



International Solidarity for Freedom of Expression on the Context of Societal Fascistization

Contents

1. Concept of The State
2. Transition from Free-Competition to Imperialist Capitalism
3. The Fate of The Bourgeois-Democratic Rights and Freedoms
4. A Critical Review
5. Long live International Solidarity!
6. References

1. Concept of The State

The Historic Origin of the State

The state is not a timeless entity but a historical product that emerged alongside class divisions in society. In fact, the state arose as a response to the irreconcilable contradictions between economic classes, serving as a tool for the dominant class to enforce its interests. There was a time when there was no state, or at least an organized power on behalf of some against the others. In this period, which is called primitive communism, the production and consumption were organized collectively with no one deprived of benefits of this process.

The State as a Product of Class Society

Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels asserted that the state originates from material conditions and class antagonisms. In *The Communist Manifesto*, they described the state as "a committee for managing the common affairs of the whole bourgeoisie" (Marx and Engels, 1848). This highlights that the state is an expression of class rule, not a neutral or eternal institution.

This is the case even in the most democratic countries of the world in our era. Nowhere in the world does the state represent the whole society, but interests of their classes, the bourgeoisie. Nevertheless, they do their best to pretend they are representatives of the whole society, e.g. through public voting.

Engels explored the historical evolution of the state in *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*. He argued that the state emerged at a specific point in societal development, when social surplus and private property created class distinctions. According to Engels:

"The state is, therefore, by no means a power forced on society from without... Rather, it is a product of society at a particular stage of development; it is the admission that this society has become entangled in an insoluble contradiction with itself" (Engels, 1884).

The state was created to regulate conflicts between classes and protect the property and privileges of the ruling class. It thus institutionalized oppression, ensuring the domination of the propertied class over those who labored.

Forms of the State in Class Societies

The state takes different forms depending on the dominant mode of production. In ancient societies, the state functioned as a tool for slave owners. In feudal societies, it served the interests of the aristocracy. With the rise of capitalism, the state became an instrument of the bourgeoisie to enforce capitalist exploitation and protect private property.

This simple fact that the ruling states in our time are just the organized power of the ruling classes, is not deniable, especially since the beginning of the new millennium when local/world wars were conducted, e.g. on Iraq, Afghanistan, Libya, Syria, Ukraine, etc. These wars, with participation of all NATO members and other imperialist powers, are of course financed by the taxes of the hardworking masses, and against the masses, but in absolute absence of the very masses behind the closed doors. This simple fact, once again asserted and pushed forward the true ideas of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels on the concept of the state on the one hand, and demolished all versions of bourgeois theories on the subject, on the other hand, which were taught for decades in academic circles of metropolises.

Lenin reaffirmed this understanding in *The State and Revolution*, where he described the state as a mechanism of coercion:

"The state arises where, when, and insofar as class antagonism cannot be objectively reconciled. And conversely, the existence of the state proves that the class antagonisms are irreconcilable" (Lenin, 1917).

Therefore, a scientific view situates the state within a historical and materialist framework, seeing it as an instrument born of class conflict. Its origins lie in economic inequality, and its ultimate fate is to dissolve when class antagonisms are resolved in a higher communist society.

2. Transition from Free-Competition to Imperialist Capitalism

Transition from free-competition capitalism to imperialist capitalism was a critical stage in the development of the global capitalist system. This transition, primarily analyzed by Vladimir Lenin, builds upon the foundational works of Marx and Engels, who described the dynamics of capital accumulation and class struggle that drive capitalism's evolution.

Free-Competition Capitalism

In its early stages, capitalism was characterized by free competition among numerous small producers and merchants. Marx and Engels outlined this phase in *The Communist Manifesto*, where they emphasized how capitalism initially freed productive forces: "*The bourgeoisie, historically, has played a most revolutionary part... It has created more massive and more colossal productive forces than have all preceding generations together*" (Marx and Engels, 1848).

However, Marx noted in *Capital* that this competitive environment leads inevitably to the centralization of capital:

"Centralization of the means of production and socialization of labor reach a point at which they become incompatible with their capitalist integument" (Marx, 1867).

As competition intensifies, smaller capitalists are driven out, leading to monopolization and the domination of large corporations.

As the state in the former free-competition capitalism was a collective representation of the whole bourgeoisies and merchants, it had inevitably a given democratic character. It is true, it was still the coercion instrument in the hands of capitalists against workers and peasants, but, as there were no monopolies, the state was in a position to be shared among all capitalists, hence democratic as it was promised in all bourgeois revolutions.

