

F O U R T H  
**i**NTERNATI**o**NAL  
WORKERS OF ALL COUNTRIES, UNITE!

# DISCUSSION TEXTS 18<sup>TH</sup> CONGRESS

At its meeting of 24 to 28 February 2024, the International Committee of the Fourth International adopted the resolutions proposed to the 18th World Congress scheduled for February 2025.

The IC approved the four resolutions presented by the Executive Bureau. Four alternative texts presented by two IC members were rejected. These texts were published in Bulletins #1 and #2 with updates, notably of the resolutions on the international situation, in Bulletins #4 and #5. In this bulletin, other contributions to the debate.

## Table of Contents

<b>Proposed amendment to the Manifesto</b> <i>MSP, Mexique</i>	<b>3</b>
<b>Amendment to the Manifesto</b> <i>Gauche anticapitaliste / SAP – Belgium</i>	<b>4</b>
<b>Comments on the Manifesto</b> <i>Ação Popular Socialista (APS – Brazil)</i>	<b>5</b>
<b>Utopian or scientific eco-socialism? – A critique of the FI Manifesto</b> <i>Anders Ekeland Norway</i>	<b>7</b>
<b>The environment, population and our ecosocialist vision</b> <i>Michael Friedman and Kay Mann. Solidarity, US</i>	<b>10</b>
<b>For an anti-war movement that defends the right of peoples to self-determination – The case of Ukraine</b> <i>Catherine Samary, Membre du CI, France</i>	<b>11</b>
<b>Amendment to the text on the international situation, on the defence of democratic rights against the extreme right</b> <i>SAP (Netherlands)</i>	<b>13</b>
<b>Comments on the draft resolution on the international situation</b> <i>Ação Popular Socialista (APS, Brazil)</i>	<b>13</b>
<b>On the situation in Syria after the defeat of al-Assad – A first approach</b> <i>Ação Popular Socialista (APS – Brazil)</i>	<b>15</b>
<b>Class independence between progressivism and the extreme right</b> <i>Daniel Libreros, Movimiento Ecosocialista de Colombia (Ecosocialist Movement of Colombia) ; Mario Unda and Carlos Rojas, Movimiento Revolucionario de los Trabajadores (MRT, Revolutionary Workers Movement) ; Jaime González, Manuel Aguilar Mora, Ismael Contreras, Álvaro Vázquez and José Juan Grijalva, Liga de Unidad Socialista ( LUS, Socialist Unity League) of Mexico ; Andrés Lund, Josie Chávez, Rosario Villalobos, Fernando E. Tecuatl, Javier Contreras and Edgard Sánchez, Partido Revolucionario de los Trabajadores (PRT, Revolutionary Workers Party) of Mexico</i>	<b>17</b>
<b>A gap to be filled</b> <i>Fabrizio Burattini (Sinistra Anticapitalista, Italian section of the FI)</i>	<b>19</b>
<b>Amendment to “Our orientation and tasks in social movements”</b> <i>Gauche anticapitaliste/SAP - Belgium</i>	<b>21</b>
<b>Amendments to text on social movements</b> <i>Antiracist Commission Gauche anticapitaliste / SAP- Belgium</i>	<b>22</b>
<b>LGBTIQ organizing = Appendix to social movements text</b> <i>Terry IC Britain, Olivia IC Denmark, LGBTIQ Commission</i>	<b>23</b>
<b>Amendments to the Text on Partybuilding tasks</b> <i>Antiracist commission Gauche anticapitaliste/ SAP - Belgium</i>	<b>24</b>

# Proposed amendment to the Manifesto

This excellent document incorporates many acute observations about how the class system is maintained, among other things by the oppression of women, and how that system perpetuates that oppression. To deepen those observations, we propose the following additions in the form of amendments to the document.

In point “4. 4. Main lines of an ecosocialist alternative to capitalist growth,” we propose adding a new point 4.6 as follows:

4.6. Humanity cannot be emancipated if half the population is oppressed for being women

We want to build a new society that eliminates ancestral gender oppression. While women’s specific oppression did not begin with the capitalist system, the latter certainly benefits both materially and ideologically from its perpetuation.

