International Forum – Colombo 2026 March

Discussion Paper 02

Challenges of Global and Regional Leftist Movement in the Face of Imperialism

The Global Economic Crisis

Capitalism stands on the brink of one of the deepest crises recorded in global history. This is evidenced by several factors: the decline in the global economic growth rate, obstructions and hurdles within the capital mechanism, the global debt crisis, and a massive increase in economic inequality.

In April 2025, the International Monetary Fund (IMF) released its World Economic Outlook report, and the facts mentioned therein were highly controversial. The report notes that the global economic structure implemented in most countries over the past 80 years has fallen into crisis and is currently undergoing a restructuring. It further states that the resulting uncertainty and policy unpredictability are defining factors of the world economy at this moment.

According to the IMF, global economic growth in 2026 will range between 2.8% and 3%. If the global growth rate cannot be maintained at a mean value of at least 3%, the circuit of capital circulation will be blocked, causing the economic crisis to escalate further. According to reports from the UN Commission on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), the global economic growth rate in 2026 will not exceed 2.6%. A report by the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), a group comprising 38 of the world's leading economies, states that the world economy is heading toward its weakest growth period since falling victim to the COVID-19 pandemic in 2020. While global economic growth had exceeded 3% every year since 2020 and stood at 3.3% in 2024, the OECD predicts it will be limited to a mean value of only 2.9% in 2025 and 2026. Meanwhile, the World Bank has also downgraded its forecast for global economic growth, stating that the world's major economies have undergone a downturn. In its semi-annual Global Economic Prospects report released in June 2025, the World Bank stated that global output would grow by only 2.3% in 2026. Aside from the recession years of 2009 and 2020, this represents the lowest economic growth rate since 2008.

The Debt Crisis Intensifies

In addition to the decline in global economic growth, a debt crisis is developing on a global scale. The report presented by the International Monetary Fund (IMF) on October 15, 2024, regarding global indebtedness, issued clear warnings. It states:

"Global public debt remains at very high levels. It is expected to exceed $100 trillion by the end of this year. To put it another way, the debt burden will be approximately 93% of global GDP, and by 2030, it will reach 100% of GDP. This is 10% higher as a percentage of global GDP compared to the value held in 2019, prior to the pandemic."

Emerging markets and underdeveloped states of the Global South, in particular, face both rising debt service costs and a shrinking space for maneuver within government budgets. The result is a reduction in allocations for social safety nets or public investment, a diminished capacity to respond to economic shocks, and an increasing trend toward further borrowing. The report further notes that in addition to issuing more debt, countries are increasingly likely to use complex and opaque financing methods. They state that new debt instruments have emerged, such as Public-Private Partnerships (PPPs), the privatization of State-Owned Enterprises (SOEs), and the linking of pension funds with guaranteed, securitized, and collateralized debt contracts. Due to the complexity of these new types of debt instruments, a large portion of the actual debt remains hidden from policymakers and the public. Often, this has become a key element in the debt restructuring process.

The Hellscape of Inequality

As the economic crisis unfolds in this manner, the number of billionaires in the world has increased. In the past year, 2024, 204 new billionaires were created. During 2024 alone, the wealth of the world's billionaires grew by $2 trillion. This represents a concentration of approximately $5.7 billion per day into the hands of the top capitalists, a growth rate five times higher than that of 2023. This ever-growing concentration of wealth is made possible by a concentrated monopoly of power. According to the latest Oxfam report, the wealth of global billionaires in 2025 grew three times faster than the average of the previous five years, reaching a record level of $18.3 trillion. For the first time, the number of billionaires in the world exceeded 3,000 in 2025. The report poetically notes that the wealth accumulated by the world's billionaires in 2025 alone is 26 times the amount required to eliminate global poverty. In other words, if the wealth earned by the planet's billionaires in just one year were socialized, poverty could be eradicated across 26 planets similar to Earth.

Amitabh Behar, the International Executive Director of Oxfam, stated: "The capture of our global economy by a privileged few has reached heights no one could have predicted some time ago. Our failure to stop billionaires worldwide has now led to the rapid emergence of trillionaires. Not only has the rate of billionaire wealth accumulation tripled, but their power has also grown exponentially."

This inequality will rise further alongside the debt crisis. Low and middle-income countries typically spend about half of their national budgets on debt repayments. The financial value generated by the majority of the world's nations is increasingly accumulating in the hands of wealthy creditor firms based in New York and London. This expenditure is significantly higher than the combined public investment these low and middle-income countries make in education and healthcare. Between 1970 and 2023, governments of the Global South paid $3.3 trillion in interest to the financial monopolies of the Global North. What other examples are needed to illustrate the exploitation occurring through debt?