The Rise of Imperialism

Lenin further developed Marx's analysis in *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*, identifying the transition to imperialism as the result of monopolization. He outlined five key features of imperialism:

1. **Concentration of Production and Capital:** Large-scale industries and monopolies dominate economic life, replacing free competition. "*At a certain stage of development, concentration itself, as it were, leads directly to monopoly*" (Lenin, 1917).
2. **Financial Capital and Financial Oligarchy:** The merging of industrial and banking capital gives rise to financial capital controlled by powerful oligarchies.

Some of these oligarchs, mainly from two super-imperialist countries of the United States and Russia are listed below for instance. There is plethora of them around the world:

Roman Abramovich (Russia) - A prominent figure in Russia's oil and gas industries.

Oleg Deripaska (Russia) - A key figure in the Russian aluminium industry.

Charles Koch (USA) - As the co-owner of Koch Industries, one of the largest privately-held companies in the U.S., Koch has used his wealth to influence political policies, particularly through his funding of conservative causes and politicians.

David Koch (USA) - Though he passed away in 2019, David Koch's influence as a philanthropist and political donor has left a lasting impact, particularly in supporting conservative movements.

Harold Hamm (USA) - The founder of Continental Resources, Hamm is a major figure in the American oil industry and has used his wealth to support political causes, including funding Mitt Romney's presidential campaign.

Alisher Usmanov (Russia) - A major figure in the Russian metals and telecommunications sectors, Usmanov has close ties to the Kremlin and was once one of the richest men in Russia.

Donald Trump (USA) - The former and future U.S. president is often described as an oligarch due to his vast wealth and influence, particularly in real estate and his use of political power to benefit his business interests.

3. **Export of Capital:** In imperialist capitalism, the export of surplus capital (investments abroad) becomes more important than the export of goods, reflecting the saturation of domestic markets.

A few prominent examples of capital export in modern imperialist contexts include:

U.S. Investments in China: The U.S. has historically invested heavily in China, particularly in sectors like technology, manufacturing, and finance. Companies such as Apple and Microsoft maintain significant investments in China, which is a hub for production due to its lower labor costs.

European Investments in Africa: European countries, especially former colonial powers such as France, have continued to export capital to Africa. French companies like Total and BNP Paribas have substantial stakes in the continent's oil and financial sectors

Japanese Investments in Southeast Asia: Japan exports capital to countries like Indonesia, Vietnam, and Malaysia. Japanese multinational corporations like Toyota and Sony benefit from cheap labor while securing profits from the local markets

German Capital in Eastern Europe: Germany has invested heavily in Eastern Europe, particularly in manufacturing industries like automotive and energy, as these regions provide cheaper labor compared to Germany. Companies like Volkswagen and Siemens have made substantial investments

British Financial Capital in the Middle East: The UK remains a significant player in capital export, particularly through financial institutions like HSBC. Its investments are often directed towards oil-producing regions like the Middle East

4. **Formation of International Monopolies:** Monopoly alliances dominate global trade and divide the world among themselves.

Here are five examples of prominent monopolies across different regions:

United States - Google: Google dominates the global search engine market, controlling around 90% of all online searches.

Europe - Luxottica: An Italian company, Luxottica has substantial control over the eyewear market. It owns brands like Ray-Ban and Oakley, and also manufactures for other luxury brands, leading to its overwhelming dominance in the global eyewear industry

China - Alibaba: Alibaba Group is a Chinese multinational conglomerate that operates in sectors including e-commerce, cloud computing, and digital payments.

Russia - Gazprom: As a state-controlled enterprise, Gazprom is the world's largest producer of natural gas, dominating the energy sector in Russia and influencing global energy markets. It is a key player in the energy monopoly of the country

United States - Tyson Foods: This company controls a significant share of the U.S. poultry market, providing chicken to major retailers and fast-food chains. Tyson Foods has faced multiple accusations of market manipulation

5. **Territorial Division of the World:** Competition between imperialist powers leads to the division and redivision of colonies and territories, resulting in conflicts and wars.

For instance:

The war among western imperialists on the one hand and Russian imperialists on the other hand over *Ukraine*.

Imperialist conflicts over seizure of *Syria* among new imperialist powers of Turkey, Islamic Republic of Iran, and Saudi Arabia.

Militaristic/fascist expansionism conducted by Israel's government through *Palestine*, supported by unanimously whole western imperialists.

Lenin argued that imperialism is the highest stage of capitalism because it represents the system's maturity and its inherent contradictions. The economic concentration and global expansion of capital intensify class struggle, inter-imperialist rivalries, and the exploitation of colonial regions. Therefore, in the imperialist stage of capitalism, monopolies subjugate all spheres of society to their sole interests.