In the economic sphere, the division of the public and private worlds, typical of capitalism in urban areas, places the responsibility of most care work on women as something “natural.” This saves the dominant classes enormous sums that they would have to pay in the form of wages if workers had to find these services in the market. It also lowers wages for professional care services when they are placed on the market because they are considered women’s tasks, and, therefore, activities that “anyone can do,” as well as making it harder particularly for poor women to fully join the labor market, which excludes 700 million adult women worldwide.

Rural women also lack access and decision-making power over the lands they inhabit; they provide 55% to 70% of the labor but only own 9% of peasant lands, and lack access to resources, credit, and public policies, making them vulnerable. For all these reasons, they are at the forefront of sustainable and regenerative projects. Transnational corporations’ control of seeds and agricultural products such as GMO maize threaten their autonomy, since peasant women lose the right to decide what seeds they use, how they produce and the techniques that preserve biodiversity. Therefore, the struggle for food sovereignty is also a struggle for the

emancipation of peasant women. Ideologically and politically, assigning women care work as their duty provides capital with an enormous flexible reserve army of female labor that can be called upon to take formal jobs when convenient, such as, for example, in times of war. In those moments, it is argued that women can do any kind of work outside the home and that it is their “patriotic duty” to replace the male labor force sent off to the battlefields. Of course, once hostilities are at an end, it is once again argued that women’s place is only in the home. And, in times of “peace,” this facilitates assigning greater and greater amounts of care tasks to the private sphere, favoring neoliberal policies based on the huge cutbacks in public services.

Gender violence is profoundly connected to economic and social inequality, exacerbated by neoliberal policies that impoverish huge swathes of the population, particularly women. The lack of access to education, decent work, health services, and social security turn many women into victims of trafficking rings for sexual and labor exploitation. Human trafficking, which rose globally 25% just between 2019 and 2022, is a modern form of slavery, in which women are commodities that benefit organized crime.

All this depresses wages artificially, contributes significantly to capital accumulation, and ensures low-cost social reproduction. The differentiation between what men and women are supposed to do in society justifies and is perpetuated by control over women’s bodies and sexuality and gender violence or the threat of its use. All this contributes to greater capital accumulation in a few hands and can only be eliminated by providing collective, free or cheap public services, in addition to creating a culture in which the remaining tasks are divided equitably between women and men.

Although this document clearly cannot include all women’s demands to counter our oppression, we think that point 4.14 in the current version should be amended to include our right to live without violence, in addition to our right

to control our own bodies. These are the two main demands that in general mobilize the largest number of women in the world as women.

Therefore, we propose that the title of the point should read as follows:

**“4.14. Guarantee the right of women to decide about their own bodies and to live a life free of violence”**

And, at the end of the point, we should add the following paragraph:

Violence is increasing worldwide due both to wars and genocide and to the social tension arising from the impoverishment of the vast majority of the population. Women’s oppression causes this violence to be expressed especially sharply, with an increase in femicide, rape, sexual harassment, and trafficking in women for sexual and labor exploitation, and all other forms of gender-based violence. The society we want to build cannot allow this to continue; women must be able to live without violence.

We propose the following point 1.9 be added to the first section, which deals with the current state of capitalism:

1.9. Climate change disproportionately affects LGBT+ persons living in vulnerable areas and living and working in the street, as is often the case of trans people, and the negative effects of climate change on their health are even greater for them due to the institutional discrimination they face.

MSP, Mexique

# Amendment to the Manifesto

## Amendment 1

2. The world we fight for (§2.30):

We must learn to think about the interdependence of living beings and develop a conception of the relationship between humanity and nature that will probably resemble in some respects that of indigenous peoples, but will nevertheless be different. A conception in which the ethical notions of precaution, respect and responsibility, as well as wonder at the beauty of the world, will constantly interact with a scientific understanding that is both ever more refined and ever more aware of its incompleteness.

Explanation: The previous wording ('which will probably resemble that of indigenous peoples in certain respects, but which will nevertheless be different') implies that there is an indigenous conception, which is a dangerous shortcut that flirts with fetishization.