Trump's Approach

While some attempt to portray the current global economic crisis as something exacerbated by Trump's tariff policies, the reality is quite the opposite. Trump's actions are not the root of the crisis; rather, it would not be incorrect to label them as the American ruling class's response to the global capitalist crisis. In this context, the primary target has been China. Donald Trump has publicly stated multiple times that China is his chief adversary.

By 2024, China became the world leader in goods manufacturing. Furthermore, China had overtaken the Western dominance, led by the United States, in international trade. China established dominance across all global regions in trade and became a leader in resource acquisition. Its trade and technological hegemony were being consolidated not only in Asia but also across the African continent, the Americas, and Europe.

The United States began its response to China by imposing sanctions on Huawei, a massive Chinese telecommunications company. The changes made by Donald Trump to tax and tariff policies were the next extension of this. This was not merely an arbitrary decision or the result of a mania on the part of Donald Trump; it was a program proposed by right-wing conservative groups as a solution to the economic crisis facing the United States. The core foundations of this so-called solution appear to be Trump's election promises: the "America First" policy and protectionist economic policies. However, these "patchwork" solutions cannot remedy the unfolding crisis of the capitalist system, either globally or within the United States. What is likely to happen is that the imperialist response to this crisis will spread from the economic sphere to the political sphere, and from there to the military sphere, only becoming increasingly aggressive.

The Pivot to Military Dominance

As American imperialism, built upon economic, political, and military hegemony, finds itself unable to halt its economic decline, the inherent contradictions of capitalism have deepened. The share of value-added manufacturing in high-income countries fell from 78% in 2000 to 51% by 2021, while the share of low and middle-income countries rose from 22% in 2004 to 48% in 2023. According to a 2024 World Bank report, China's share of the total world economy rose from 9% in 2004 to 29% by 2023, while the United States' share dropped from 25% in 2000 to 16% in 2021.

Despite boasting of a trade war with China and repeatedly declaring the strengthening of the national economy and production as its strategy, the United States has increasingly relied on its military and political power rather than economic competitiveness to maintain global dominance. Amidst this rhetoric, NATO expanded further into Eastern Europe, while the U.S. trade system in Asia was reinforced. The military apparatus is being strengthened through renewed bilateral and multilateral agreements, such as the AUKUS trilateral security partnership (Australia, UK, and US), the US-Japan-South Korea trilateral agreement, and the QUAD alliance (US, Australia, Japan, and India). The U.S. further consolidates its dominance by maintaining over 730 foreign military bases. Contrary to Trump’s initial claims of ending the war in Ukraine, it has instead evolved in new directions. While the U.S. abets a genocide in Gaza to maintain Middle Eastern hegemony, its attack on Iran on June 22, 2025, has demonstrated that the United States has not altered its pattern of military interventionism.

The Invasion of Imperialism

Imperialist nations, including the United States and the powerful states of the European Union, are engaged in a long-term plan to seize regions rich in fuel and raw materials, countries with large and active consumer markets, and territories of significant military-strategic and economic importance. Following the collapse of the socialist bloc in Eastern Europe and Central Asia (led by the Soviet Union) and the fall of the Berlin Wall in the early 1990s, marking the end of the Cold War, this strategy rapidly evolved into new dimensions. Within this geo-political operation, the Middle East, Latin America, Eastern Europe, and Asia have emerged as critical "hotspots." At this moment, this military strategy has manifested in several theaters:

- Eastern Europe: Through the ongoing war in Ukraine.
- Middle East: Through wars targeting Palestine and Iran.
- Latin America: Through the kidnapping of the Venezuelan President, threats to invade Colombia, and the continued oppression of Cuba via economic sanctions.

There is a looming risk that these military tactics will soon expand toward the South China Sea, the Indian Ocean, and the nations of South and Central Asia.

The Power Struggle in the Indian Ocean

The imperialist strategy operating across the Middle East, Eastern Europe, and Central Asia significantly impacts Asia, making the continent a primary target. The Indian Ocean region is a critical pivot point, politically, economically, commercially, and militarily. Its importance stems from being the gateway to the world's most populous nations—India, China, and Russia—and providing the primary access routes to these massive markets.