Contradictions and Revolutionary Potential

The transition to imperialism does not resolve capitalism's contradictions but instead exacerbates them. Marx and Engels foresaw this in *The Communist Manifesto*: "Modern industry has established the world market, for which the discovery of America paved the way" (Marx and Engels, 1848).

Lenin emphasized that the concentration of capital under imperialism heightens inequalities, leading to conditions ripe for proletarian revolution. He wrote: "Imperialism is the eve of the socialist revolution" (Lenin, 1917).

The scientific analysis of the transition from free-competition to imperialist capitalism demonstrates capitalism's inherent tendency toward monopolization and global expansion.

While this stage intensifies exploitation and contradictions, it also demolishes all formerly known democratic principles, creating the conditions for revolutionary change.

2. The Fate of The Bourgeois-Democratic Rights and Freedoms

Bourgeois-democratic rights and freedoms, which are products of bourgeois revolution, but kept alive by the endless efforts of the masses during centuries, are seen as a necessary but limited stage in the historical development of society. These rights and freedoms, often supported by the bourgeoisie during the early stages of capitalist development, represent a form of political freedom that serves the interests of the capitalist class, while still suppressing the working class and preventing true liberation. However, this narrow given framework is still worth struggling for, especially when fascists were and are determined to destroy them.

On the Importance of Bourgeois Democracy

Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels recognized the significance of bourgeois-democratic rights in advancing certain freedoms, particularly in opposition to feudal and absolutist monarchies. For example, in the *Communist Manifesto* (1848), Marx and Engels argued that the bourgeoisie, through its revolution against feudalism, established basic political freedoms like freedom of speech, assembly, and press, which were essential for the development of capitalist society. However, these rights were inherently limited as they ultimately served the interests of the bourgeoisie by maintaining capitalist property relations. Marx and Engels emphasized that these freedoms, while progressive in comparison to feudal systems, were still constrained by class interests, and they would ultimately have to be transcended through a proletarian revolution (Marx & Engels, 1848).

Marx, in his analysis of the state (especially in works like *The Civil War in France*), argued that the state, even under bourgeois democracy, is not neutral but an instrument of class oppression. In capitalist societies, the state enforces the interests of the ruling class—the bourgeoisie. As Marx wrote in *Critique of the Gotha Program* (1875), while the bourgeois state grants certain freedoms, it also limits the workers' ability to fully assert their collective will, keeping capitalist property relations intact.

But *what happens to the bourgeois-democratic rights and freedoms* when the free-competition ends and imperialists subjugate all spheres of society?

The Subjugation of Democracy under Imperialism

Vladimir Lenin, in *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism* (1917), explained that as capitalism develops into imperialism, the era of free competition gives way to monopoly domination. Economic power becomes concentrated in the hands of a few massive corporations and financial oligarchies, as we saw above. This shift profoundly affects bourgeois-democratic rights, as the capitalist state increasingly aligns itself with monopoly capital to suppress dissent and maintain the status quo. Lenin noted that under imperialism, even the semblance of democracy often serves as a tool to obscure the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie (Lenin, 1917).

Bourgeois-democratic rights such as freedom of speech, assembly, and press become instruments of control rather than genuine freedoms. Monopoly capital uses these mechanisms to manipulate public opinion and marginalize revolutionary forces. As Lenin observed, imperialism leads to a heightened repression of workers' movements and the curtailment of their democratic participation to safeguard the economic and political dominance of the ruling class.

However, does this mean that revolutionaries and conscious and awake intellectuals must resign voluntarily from the necessary fight for bourgeois-democratic rights and freedoms? The answer is a resounding NO. In fact, this is the most important democratic task of the proletariat and their allies to uphold and promote genuine democratic rights and freedoms. Only through this path can the oppressed people raise their voice and propaganda against the dirty conspiracies of monopolies, if the revolutionary agenda is not available. And if you are subtle enough, you immediately comprehend that if anything has remained from these democratic rights and freedoms, that is because of the heroic struggles of the very masses and their conscientious representatives.

The Role of Militarism and Repression

Imperialism is also marked by an expansion of militarism, which undermines democratic rights further. Lenin argued that the imperialist state becomes increasingly militarized to protect its

global interests, suppress internal dissent, and maintain order within its borders. For example, states under imperialist control use laws and state apparatus to suppress workers' organizations, revolutionary movements, and any forms of resistance to monopoly power (Lenin, 1917).

In *The Civil War in France* (1871), Karl Marx analyzed the Paris Commune as a challenge to the bourgeois state's repressive apparatus. He argued that the bourgeoisie would always prioritize the preservation of its economic interests over democratic ideals. Under imperialism, this contradiction intensifies as the state transforms into an outright instrument of monopoly control, using force and legislation to stifle opposition.

