becomes increasingly centralized and global. The hegemonic system became most centralized and global in the 19th and 20th centuries. In the last two hundred years, the hegemony of England and the USA in the Middle East has become particularly strong.

The interpretations of independent and semi-independent states are petty bourgeois interpretations of power, and these interpretations serve no purpose other than to conceal the reality of power rather than explaining the reality of the Nation State.

“In all hegemonic systems of the last 5000 years, there has never been a place for the phenomenon of an “independent” state.”

In this context, the Middle East, which has fallen into a deep crisis has entered a state of a periphery. After the collapse of the Ottoman hegemony, the crisis in the thousands year old culture of centralized hegemonic power has deepened. The system of hegemonic power represented by England and the USA was built over the last four hundred years and was implemented with the creation of Nation States. To understand it, one must understand the nature of Nation States.

In particular, these petite bourgeois interpretations of the Nation States that were established by the hegemonic powers in the Middle East serve to conceal the problems of the state and democracy and pretend that they are not a result of the capitalist system. It should not be forgotten that England, during the period of its hegemony, took the lead in establishing Nation States first in Europe and then throughout the world, and that with this it had two main objectives.

First: with the creation of Nation States it sought to split the old empires and large states that were obstacles for England's hegemony, divide them in small states and with this take away these obstacles. Second: at the end of the Middle Ages, the tradition of the Democratic Nation became an obstacle to the development of

for the last four hundred years has been held by the USA and Anglo-Saxon England. All other Nation States were inevitably dissolved in order to subordinate them under British interest. Every hegemonic system has to do this and it was always like this throughout history. With the period of capitalist hegemony,

The Middle East with the actual nation state borders



Capitalism. With the creation of Nation States England sought to remove this obstacle as well. The achievement of both goals would pave the way for the establishment of capitalist hegemony. The monopoly of the hegemonic Nation States

the inner organization of states has become more systematized. If some claim that independent states outside the world system are possible, such a claim is not only impossible, but its rhetoric and rationalism is of the petite bourgeois.

In all hegemonic systems of the last 5000 years, there has never been a place for the phenomenon of an “independent” state. Under the hegemony of a system like capitalism, which is full of violence and imperialism, to imagine something like building independent states or states existing independently is completely empty and meaningless.

Why does the capitalist system need the hegemonic Nation State? It is clear that in this period the system cannot continue to exist with a state of any other form. Unless the empires get split up and the democratic republics that grew in the cities at the end of the Middle Ages get eliminated, the development of a Democratic Nation can not be prevented and Capitalism cannot grow into a hegemonic system. Unless power is reorganized as a Nation State, Capitalism cannot maintain and develop its existence. British hegemony had given the Middle East a strategic

role because it was on a path of domination that went all the way to India.

After Napoleon, Britain gradually expanded its control over the Middle East, to push forward the integrity of the system. To this end, it eroded the Spanish and French empires. It set up a barrier to prevent the Russian Empire from expanding to the south. It used the Ottoman Empire by keeping it in a buffer status. When the Ottoman Empire allied with the growing German hegemony, British hegemony pushed the process of disintegration in the Ottoman Empire forward and achieved its goal with the First World War. From that time on, all the Nation States that were established in the Middle East

first bore the stamp of England and then the one of its strategic ally, the USA.



Starting with the Republic of Turkey that was the first to be established, all the new constructed Nation States that were established could not continue their existence without the consent of the central Nation State.

The collapse of Soviet Russia, seventy years after its establishment, and the development of China on the path of capitalism, confirm this fact. The existence of conflicts at the beginning - for example, the conflicts in the early years of the establishment of the Republic of Turkey – were no obstacle for this outcome. For more than four hundred years now, there has been a hegemonic system that does not easily abandon this accumulation of power and is not ready to share this accumulation with other so-called “independent” Nation States. Sharing hegemony is incompatible with the logic of the system. Either a war will break out in which one will win and keep the hegemony or a more prosperous and

productive system will emerge. The power of the old hegemony is not enough for either of them. It will need to fight wars of self-defense within the framework of dialectical unity and will need to continue its existence through compromise. If one chooses capitalism and at the same time

“A realistic judgment would be to say that the Nation States in the Middle Eastern culture are the agents of the hegemonic Nation State.”

claims independence outside the system, it only means to be out of self-deception or arrogance. Therefore, a realistic judgment would be to say that the Nation States in the Middle Eastern culture are the agents of the hegemonic Nation State.