Furthermore, a China-Russia power bloc is emerging as an alternative to the NATO-led imperialist camp, with China prioritizing the Indian Ocean for its global trade ambitions. Consequently, a fierce competition for economic and military dominance has ignited among global and regional powers. Sri Lanka, situated in a highly strategic geopolitical position within this ocean, has become a key focus for political subjugation in this struggle.

The U.S. has a long history of plans targeting the South China Sea and the Indian Ocean:

- 2000 – "Back to Asia": Launched alongside the "Project for the New American Century," aimed at securing dominance by installing compliant regimes in littoral states.
- Containment of China: The U.S. exploited territorial disputes (Senkaku Islands with Japan; Spratly and Paracel Islands with Vietnam and the Philippines) to isolate China.
- 2009 – "Pivot to Asia": Under the Obama administration, the U.S. accelerated its regional intervention.
- 2017 – "Indo-Pacific Strategy": This marked a decisive shift toward militarization.

The United States Indo-Pacific Command (USINDOPACOM) is the primary vehicle for this intervention. Covering an area from the U.S. West Coast to the east of India, and from the Arctic to the Antarctic, it utilizes four massive components:

1. U.S. Pacific Fleet
2. U.S. Pacific Air Forces
3. U.S. Army Pacific
4. U.S. Marine Forces Pacific

This command reportedly oversees 375,000 personnel, 200 ships (including 5 aircraft carriers), and 1,100 aircraft. India works closely with this strategy, and Sri Lanka's defense agreements with India, the U.S., and Japan must be viewed within this context of military encirclement.

And also China has simultaneously developed its own strategies for Indian Ocean influence:

- String of Pearls (2004): This strategy (though some argue the term was popularized by U.S. propaganda) identifies a chain of vital commercial and naval hubs: the Kra Canal (proposed) in Myanmar, Sittwe in Thailand, Gwadar in Pakistan, Chittagong in Bangladesh, Hambantota in Sri Lanka, and the Maldives.
- Belt and Road Initiative (BRI): Launched in 2013 as the "New Silk Road," it initially focused on land routes through Central Asia (Kazakhstan, Turkmenistan, etc.) to Europe. It evolved into the "One Belt, One Road" project, incorporating a Maritime Silk Road.

The BRI is China's official geopolitical project, involving investments and political partnerships across 150 countries, representing a direct challenge to Western maritime hegemony.

The Role of India

We recall that during the Cold War era prior to the 1990s, India was a leader among the Non-Aligned Movement and maintained a pro-Soviet leaning in geopolitical matters. However, following that period, Indian foreign policy shifted rapidly, demonstrating a much closer alignment with the United States.

Yet, it is inaccurate to reduce India's political role to mere "pro-Americanism." India, which has been an adversary of China since the 1962 Sino-Indian border conflict, views China as a major obstacle to its current ambition of becoming a global economic superpower. For this reason, India collaborates with the United States' military initiatives in the South China Sea and the Indian Ocean aimed at countering China.

The best example of this is India's participation in the QUAD—a military partnership involving the U.S., Japan, and Australia—which has been dubbed the "NATO of Asia." Beyond this, India maintains a deep military cooperation with the U.S. through four foundational defense agreements: BECA, GSOMFA, LEMOA, and COMCASA. It is no secret that these agreements facilitate joint military exercises, integrated military operations, mutual training, the exchange of classified intelligence, logistics support, and cooperation between the intelligence agencies of both nations.

The Indian capitalist class's ambition to become a global superpower faces a significant hurdle: the dominance of the United States and the U.S. dollar. Consequently, while India collaborates with the U.S. on a geopolitical and military level, it stands at the forefront of the De-Dollarization movement on the economic front, alongside China, Russia, Brazil, and South Africa within the BRICS alliance. BRICS represents the world's leading emerging economies, boasting Combined Population of Approximately 3.21 billion and a Combined GDP of Approximately $28.06 trillion.

This illustrates that the Indian capitalist class is playing a double game. To counter China—its primary regional rival—it participates in reactionary, pro-American military programs. Yet, to secure its economic interests against dollar hegemony, it collaborates with major economies like China and Russia. However, the landscape shifted in February 2026 when India signaled an agreement on a trade deal with the United States. Reports indicate that India agreed to halt fuel purchases from Russia and implement zero-tariff rates on U.S. goods imports. This followed a similar announcement regarding a trade pact with the European Union. These developments suggest that India's policy of balancing military ties with the U.S. against economic ties with China and Russia is undergoing a transformation. Therefore, we cannot view India's geopolitical role through a simple black-and-white lens. To achieve its ambitions as a regional power and to pursue its dream of rising as a global superpower, India is actively managing the complexities of a multipolar world.