Ideological Domination and Cultural Subjugation

Imperialism extends its control to all spheres of life, including ideology, education, and culture. Friedrich Engels, in *Anti-Dühring* (1877), highlighted how bourgeois ideology pervades society under capitalism. In the imperialist stage, this domination becomes even more pronounced, with the ruling class leveraging cultural and ideological institutions to legitimize its power and suppress alternatives. The "freedom" provided by bourgeois-democratic institutions becomes a façade, masking the lack of genuine equality or representation for the proletariat. However, the best art of proletariat during relative calmness must be unmasking this democracy and advocating for a genuine one!

4. A Critical Review

Freedom of expression is not constitutionally guaranteed or is severely restricted in several countries. Here are a few examples, among numerous ones, where freedom of expression is either not enshrined in the constitution or faces significant legal and practical barriers. It is worth thinking about that these countries are either new imperialist powers of their geopolitical block, or strongly backed by imperialists of west and east, no matter!

1. **North Korea:** The government maintains strict control over all forms of expression, with no constitutional provision for freedom of speech. Backed by Chinese and Russian imperialists.
2. **China:** Freedom of expression is heavily restricted, and the government exercises extensive control over media and internet content. A super-imperialist power.

3. **Saudi Arabia:** The kingdom lacks constitutional guarantees for freedom of expression, with severe penalties for dissent. New imperialist power, strongly backed by U.S imperialism.
4. **Iran:** Despite constitutional references to some freedoms, expression is highly controlled, with dissent often criminalized. New imperialist country, strongly backed by Russian and Chinese imperialists.

Fate of a man who defies Islam:

Salman Rushdie, an acclaimed British-Indian author, became the target of controversy and hostility from the Islamic Republic of Iran following the publication of his novel *The Satanic Verses* in 1988. The book was deemed blasphemous by many Muslims due to its perceived irreverent portrayal of Islam and the Prophet Muhammad.

In 1989, Iran's Supreme Leader, Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini, issued a fatwa (religious edict) calling for Rushdie's assassination, offering a multimillion-dollar bounty for his death. This led to years of threats and violence against Rushdie and individuals associated with the book, including translators and publishers, some of whom were attacked or killed. The fatwa remains technically in effect, though the Iranian government has, at times, distanced itself from actively pursuing it.

The incident underscored tensions between freedom of expression and religious sensitivities, sparking global debates about censorship and free speech. Rushdie lived under police protection for many years but continued his literary work despite the threats. In 2022, he was attacked and severely injured during a public appearance in New York.

5. **Syria:** Amid ongoing conflict, expression is heavily monitored and suppressed by the government. Backed by Russian and Iranian imperialists.
6. **United Arab Emirates (UAE):** Freedom of expression is limited, particularly regarding criticism of the government or monarchy. New imperialist power backed by western imperialists.
7. **Turkey:** Freedom of expression experiences tough days and is close to death. Tens of thousands of journalists have filled the prisons after the recent 2016 coup. New imperialist power. Member of, and strongly backed by, NATO.

In these countries, lack of constitutional guarantees or the presence of vague laws enables governments to restrict expression through censorship, arrests, and other forms of suppression

However, the story does not end here.

On the other side of the world, the most “democratic”, “republic” western world, surprisingly we have a similar story, though this time in unveiled “justified” form.

Here in this article, there is no time for us to review the most sophisticated and masked forms of manipulation of public opinions by media, controlled by imperialists, which is outright against freedom of conscience. Here, we just limit ourselves to a few, but systematic, violations of freedom of expression stemming from imperialist ruling classes against the justified freedom-related wishes of the masses.

Recent incidents in Western countries highlight significant restrictions on freedom of expression, particularly in the context of mass protests and demonstrations:

1. **United Kingdom:** The introduction of the Public Order Act in 2023 significantly restricted the right to protest. This law criminalized certain forms of peaceful protest, including spontaneous demonstrations, and imposed penalties for causing "serious disruption," undermining freedom of assembly and expression. It was widely criticized as a tool to suppress dissent, especially targeting climate activists (source: Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch).

Restrictions on Anti-Monarchy Protests in the UK: During King Charles III's coronation, peaceful protesters were detained under broad policing powers, raising concerns over freedom of speech (source: Electronic Frontier Foundation and Human Rights Watch).

2. **France:** In 2023, protests against pension reforms faced harsh responses, with authorities deploying tear gas and detaining protesters en masse. There was criticism over excessive force and surveillance, which created a chilling effect on participation (source: Amnesty International and JURIST).

Censorship Laws in France: Measures against the spread of disinformation led to penalties that critics argue are overly broad and threaten legitimate journalism and dissent (source: ARTICLE 19).