For example, the existence of the twenty-two weak Arab Nation States can only be explained by the interests of the hegemonic Nation State.

The existence of the Republic of Turkey as a leftover of the Ottoman empire was recognized when it accepted to become a marginal Nation State. Otherwise, it could not have been built up. Just as Nation States in general are not tools for escaping from conflict, but rather tools for increasing conflict, in the Middle East they have the same function. Their goal is to ensure the global stability of the hegemonic Nation States. As a result, they globalize the crisis of Capitalism. The Nation States in the Middle East are constantly in conflict because they don't consider the the culture of the region. In addition to the old crisis of power, they deepen it with their alienation and in this way, they are completely cut off from the reality of the regional

society's culture. These agent institutions do not solve any social problems and therefore increasingly becoming useless.

Although the Nation States in the region justified their existence to some extent with the creation of state capitalism at the beginning of capitalism, they soon will drown in social problems. They became not only anti-democratic, but also anti-social. Following the logic of their creation, Nation States were inherently opposed to the Democratic Nation. In their latest stages, this opposition turns into an opposition to society itself which leads to collapse of the opposition as a consequence. If we take a closer look at their current situation, we will be able to understand their reality better.



IF WE EVALUATE THE CURRENT STATE OF THE NATION-STATE IN THE REGION AND POSSIBLE DEVELOPMENTS WE CAN SAY THE FOLLOWING:

Arab Nation States have long been the main source of resentment among their own people. Of these Nation States, the Iraqi state, which seemed the strongest, has now become the graveyard of the Nation State. A new nation-state cannot be built in the place of the destroyed Nation State, and even if Iraq will be divided into three new Nation States this will not solve the problems, but rather aggravate them and the war will reach the level of a massacre. Arab-Shiite, Arab-Sunni and Kurdish Nation States will certainly witness the bloodiest scenes in the 21st century.

When one looks at the current situation and compares it with the Halabja massacre in the recent past and other sectarian and ethnic massacres, the danger of future nationalist wars becomes clearer. The present and the future are very similar to the city-states that destroyed each other in the Sumerian era. I believe it would not be wrong

to say that from Morocco to Yemen, from Sudan to Syria and even Lebanon, the current situation of Arab Nation States will not be any different from Iraq in the near future. They appear to be fighting against Israel, but in reality they are cooperating to maintain Israel's existence. In fact their existence is made possible by Israeli hegemony. Perhaps the Arab Nation States need Israel the most. In the Arab world, the nationalism of political Islam is more problematic than secular nationalism and its Nation State. This nationalism, which is based on the exploitation of cultural Islam, can only play the role of a late fascist movement. As has been seen with the example of Al-Qaeda, it does not go beyond a provocateur organization that Nation States will always use as a shield. Whether it is the former or the new ones, Arab state-nationalism does not and cannot play any other role than that of a gravedigger for the social life and the Islamic tradition.

The other elements of capitalism, the institutions of industrialism and surplus value, are no different in this regard than state-nationalism. Industrialism and the economy based on oil and construction are going to be the biggest sources of crisis. When the oil runs out, with cities growing like tumors, the near future may be a real catastrophe for the Arabs. Throughout history, the Arab peoples have faced huge economic and democratic problems. Arab nation states that pursue Capitalist Modernity, let alone from solving these problems, do not even want to mention the word "solution". They always aggravate the problems, cover them with fake religious and sectarian wars, and push them towards a stage where, as seen in the example of Iraq, they either end up disintegrating or at war. The alternative to this would lie in solutions based on fundamental economic, social, cultural solutions and democratic nations. The second frame in which Arabs problems could be solved is through the

transcendence of Capitalist Modernity. The situation we are talking about here is a break from the system. One must be well aware that Islamic radicalism or political Islam cannot be alternative models. Islam as a culture against Capitalist Modernity can only play a role in an alternative life of Modernity. The paradigm of a modernity in which the historical and social realities of all peoples of the Middle East have their place, will also be the best alternative for the Arab people. For the people, the alternative modernity is a Democratic Modernity that is made up of the integration of the democratic, socialist, ecological, feminist and cultural national movements that have always struggled against Capitalist Modernity.