The Geopolitical Significance of Sri Lanka's Location

Situated just below the Indian subcontinent and positioned at the very center of the Indian Ocean, along the vital sea route between the East and the West, Sri Lanka holds immense economic, political, and especially military significance. Throughout history, this importance has remained constant whenever the questions of regional dominance or trade hegemony have arisen.

This unique positioning is precisely why every colonial power emphasized the necessity of capturing Sri Lanka, exerted great effort to do so, and ultimately brought it under their control. Whether it was the Portuguese, French, Dutch, or British who maintained colonies in the Indian Ocean, or the Germans and Japanese who sought to conquer the Indian subcontinent, all these nations recognized Sri Lanka's strategic value. It was due to this geographical reality that for nearly 450 years (from 1505 to 1948) the Portuguese, Dutch, and British ruled the island, either in part or in its entirety. Now Sri Lanka is the specific point where China's Belt and Road Initiative (BRI) and the U.S.-led Indo-Pacific Strategy collide.

In the context of the global power struggle previously discussed, Sri Lanka's geographical positioning is not merely a matter of pride but a critical factor in international security and trade. Admiral Steve Koehler, Commander of the U.S. Pacific Fleet, started a three-day official visit to Sri Lanka, on February 19 - 21, 2026. The US Embassy in Colombo stated the high-level visit aims to deepen the security partnership between the two nations and address evolving challenges in the Indo-Pacific region. In 2021 Pacific Command Military Professor and former US diplomat Professor Patrick Mendis described islands of Sri Lanka and Taiwan as "unsinkable aircraft carriers" in the Indian and Pacific Oceans. Since the Trump administration designated China a "strategic competitor," Sri Lanka and Taiwan have increasingly become plausible geopolitical flashpoints in the Pacific and Indian Oceans. Indeed, the United States has its own "unsinkable aircraft carrier" on the more secretive but strategic 17-square-mile Diego Garcia in the middle of the Indian Ocean—just 1,200 miles from Sri Lanka. The United States renewed the lease of the charted real estate (from the British in 1966) for another 20 years in 2016 and it will end in 2036.

Unlike many of its neighbors, Sri Lanka possesses natural and man-made deep-water ports that can accommodate the world's largest vessels and aircraft carriers.

- Trincomalee: One of the world's largest natural deep-sea harbors. Historically used by the British as a primary naval base, it remains a "military prize" for any power wishing to control the Bay of Bengal.
- Hambantota & Colombo: These ports are vital nodes in China's Maritime Silk Road. For the West and India, these represent potential "dual-use" facilities that could be converted from commercial ports to military outposts.

Today, 30% of total global trade passes through the Indian Ocean, and 50% of the world's container traffic is handled at Indian Ocean ports. Furthermore, the region is a critical artery for energy security, with the 90% of its required petroleum of Japan, 75% of China and 85% of India being transported across its waters. In addition to energy, the Indian Ocean is vital for industrial manufacturing in the West; 40 out of the 57 essential industrial raw materials required by the United States are transported through this region. Sri Lanka is situated adjacent to the sea route that is becoming the most vital maritime trade artery in the world. The distance from Sri Lanka’s Hambantota Port to this primary international shipping lane is a mere 10 nautical miles. Consequently, the significance of Sri Lanka in ensuring the security of any nation's Sea Lines of Communication (SLOCs) is immense.

Therefore, the eyes of any global or regional power seeking to achieve economic, commercial, maritime, and military dominance in the Indian Ocean are inevitably fixed upon Sri Lanka. Consequently, when considering the risk of Sri Lanka losing its political sovereignty, the escalating contradiction between the United States and China must be taken into account as an absolute necessity. Furthermore, the manner in which India positions itself within this power struggle is also significant. This is why the policy adopted by the present NPP (National People's Power) government regarding India and the United States has become exceptionally critical.

Agreements with India under Ranil Wickremesinghe

While India established significant authority in Sri Lankan politics during Gotabaya Rajapaksa’s presidency, the intensity of Indian intervention appeared to escalate during Ranil Wickremesinghe’s administration. Following the 2023 protest movement that ousted Rajapaksa, Wickremesinghe visited India on July 21, 2023, where he established the "Promoting Connectivity, Catalyzing Prosperity" (India-Sri Lanka Economic Partnership Vision). According to the President’s Media Division (PMD), this agreement implemented the "Indian Project" across five key pillars:

1. Maritime Connectivity

- Ports: Indian involvement in the development and operations of the Colombo, Trincomalee, and Kankesanthurai ports.
- Ferry Services: Resumption of passenger ferry services between Nagapattinam (India) and Kankesanthurai (Sri Lanka), as well as Rameswaram and Talaimannar.