3. **Germany:** Palestinian solidarity protests were preemptively banned in Berlin, justified by discriminatory, stereotypic assumptions about participants. Such restrictions violated international standards on peaceful assembly (source: Amnesty International).

Suppression of Environmental Activists: Western countries, including Germany, have cracked down on environmental activists with arrests and restrictive measures during protests (source: ARTICLE 19).

The display of Rojava-related flags, such as those of the YPG (People's Protection Units) and YPJ (Women's Protection Units), has faced restrictions in Germany due to their perceived connection to the PKK (Kurdistan Workers' Party), a banned organization in the country. In 2017, the German Interior Ministry issued directives prohibiting certain Kurdish symbols, including these flags, under the PKK ban. While the YPG and YPJ have been recognized internationally for their fight against ISIS, German authorities argue that these symbols are linked to the PKK, labeled a terrorist organization by Germany, Turkey, and others. This has led to police confiscating such flags during protests and even launching investigations against individuals displaying them. However, some court rulings, such as one in Gelsenkirchen, have acquitted activists, declaring that the flags were not banned outright. Activists continue to call for a nationwide lifting of these restrictions, arguing that the bans undermine freedom of expression and assembly (source: ANF English Mobile, Kurdistan24, and Emergency Committee for Rojava).

4. **Netherlands:** Police used water cannons and detained hundreds of climate activists during Extinction Rebellion demonstrations. Critics argued that the crackdown was disproportionate and discouraged civil disobedience (source: Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch).
5. **Spain:** Anti-protest laws, including the "Gag Law," have been used to restrict freedom of assembly. These measures included heavy fines for unauthorized protests, surveillance of activists, and limitations on expressing dissent near certain government buildings (source: Amnesty International).
6. **Italy:** Climate activists have been labeled "eco-terrorists" and faced legal penalties under anti-terrorism laws. Such measures have sparked concerns about the criminalization of peaceful civil disobedience (source: Amnesty International).

7. **Austria:** In 2023, peaceful anti-government protesters were subjected to police surveillance and fines for violating new laws requiring prior notification of assemblies, raising concerns about unnecessary restrictions (source: Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch).
8. **Sweden:** Collaboration in coordinated stage against Julian Assange for sexual misconduct allegations:

The sexual misconduct allegations against Julian Assange were part of a political conspiracy typically to neutralize or discredit him for his work with WikiLeaks:

Timing of Allegations:

The allegations emerged shortly after WikiLeaks released classified U.S. military and diplomatic documents, such as the "Collateral Murder" video and the Afghanistan and Iraq war logs. The timing suggests an effort to tarnish Assange's reputation and shift focus from the leaks to his personal life.

U.S. Involvement:

The U.S. pressured Sweden to pursue the case to facilitate his extradition. The fear was that once Assange was in Swedish custody, Sweden might hand him over to the U.S. more readily than the U.K.

Dropping and Reviving the Case:

Swedish prosecutors initially dropped the investigation in 2010, citing insufficient evidence, but later reopened it after international attention. This back-and-forth reflects external political pressure rather than a genuine pursuit of justice.

Extradition Risk:

Assange sought asylum in the Ecuadorian Embassy not primarily to avoid the allegations in Sweden, but to prevent extradition to the U.S. His asylum application and subsequent statements emphasized this concern, suggesting that the allegations were a pretext for eventual U.S. extradition.

Lack of Formal Charges:

Assange was never formally charged in Sweden; prosecutors only sought to question him. This indicates a weak legal case, used more for its political implications than for resolving the allegations.

Statements from Officials:

Former officials, such as Nils Melzer, the UN Special Rapporteur on Torture, have described the allegations as a coordinated attack on Assange's credibility. Melzer

criticized Sweden's handling of the case, suggesting procedural irregularities that undermine its legitimacy

The portrayal of Assange in the media as a fugitive evading justice bolstered the narrative against him, which his supporters claim was deliberately cultivated to discredit WikiLeaks and its revelations.

9. **Canada:** Protests by indigenous groups against pipeline construction faced militarized police responses, including arrests and surveillance, which activists criticized as suppressing environmental and indigenous rights movements (source: Human Rights Watch).
10. **United States:** Authorities in multiple states enacted anti-protest laws that imposed harsh penalties for participating in demonstrations deemed disruptive. These measures disproportionately targeted racial justice protests (source: Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch).

Targeting of Journalists in the U.S.: Reports indicate that some journalists covering protests or government actions have faced detentions and equipment seizures, undermining press freedom (source: Electronic Frontier Foundation).

Pressure on Whistleblowers: In the U.S., whistleblowers exposing government misconduct have faced prosecution under the Espionage Act, which critics argue is used to silence dissent (source: Electronic Frontier Foundation and ARTICLE 19).