Whether it is the former or the new ones, Arab state-nationalism does not and cannot play any other role than that of a gravedigger for the social life and the Islamic tradition. The other elements of capitalism, the institutions of industrialism and surplus value, are no different in this regard than state-nationalism. Industrialism and the economy based on oil and construction are going to be the biggest sources of crisis. When the oil runs out, with cities growing like tumors, the near future may be a real catastrophe for the Arabs.

“The nationalist, Islamist and state-nationalist views of the Arab nation towards Israel has been coordinated by the hegemony of the Israeli-Jewish ideology itself.”

Throughout history, the Arab peoples have faced huge economic and democratic problems. Arab nation states that pursue Capitalist Modernity, let alone from solving these problems, do not even want to mention the word

"solution". They always aggravate the problems, cover them with fake religious and sectarian wars, and push them towards a stage where, as seen in the example of Iraq, they either end up disintegrating or at war. The alternative to this would lie in solutions based on fundamental economic, social, cultural solutions and democratic nations. The second frame in which Arabs problems could be solved is through the transcendence of Capitalist Modernity. The situation we are talking about here is a break from the system. One must be well aware that Islamic radicalism or political Islam cannot be alternative models. Islam as a culture against Capitalist Modernity can only play a role in an alternative life of Modernity. The paradigm of a modernity in which the historical and social realities of all peoples of the Middle East have their place, will also be the best alternative for the Arab people. For the people, the alternative modernity is a Democratic Modernity that is

made up of the integration of the democratic, socialist, ecological, feminist and cultural national movements that have always struggled against Capitalist Modernity. In the context of the Arab problems, the problems of second-order are related to the existence of Israel. The nationalist, Islamist and state-nationalist views of the Arab nation towards Israel has been coordinated by the hegemony of the Israeli-Jewish ideology itself. For these remain within the limits drawn by the Israeli-Jewish state and ideology. As long as they remain within the same modernity, even if the Israeli hegemony is small in number, they will remain it's toy. Israel itself will not be able to free itself from what it created - that is from Capitalist Modernity - and will remain its captive. As long as Israel finds itself surrounded by a sea of Arabs and fears that it can be drowned at any time by hostile forces, it will not step back from using all means of its superiority in weapon technology to defend itself,

including even atomic weapons. Israel either has to create a Middle East that completely accepts Israel's hegemony and find balance with the existing nation states. How difficult this will be has just been explained. Or, if it wants to free itself from the captivity of the system it has created, it must consider overcoming capitalist modernity. In the complex situation in the Middle East, Democratic Modernity is the only alternative for a permanent solution, not only for the Jewish problem, but also for the problem of the state of Israel, which is surrounded by nationalist and religionist monsters.

If one thinks of Judaism only in the context of Capitalism, Modernity, and the Nation State, it would be insufficient and wrong. Its impact on Democratic Modernity has been significant. Although not as strong as the historical line of domination and oppression (the Jewish Kingdom, the State of Israel) there has always been a strong Jewish line of Democratic Civilization.

The poor part of Judaism and its relations that has weakened the tribal relations are always mentioned in history. From Ismael, Prophet Abraham's son from his concubine Hagar, to Joseph in Egypt, from Moses' sister Mary to Jesus' mother Mary, and from there to our present day, many prophets, writers, intellectuals, social anarchists, feminists, philosophers, and scientists, all of whom have made great discoveries, inventions, theories, revolutions, and works of art, show another face of the Jewish people in the struggle for Democratic Civilization and the struggle for Modernity.

The Jews have not always used their material and ideological power for the benefit of the monopolists.

Many of their important efforts and successes have been made for a brighter, more just, free, and more democratic world. What movement of prophets, support for the poor, Utopian, socialist, anarchist, feminist, and ecological movements can we imagine without the Jews? In philosophical schools, scientific and artistic movements, religious sects, one can hardly think of anything without Jews. Against Capitalism stands Socialism, against the Nation State Internationalism, against Liberalism Communalism, against sexist society Feminism, against Industrialism Eco-economism, against religious fanaticism Secularism, could any of them have developed without Jews and Judaism?



It is clear that Judaism is important to both worlds of modernity. In important parts of history and our present day, Jews maintain this importance. Nevertheless, the Jewish question, as it was in history, continues to exist in our present day. I would like to repeat a statement by K. Marx: Marx said: “If the proletariat wants to liberate itself, it must know that this will not happen until the world is liberated” I also say that if Judaism wants to liberate itself, it must know that it cannot liberate itself unless it liberates the world, and therefore it must use its strategic material and ideological power for this. Democratic Modernity is based on this foundation.