2. Air Connectivity

- Aviation: Resumption of flights between Jaffna and Chennai, targeting destinations like Trincomalee and Batticaloa. Reports also indicated an agreement to sell 16 Sri Lankan airports—including Katunayake, Mattala, and Ratmalana—to the Adani Group.

3. Energy and Power

- Grid Interconnection: Establishing a high-capacity power grid connection to enable a bilateral electricity market between Sri Lanka and the BBIN nations (Bangladesh, Bhutan, India, and Nepal).
- Petroleum: Construction of a multi-product petroleum pipeline from South India to Sri Lanka.

4. Financial Connectivity

- Currency: Designating the Indian Rupee (INR) as a currency for trade settlements between the two nations.
- Digital Payments: Implementing the Unified Payments Interface (UPI)-based digital payment system for business and consumer transactions.

5. People-to-People and Infrastructure

- Land Access: Discussion on developing a land bridge (passenger bridge) connecting India to the ports of Trincomalee and Colombo.
- Collaboration: Joint ventures in agriculture, IT, finance, health, space applications, and humanities (history and culture).

Agreements made between Wickremesinghe and Modi essentially serve as a blueprint for Indian dominance across economic, political, and security sectors, placing Sri Lankan sovereignty at risk, and also the current National People's Power (NPP) government's policy is built upon these very same foundations. In President Anura Kumara Dissanayake’s first official foreign tour (December 15–17, 2024), he met Indian President and Prime Minister. Prior to meeting PM Modi, the President met with External Affairs Minister Dr. S. Jaishankar, National Security Advisor Ajit Doval, and Finance Minister Nirmala Sitharaman. On December 16, 2024, the joint statement titled "Fostering Partnerships for a Shared Future" was released. This new statement is seen as being fundamentally similar to Wickremesinghe's 2023 "Economic Partnership Vision." Despite the change in government, the strategic agreements regarding connectivity and Indian integration remain largely unchanged, reflecting a continuity in the geopolitical trajectory of the island.

The Indian Agreements: A Critique of the NPP Administration

The text asserts that the National People's Power (NPP) government is advancing a four-decade-old neoliberal capitalist agenda that previous administrations could not complete. It argues that through IMF-proposed structural reforms, Sri Lanka’s economy is being tied to imperialist interests, with Indian mega-capitalists providing the necessary capital. In this framework, India acts as the primary intermediary for global imperialist operations in Sri Lanka. During Indian Prime Minister Narendra Modi's visit to Sri Lanka on April 5, 2025, seven agreements were signed.

While the government confirmed the titles, the specific contents were not officially released, leading to public protests and their branding as "Secret Agreements"

1. Energy Exchange Agreement
2. Trincomalee Energy Hub Agreement
3. Multi-sectoral Grant Support – Eastern Province
4. Digital Cooperation Agreement
5. Health and Pharmaceuticals Agreement
6. Pharmaceutical Regulatory Cooperation
7. Defense Cooperation Agreement

The government refused to reveal the drafts of seven agreements. JVP General Secretary Tilvin Silva falsely claimed the agreements were tabled in Parliament; Cabinet Spokesman Nalinda Jayatissa later admitted this was untrue. Despite the government suggesting that the public could request copies via the Right to Information (RTI) Act, all such requests were reportedly denied. Finally the Cabinet Spokesman allegedly stated that copies could not be released without the permission of the Indian Prime Minister, and it challenges Sri Lanka's status as a sovereign nation rather than an Indian colony. Also parliamentary opposition parties are in the same stance, "mocking the public" through their silence or complicity:

- SJB (Samagi Jana Balawegaya) did not opposed the pacts. - Opposition leader Sajith Premadasa notably gifted a photograph of a leopard to PM Modi but avoided commenting on the agreements.
- SLPP (Rajapakshas) Remained silent in Parliament - Namal Rajapaksha later traveled to India to participate in "Emerging Bharat" seminars with PM Modi.
- Minority Parties: The TNA, SLMC, and estate-sector parties maintained a policy of silence.

While the government did not release the documents, copies of three critical agreements eventually leaked online through third-party stakeholders:

1. Energy Import and Export Agreement
2. Tripartite MoU on the Trincomalee Energy Hub
3. Defense Cooperation Agreement

Since the government has not dismissed these leaked versions as forgeries following their circulation, we can accept them as authentic. Preliminary study of these documents suggests they are "extremely serious and destructive" to the nation’s interests.