Fate of a man who exposes war crime documents against the U.S super-imperialism: Julian Assange is the founder of WikiLeaks, an organization known for publishing classified information, leaked documents, and news of significant public interest. His case has become a landmark example of issues surrounding press freedom, whistleblowing, and state secrecy.

WikiLeaks and U.S. Leaks: Assange gained global attention in 2010 when WikiLeaks published a series of leaks provided by whistleblower Chelsea Manning. These included classified U.S. military and diplomatic documents, such as the "Collateral Murder" video, exposing civilian deaths in Iraq.

Legal Troubles in Sweden: In 2010, Assange faced allegations of sexual misconduct in Sweden. He denied the charges, claiming they were politically motivated, and sought

asylum to avoid extradition to Sweden and potentially the U.S, where he would have encountered the risk of execution.

Asylum in the Ecuadorian Embassy: Assange entered the Ecuadorian Embassy in London in 2012, where he was granted asylum to avoid extradition. He remained there for nearly seven years until Ecuador withdrew his asylum in 2019.

Arrest in London: In April 2019, British police arrested Assange for breaching bail conditions. Subsequently, the U.S. requested his extradition on charges of conspiracy to commit computer intrusion and, later, multiple charges under the Espionage Act for publishing classified materials.

Extradition and Legal Battle: Assange was detained in Belmarsh Prison in the UK while fighting extradition to the U.S. If he was extradited and convicted, he would face up to 175 years in prison. His supporters argue that his prosecution undermines press freedom globally.

Health and Human Rights Concerns: Organizations like Amnesty International and the UN had raised concerns about Assange's health and the implications of his extradition for journalistic freedom.

The case remained highly controversial, with debates about the balance between state security and the public's right to know.

A subtle reader would immediately find similarities in the cases of Salman Rushdie and Julian Assange:

Julian Assange and Salman Rushdie share similarities in becoming polarizing figures due to their work challenging powerful institutions and norms:

Both faced severe backlash for exercising free speech: Assange through WikiLeaks, exposing state secrets, and Rushdie through his controversial novel *The Satanic Verses*. Their actions sparked international debates over the limits of free expression, accountability, and censorship.

Assange had faced prolonged legal battles and potential extradition to the U.S., while Rushdie was subject to a fatwa calling for his assassination, leading to years of living in hiding or under protection.

Many view them as champions of truth and free speech, while detractors criticize them for recklessness or offense against religious or national security interests.

Both cases highlight the challenges faced by individuals at the intersection of expression, power, and global controversy.

11. Hungary: Targeting LGBTQ+ Content. While Hungary is part of the EU, recent laws have targeted LGBTQ+ content, limiting freedom of expression under the guise of protecting minors (source: Electronic Frontier Foundation and ARTICLE 19)

These actions demonstrate a trend of increasing restrictions under the guise of maintaining public order. Here one must ask the basic question regarding the concept of the state again: whom will this instrument (the state) serve through maintaining public order? Does this public order benefit the slaves or the slaveowners? When Lenin consistently described imperialism as inherently reactionary, marked by political suppression domestically and aggressive expansion abroad (Lenin, 1917), he had this clear universal image in his brilliant mind.

5. Long live International Solidarity!

It goes without saying that in countries where the freedom of expression has not paved its way to their constitutions, revolutionaries and freedom-seekers, democrats and socialists have one direct task, the Democratic Revolution. Social movements in countries such as Iran, Iraq, Afghanistan, Turkey, the countries of the Persian Gulf, northern Africa, Palestinian and Kurdish peoples, the Middle East in short, have the same destiny: the overthrow of Islamic fascist regimes and the establishment of a new type of people democracies, in total independency of east/west imperialists.

In the so called western democratic countries, the story has its complexities. Here, the democratic façade is still working. And, on paper at least, every “civilian” citizen has his/her protected democratic rights and freedoms. However, if we, once and for all, let ourselves to get rid of the tiring tune of social media about so called far-right/conservative parties and politics, which are really gaining power in the US and Europe, we find ourselves encountered by fascists and fascistization of state, economy and all societal sphere of life.

This fascistization has its economic and historic roots in the present stage of capitalist development, began with the latest and deepest world economic crisis of 2008.

Therefore, a twofold task is assumed here in these countries: protecting and upholding bourgeois democratic rights and freedoms, on the one hand, and proceeding with the international socialist revolution on the other hand, in solidarity with revolutionaries, freedom-seekers, democrats and socialists of the first group.