Jews must re-engage with the democratic culture of the Middle East in a measured and principled manner. In a Middle Eastern geopolitics of Nation State, Israel as a Nation State will always be at war. Fire cannot be extinguished with fire. No matter how contented it may be with the support of the hegemonic power of Capitalist Modernity, this is not

enough to provide a lasting solution. No system that is not free from Capitalist Modernity can provide lasting security. Until the Jewish people in general and the Israeli problem in particular are resolved, neither, in the Middle East nor in the whole world can societies solve their problems.

“Until the Jewish people in general and the Israeli problem in particular are resolved, neither, in the Middle East nor in the whole world can societies solve their problems.”


Nation State perspectives do not solve problems, they only aggravate them, and there is no better way to learn this than from the example of Israel and Palestine. An uncountable amount of money has been spent on the Israeli-Palestinian war and so much blood has been shed. What remains of all this is a legacy with more serious problems than before.

In the case of Israel-Palestine, what has failed is Capitalist Modernity and its Nation State paradigm. The wars, conflicts, and increasing tensions in the Middle East are making the transformation of Modernity necessary.

The aggravated social and national problems will not be solved and will not end until Modernity is transformed. The Arab-Israeli conflict itself also demonstrates the need for the transformation of Modernity. If the dominant system cannot solve the fundamental problems, what must be done is to (dis-)solve the system. Democratic Modernity offers an alternative for this solution.

When the culture of the Middle East renews itself, it should be known that the path to this will pass through a revolution in truth. The revolution in truth is a revolution in the way of thinking and living. Revolution is the liberation from the lifestyle and ideological hegemony of Capitalist Modernity.

One should not be fooled by the false religions and chauvinistic tribalism that pretend to hold on to tradition. They do not fight Capitalist Modernity. Like a watchdog, they want their share of it. One can never think of these people as fighters for truth. After all, they have not only been defeated by Modernity, they are even its servants.



If the old leftists, feminists, ecologists and culturalist movements want to be anti-modernists in their words and actions, they must know that the battle for truth takes place within the unity of words and action and must practice them in their own lifestyle. If the battle for truth is waged in every moment of life, in all social spheres, in economic and ecological communities, in democratic cities, local, regional, national and supranational spaces, it will achieve meaning and victory. Just as in the early days of religions, there were messengers and apostles, if those who search for the truth don't live like them, the battle for truth cannot be waged, and even if it is waged, it will not succeed.

Revolutions and revolutionaries do not die, which confirms that only if people take care of their legacy they can live. The culture of the Middle East is a culture of integrating thought-speech-action and is quite rich in this respect. Democratic Modernity will play its historical role by adding its criticism of civilization

and Capitalist Modernity to this culture. The Middle East needs the poems of re-awakened goddesses, Zoroaster, Moses, Jesus and Muhammad, Saint Paul, Mani, Veysel Qerani, Hallac-i Mansur, Suhrawardi, Yunus Emre and Bruno. The revolution for truth does not become old by incorporating the old heritage, instead in this way it renews itself; otherwise

“The militant of truth in the democratic era is the person who creates this identity in her/his personality, lives the legacy of life in a free way and make others live it.”

it will not succeed. After all, what remains is our heritage of life, our social identity. The militant of truth in the democratic era is the person who creates this identity in her/his personality, lives the legacy of life in a free way and make others live it.

The individual of a democratic civilization, as much as she/he wages a thought-speech-action based struggle against the three apocalyptical horsemen of Capitalist Modernity (capitalism, industrialism and the nation state she/he must also wage a thought-speech-action based struggle in her/his own person for life with the three angels of salvation of Democratic Modernity (economic society, ecological society and

democratic society). Otherwise she/he cannot constitute her/himself as an individual of a Democratic Civilization and cannot make her/himself a pioneer of truth. As much as the academic community does not live and struggle together with the collective social units, it cannot be the pioneer of realizing a world of justice, freedom and democracy.



**“When the culture of the Middle East renews itself,
it should be known that the path to this will pass through a
revolution in truth. The revolution in truth is a revolution in
the way of thinking and living. Revolution is the liberation
from the lifestyle and ideological hegemony
of Capitalist Modernity.”**



**internationalistcommune.com
t.me/communeinfo
x.com/CommuneInt**