Colonization through Agreements

Certain agreements signed with India have been made public, while others remain concealed by the government. The first, the Energy Exchange Agreement, establishes a framework to interconnect the primary electricity transmission grids of Sri Lanka and India. Reports from 2023, now formalized by this pact, identified Mannar in Northern Sri Lanka and Madurai in Southern India as the connection points for the proposed cross-border transmission line. While technical specifics (such as whether the connection will be via overhead spans or submarine cables) remain finalized, Indian media reports indicate that Sri Lanka is conducting load-flow studies for the 2027–28 window, anticipating a 500 MW exchange. This clarifies that the project is not about selling Sri Lanka’s surplus energy to India, as the government claims, but rather integrating India into Sri Lanka’s national power supply.

Consequently, Sri Lanka risks the same fate as Bangladesh and Nepal under similar Indian agreements. We witnessed India disconnect electricity to Bangladesh for two weeks when the latter's policies contradicted Indian political interests. Similarly, during Nepal’s 2015 constitutional amendment, India leveraged power cuts to exert political pressure. Today, even when Nepal’s reservoirs overflow, they are often unable to generate hydroelectricity for domestic use because they are contractually bound to purchase a mandatory quota of electricity from India regardless of internal supply. The Sri Lankan government has entered into an agreement with similarly draconian conditions.

The second and third agreements, concerning the Trincomalee Energy Hub and the Eastern Province, grant India a virtual monopoly over Sri Lanka’s petroleum supply. Furthermore, it sacrifices the Eastern Province—including the strategic Trincomalee Harbor and the Oil Tank Farm complex—to India’s geopolitical ambitions.

- Fuel Monopoly: In 2003, the government granted the Indian Oil Company (LIOC) 100 pumping stations (one-third of the Petroleum Corporation's holdings), which has since expanded to 202.
- Infrastructure Control: By taking over the Trincomalee oil tanks for 50 years and controlling the bunkering (ship fuel) sector at the port, India has secured a monopoly over maritime services on the eastern coast.
- Pipeline Expansion: The agreement facilitates a pipeline from India to Trincomalee, intended for extension to Colombo, further consolidating Indian control over fuel logistics at both major ports.

This framework includes the formation of Trincomalee Petroleum Terminals Ltd, a joint venture where LIOC holds a 49% stake. Despite the equity split, administrative control rests with India, alongside 851 acres of strategically vital land near the harbor. This complex, originally built by British imperialists with 101 tanks (99 remaining), is Sri Lanka’s only massive-scale storage facility. Reports further suggest the government has agreed to designate over 7,000 acres around Trincomalee as an Indian Economic Zone. Previous attempts by various administrations to cede such vast land (up to 624 sq. km) were thwarted by public outcry; however, the current boundaries of this proposed zone remain opaque to the public.

The fourth and fifth agreements pertain to the Healthcare Sector. One pact replaces the British and US standards previously used for pharmaceutical regulation in Sri Lanka with Indian Standards. This poses a severe risk to the quality of medicine and medical equipment. While Sri Lanka currently imports many drugs from India, they are typically those manufactured to Western standards. Only 11 countries (often categorized as "rogue states") recognize the Indian pharmaceutical standard alone. This agreement essentially sacrifices Sri Lanka's public health standards to Indian interests. The second health agreement mandates the purchase of specific medicines directly from India without a competitive procurement process, violating both the Constitution and established procurement regulations. We are now contractually bound to buy potentially inferior drugs at higher prices, forfeiting the opportunity to source high-quality medicine globally.

The sixth agreement is framed as Digitalization Cooperation. Its objective is to entrust India with the development of software systems to collect the biometric data of Sri Lankan citizens for a centralized database and Digital ID. Under feudalism (Divine Right of Kings), the state claimed authority over the citizen's body. Liberalism and Social Contract theory shifted this, asserting that the state cannot violate the physical integrity of the citizen without consent. Current Sri Lankan law follows this liberal tradition; while the state can record biographical data (name, address), it cannot seize biometrics (fingerprints, facial recognition, iris scans) without a specific court order. This new project subverts these protections and opens a "backdoor" for an Indian entity to access the private data of the entire population. In the Information Age, data is a primary weapon of subjugation. By surrendering the data of its citizenry to a foreign power, a nation effectively surrenders its sovereignty. India is currently executing this strategic intervention, placing Sri Lanka's national security and the privacy of its people in grave jeopardy.