Over the last decade, there has been a notable increase in far-right governments in Europe, with countries such as Hungary, Italy, Poland, Sweden, Finland, and Slovakia electing leaders or forming coalitions with far-right parties. These governments often emphasize nationalist, anti-immigration, and Euroskeptic policies, signaling a shift in political landscapes across the continent. **Hungary** under Viktor Orbán, for instance, has been characterized as unambiguously far-right, with strong anti-LGBTQ+ stances and restrictions on media freedom. **Italy**, led by Giorgia Meloni of the Brothers of Italy party, represents another prominent example of this trend.

In the **United States**, far-right governments particularly under Donald Trump's presidency has officially held power. These movements have influenced broader political narratives, focusing on immigration restrictions, nationalism, and a critique of globalism.

In **Germany** the far-right Alternative for Germany (AfD) party has gained prominence, becoming the main opposition party in some regions. While not in federal power, its influence has grown at the state level, particularly in East Germany.

This surge of far-right influence in Western democracies highlights significant political realignments driven by economic uncertainty, migration crises, and cultural conservatism, reshaping both domestic and international policies

In **France**, far-right movements, particularly Marine Le Pen's National Rally (Rassemblement National), have gained substantial voter support in presidential and legislative elections. However, France has not had a far-right government in recent decades. Le Pen's party has acted as a strong opposition force rather than forming a government.

In 2022, **Sweden** saw a significant shift when the Sweden Democrats, a far-right party, became a major player in a coalition government. Although they do not directly hold the prime minister's office, they strongly influence policy under the leadership of the Moderate Party's Ulf Kristersson.

This list does not end here!

The social/economic benefits which have been achieved by peoples' decades-long endless efforts after the World War II are being cut during one-night legislations and the freedom of expression is no exception.

Nevertheless, these fascist efforts have vanished against the most curious measure taken by the European governments in defense of Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu, the highest responsible person of the genocide in Palestine. This case shows everything one needs to know about what freedom of expression means to European states.

European governments have expressed “mixed” reactions to the International Criminal Court's (ICC) recent arrest warrants for Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu and other officials over war crimes. This has led to a complex balancing act, as countries neglect their obligations under international law while considering their diplomatic and historical ties with Israel.

Germany strongly supports the ICC but has hesitated to commit to enforcing the arrest warrant, citing its "unique relations and great responsibility" with Israel due to historical ties. German officials have indicated it is difficult to imagine Netanyahu being arrested on German soil. (Source: Deutsche Welle)

France and the Netherlands: Both have emphasized respecting the ICC's decisions and complying with international law, though no one has seen any practical manifestation of this empty will, up to this date. (Source: Deutsche Welle)

United Kingdom and Canada: These nations respect the ICC's independence but have refrained from explicitly endorsing immediate action, reflecting broader concerns about diplomatic consequences. (Source: Al-Monitor)

And the **United States** has consistently rejected the International Criminal Court's jurisdiction over cases involving Israel and its leaders, including the potential criminal decree targeting Benjamin Netanyahu (source: Al-Monitor). The U.S. imperialism has a history of opposing ICC investigations into allies or its own actions. For example, it previously sanctioned ICC officials over investigations into U.S. war crimes in Afghanistan. This reflects a broader policy of protecting U.S. and allied leaders from international legal actions perceived as politically motivated.

These are just a few examples of how imperialist countries react to what they themselves have created as international law, let alone what their reaction might be to what has been created, kept and defended by the people, like freedom of expression.

But more “amazing” than this is the reaction of so-called democratic organizations and NGOs in this regard and in regard to freedom of expression.

Many organizations advocating for freedom of expression, such as PEN International, Amnesty International, and ARTICLE 19, have faced criticism for perceived negligence or inadequacy in addressing the suppression of free speech related to the crisis in Gaza. Here are a few examples where organizations or institutions were accused of not fully supporting free expression or dissent regarding the situation:

Limited Condemnation of Israeli Actions: Amnesty International has warned about genocide risks in Gaza but has been critiqued for not forcefully addressing systemic barriers preventing accountability for war crimes and free speech violations. (Source: Amnesty International Australia)

PEN International and Frankfurt Book Fair Incident: PEN International received backlash when an award event for a Palestinian writer was postponed amid the conflict, highlighting perceived censorship under pressure from pro-Israel groups. (Source: PEN Australia)

Media Suppression: Organizations like ARTICLE 19 reported widespread suppression of Palestinian voices, including censorship of phrases and symbols deemed as support for terrorism, affecting academic, artistic, and journalistic freedoms. (Source: ARTICLE 19)

Fear of Retaliation: Journalists and academics have faced backlash for expressing solidarity with Palestinians, leading many to self-censoring to avoid accusations of antisemitism or professional consequences. (Source: PEN Australia and ARTICLE 19)

Hollywood Blacklisting: High-profile figures such as Susan Sarandon were dropped from projects after expressing pro-Palestinian sentiments, raising questions about freedom of speech in entertainment sectors. (Source: PEN Australia)

Social Media Platforms: These platforms have been criticized for taking down pro-Palestinian posts while allowing content supporting Israeli narratives, showing a double standard in upholding free speech. (Source: ARTICLE 19)

International Writers' Silence: Many prominent writers and journalists refrained from signing open letters or making public statements on Gaza due to fear of professional retaliation, despite being champions of free expression in other contexts. (Source: PEN Australia)

Protest Restrictions: Laws and policies in countries like Germany criminalizing certain forms of Palestinian solidarity, such as slogans or flags, were highlighted as attacks on free expression. (Source: ARTICLE 19)

Inconsistent Institutional Support: PEN and other organizations have been accused of responding unevenly to freedom of expression issues, sometimes prioritizing affiliations over their core advocacy mission. (Source: PEN Australia and ARTICLE 19)

This latest imperialist “masterpiece” in Gaza and their determination to continue to defend their project, in conjunction with all those “defenders” of freedom of expressions guided by bourgeois and petty-bourgeois modes of thinking, has just shown once again a simple fact, hence leading us to think twice over the lessons learnt by conscious proletariat across the world in the course of their decades-long struggles for genuine freedoms. The lessons are still alive:

- Struggle for every, absolutely every, democratic rights and freedoms here in the bourgeois framework.
- Opening new opportunities and paths to ratify new radical democratic rights and freedoms.
- Well-known democratic organizations such as PEN, etc. were established based on the freedom wishes of the people. They, justifiably, took the form of unions. These unions are presently guided by a petty-bourgeois mode of thinking, which is ready at any time to reconcile with the dominant systems or adopt a given silence policy. Conscious writers and members must fight to turn them into uncompromising organizations of freedom.
- The abovementioned unions must be and remain non-partisan (uberparteilich) in essence. They must not be limited to liberal members. Every Marxist-Leninist, revolutionary, and genuine democrat must struggle his/her best to be active in them. They are unions of liberals exactly to the same extent as they are a place for revolutionaries. This never means these must turn into revolutionary organizations, but into uncompromising, radical ones against **every** violation of freedom of expression.
- Any union with the petty-bourgeois mode of thinking will inevitable fail in its projects as they tend to reconcile with dominant systems.
- Every revolutionary must struggle his/her best to promote the proletarian mode of thinking in these organizations as the leading line. Only on this condition will the uncompromising character of them as genuine organizations of the people be guaranteed. This is so because the proletarian mode of thinking hasn't any benefit whatsoever in this bourgeois dominant framework and is able to take the struggle to its final stage.

- For the practice of genuine proletarian criticism/self-criticism movement in unions and their established leading circles!
- For total financial independence! Total mental/theoretical independence!
- Fight against any article/clause banning Marxist-Leninist/revolutionaries' membership in unions!
- Collective endeavor for eradication of any article/clause, leaders or charters letting fascists find membership!
- Only such new-type unions can demonstrate a genuine and unwavering commitment to the struggle for freedom of expression, fearlessly confronting any retaliation. Only and only such new-type organizations can then demonstrate genuine solidarity with all voiceless victims and oppressed around the world, and their friends and colleagues in outright unveiled fascist governments. Only this new-type organizations can then withstand threats of all kinds from all versions of fascists and governments.

Genuine international solidarity against oppression can only flourish through this new, uncompromising, and radical organization that is deeply connected to and supported by the masses.

Let's raise our voice in every language:

Long live international solidarity!

Viva la solidaridad internacional!

Vive la solidarité internationale !

Hoch die internationale Solidarität!

Да здравствует международная солидарность! (Da zdravstvuyet mezhdunarodnaya solidarnost!)

تحيا التضامن الدولي (Tahiya al-tadamun al-duwali!)

国际团结万岁 ! (Guójì tuánjié wànsui!)

Viva a solidariedade internacional!

अंतर्राष्ट्रीय एकजुटता अमर रहे! (Antarrashtriya ekjutata amar rahe!)

زنده باد همبستگی بین المللی! (Zende Bad, Hambastegi e Beinalmelali!)

Siamak Raji

Decemeber 2024

6. References

- Engels, F., 1884. *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*.
- Lenin, V.I., 1917. *The State and Revolution*.
- Marx, K. and Engels, F., 1848. *The Communist Manifesto*.
- Lenin, V.I., 1917. *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*.
- Marx, K., 1867. *Capital: Volume 1*.
- Marx, K. (1875). Critique of the Gotha Program.
- Marx, K. (1871). The Civil War in France.
- Engels, F. (1877). Anti-Dühring.