The Risks of the Defense Cooperation Agreement

The seventh agreement is a Defense Cooperation Agreement, signed by Sri Lanka's Secretary to the Ministry of Defense, Sampath Thuyyakontha, and India's Foreign Secretary, Vikram Misri. While official government rhetoric attempts to downplay this as a mere "update" to existing security protocols, the shift in terminology from Security to Defense is academically and legally significant. "Security" typically refers to soft-power cooperation—combating cross-border drug trafficking and joint training. "Defense," however, implies deep-seated military integration.

An analysis of the leaked treaty clauses reveals several points of contention regarding Sri Lanka's strategic autonomy:

1. Loss of Strategic Neutrality (Article 1.3)

This clause effectively prohibits Sri Lanka from entering into defense cooperation with any other sovereign nation. Historically, Sri Lanka maintained a non-aligned posture, engaging with multiple global powers. This agreement creates a monopolistic defense dependency on India, stripping the nation of its right to choose its own international partners.

2. Encroachment on Hydrographic and Maritime Sovereignty (Article 2.2.8)

The agreement grants India access to Sri Lanka's shipbuilding, hydrographic surveys, and oceanographic mapping.

- Economic Impact: There are active plans to sell Colombo Dockyard to Mazagon Dock Shipbuilders, an Indian state-owned defense firm.
- Security Impact: Hydrographic data is highly sensitive; it is the "DNA" of a nation's maritime territory. Ceding control of this data to a foreign power compromise both economic resources and underwater national security.

3. Compromised Medical Neutrality (Article 2.3.2)

In the event of a conflict involving India, this clause allows India to utilize Sri Lankan hospitals and medical personnel. This effectively turns Sri Lankan civilian infrastructure into a military objective, making the country a legitimate target for India's adversaries during wartime.

4. Logistics and Base Rights (Article 2.3.6)

The inclusion of "Logistics and Supply Chain Management" in a defense context is often a euphemism for:

- Establishing and maintaining armories and ammunition depots.
- Providing basing rights and services for the Indian Armed Forces.
- Facilitating the repair and maintenance of foreign warships and fighter aircraft on domestic soil.

5. The "Classified" Information Trap (Article 7)

Sri Lanka is bound by a perpetual non-disclosure agreement regarding any material India deems "Classified." The treaty lacks a precise definition for this term, allowing India to unilaterally determine what information remains hidden. Critically, Article 7.3 states that this obligation continues even if Sri Lanka withdraws from the treaty, creating a permanent "gag order" on future administrations.

6. Exclusion of International Arbitration (Article 10)

Should a dispute arise, Sri Lanka is barred from seeking redress through the International Court of Justice (ICJ), independent tribunals, or third-party mediation. All disputes must be settled through "bilateral discussion" with India. In the reality of asymmetric power dynamics, a small state like Sri Lanka has negligible leverage when negotiating one-on-one with a regional hegemon.

Synthesizing these seven agreements reveals a clear trajectory: the erosion of Sri Lanka's economic independence and political sovereignty. By integrating its energy, healthcare, digital data, and military apparatus with India, Sri Lanka risks becoming a proxy or satellite state. This alignment does not merely foster cooperation; it ensnares the nation in a geopolitical trap that could dictate its domestic and foreign policy for decades to come.

Will Lanka become an Imperialist puppet state?

Sri Lanka has not restricted its defense agreements to India alone. Throughout 2025, the NPP government signed defense cooperation pacts with India, Japan, and the United States—the three core members of the QUAD, a strategic alliance often characterized as the "NATO in Asia." The timeline of these signings underscores a rapid strategic pivot:

- April 5, 2025: Agreement signed with India.
- September 29, 2025: Agreement signed with Japan.
- November 14, 2025: Agreement signed with the United States.

During the President's visit to Japan, a memorandum was signed to strengthen bilateral ties under Japan's Official Security Assistance (OSA) framework. The explicit objective of the OSA is to bolster Japan's military cooperation with South and Southeast Asian nations. This pact was finalized between Japanese Ambassador Akio Isomata and Sri Lanka's Minister of Foreign Affairs, Foreign Employment, and Tourism, Vijitha Herath.

A Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) to enhance "inter-defense cooperation" was signed at the Sri Lankan Ministry of Defense. Signatories included U.S. Ambassador Julie Chung, Brigadier General Trenton Gibson of the Montana National Guard, and Sri Lankan Defense Secretary Air Vice Marshal Sampath Thuyyakontha. This agreement incorporates Sri Lanka into the State Partnership Program (SPP). Established by the U.S. Department of Defense in 1993 following the Cold War, the SPP connects the U.S. National Guard with the armed forces of partner nations. Critics argue the SPP is a mechanism to manage and align non-NATO countries with U.S. military interests and strategic requirements.

When viewed alongside the existing Acquisition and Cross-Servicing Agreement (ACSA) and the mounting pressure to expand the Status of Forces Agreement (SOFA), these three 2025 pacts signal a dangerous drift toward becoming an imperialist puppet state. This development is particularly striking—and ideologically contradictory—given the current administration's leftist branding. The government's perceived pro-imperialist stance on international issues, such as the crises in Palestine and Venezuela, suggests a fundamental abandonment of traditional anti-imperialist solidarity in favor of a submissive geopolitical alignment with the Western-led security architecture.

Post-Cold War Dynamics: From Unipolar Dreams to Multi-polar Realities

Until the dawn of the 1990s, the global balance of power was defined by the Cold War between the United States and the Soviet Union. This equilibrium, though tense, acted as a deterrent against a catastrophic global conflagration. Landmark agreements, such as the nuclear arms limitation treaties of 1972 and 1975, and the 1986 Reagan-Gorbachev accord to halve nuclear arsenals exemplified this era of bi-polarity. At the time, a strategic balance of power existed between the imperialist camp and the Soviet bloc, spanning the political, economic, and military spheres.

Following the collapse of the Soviet Union, the United States sought to transition from this four-decade bi-polarity to a unipolar world. It envisioned a global order dominated by a single imperialist power; what Karl Kautsky described as "Ultra-imperialism." Even pro-US commentators like Charles Krauthammer, in his work *Democratic Realism: An American Foreign Policy for a Unipolar World*, acknowledged this as a "Unipolar Moment." However, the American ruling class dreamed of cementing this as a permanent Unipolar Era.

The illusion of unipolarity was short-lived. Several key factors accelerated the return to a multipolar world:

- The birth of the European Union via the Maastricht Treaty (1993).
- The shifting stance of Russia following the 1999 Baltic crisis and the subsequent rise of Vladimir Putin.
- The emergence of China as a global economic power by 2010.

Today, we face a world shaped by this multi-polarity. The emergence of China as a dominant economic force, coupled with the consolidation of Russia as a formidable military power, has fundamentally altered the international landscape. Today, as both China and Russia simultaneously expand their economic and military capacities—positioning themselves as significant political actors—the doors have opened toward a new global balance of power. In this context, the United States relies on its two primary remaining pillars of strength: the hegemony of the Dollar as the global reserve currency and its extensive network of overseas military bases. Currently, the United States is deploying these two assets as its ultimate strategic 'trump cards' to maintain its influence. The desperate attempts of the US-led imperialist camp to maintain hegemony are manifest across two fronts:

1. The Economic Front: Manifested through economic sanctions, trade wars, and tariff disputes.
2. The Military Front: Spanning from Ukraine and Palestine to Venezuela.

The nexus between these fronts is undeniable. The war in Ukraine is inextricably linked to the vast mineral deposits of Eastern Europe, while the conflicts in the Middle East and the aggressions against Venezuela are driven by the quest for control over global oil reserves. We are witnessing a systemic attempt by established imperialist powers and emerging global players to re-divide the world. In this volatile multi-polar landscape, contradictions are transient, and the lines between "friend" and "foe" blur as alliances shift with dizzying speed.

How must the global Left and the international communist movement intervene in this rapidly shifting system of contradictions? This question demands a rigorous, dialogic approach.

Our strategy focuses on:

- National Unification: Uniting parties from diverse leftist traditions with progressives, democrats, social activists, and militant people's organizations within Lanka.
- To defeat imperialist designs in the Indo-Pacific, prevent regional power struggles from escalating into a third world war, and stop Sri Lanka from becoming "another Israel" in South Asia, we, the Frontline Socialist Party proposes a robust regional cooperation framework.
- Global Anti-Imperialism: Strengthening a global anti-imperialist mass movement as a precursor to a new type of Internationalism.
- Strategic Synthesis: Bridging the programs of the working class and progressives in imperialist centers with the revolutionary movements of the periphery.

We must formulate answers to how these distinct struggles can be integrated into a singular, cohesive global plan. We call upon all stakeholders to direct this dialogue toward a definitive political agenda for liberation.