We therefore propose replacing it with the following:

**We must learn to think about the interdependence of living beings, and develop a conception of the relationship between humanity and nature in which the ethical notions of precaution, respect and responsibility, as well as wonder at the beauty of the world, are combined with an increasingly refined scientific understanding, and one that is increasingly aware of its own incompleteness. The cultures of indigenous peoples can be fertile sources of inspiration for developing such a vision, provided that an open dialogue is established with them and between them, free of racism and fetishism.**

## Amendment 2

4.17. Foster a cultural revolution based on careful respect for the living and "love for Mother Earth" (§4.17)

A radical break with the ideology of human domination of nature is essential to the development of both an ecological and a feminist (ecofeminist) culture of "caring" for people and the environment. The defence of biodiversity, in particular, cannot be based solely on reason (the

human interest properly understood): it requires just as much empathy, respect, prudence and the kind of global conception that the first peoples sum up by the phrase "love of Mother Earth". Maintaining this global conception or reacquiring it – through struggles, artistic creation, education and production/consumption alternatives, in particular – is a major ideological challenge in the ecosocialist struggle. Western modernity has systematized the idea that human beings are divine creatures whose mission is to dominate nature and instrumentalize other animals, reduced to the rank of machines. This non-materialist conception, intimately linked to colonial and patriarchal dominations, is completely disqualified today by scientific knowledge. We are part of the living Earth, we are also animals and human life would be impossible in absence of plants, of other animals, of the network of life on this planet.

Explanation: In addition to restructuring the paragraph, which we feel restates the argument more clearly, the aim, as with amendment 1, is to distance ourselves from an essentialist vision of indigenous peoples, which ignores their diversity, and from essentialist versions of ecofeminism, which claim that women are naturally more inclined to care than men. The amendment also removes the expression 'cultural revolution', which has questionable historical connotations.

We therefore propose replacing the above paragraph with the following:

### **4.17. Breaking with the ideology of domination and building a culture of care**

Western modernity has systematized the idea that human beings are divine creatures whose mission is to dominate nature and use other animals as machines. This non-materialistic concept, closely linked to colonial and patriarchal domination, is now completely disqualified by scientific knowledge: we are part of the living Earth, we are also animals, and human life would be impossible in isolation from the vast network of interactions that structure living things. A major challenge of the ecosocialist struggle is

therefore to rediscover or build - through artistic creation, through education, through alternative ways of producing and consuming and, of course, through struggle - a different conception, one that promotes values centred on care, whether for humans or for the environment. The seeds of such a concept can be seen in the various indigenous cultures, where concepts such as 'love of Mother Earth' are frequently found; as well as in feminist struggles, with women today ensuring, in our patriarchal societies do the bulk of this care work, which is profoundly devalued and invisibilized.

## Amendment 3

6. Against the tide, make the struggles converge to break with capitalist productivity. Seize the government, initiate the ecosocialist rupture based on self-activity, self-organization, control from below, the broadest democracy (§32):

An ecosocialist strategy of rupture involves the struggle for the formation of a government on the basis of a transitional plan and the systematic promotion of self-activity, control and direct intervention by the exploited and oppressed at all levels [...]

Explanation: The expression 'formation of a government' can easily be interpreted as implying a reformist approach, where 'self-organization' would only have a secondary role, as a safeguard, 'promoted' by the government itself. This interpretation obviously contradicts the rest of the paragraph. A clarification would require a long development on the strategic hypothesis of workers' government, which seems unnecessary here.

We therefore propose replacing this part of the sentence with the following:

**An ecosocialist strategy of rupture implies the struggle for the creation of a popular power defending a transition plan, and emanating from the democratic self-organization at all levels of the exploited and oppressed [...].**

Gauche anticapitaliste / SAP  
– Belgium

# Comments on the Manifesto

Comrades,

We present here comments from the APS (Brazil) on the new version of the Ecosocialist Manifesto which will be ratified at the World Congress of the Fourth International in February, 2025.

## Introduction

APS (Brazil) believes that our planet is undergoing a process of environmental exhaustion, with global warming as a striking example and the climate crisis as an acute situation in the process. This exhaustion is fundamentally caused by the race of monopolistic companies and state powers for control of natural resources and by a historically predatory industrial development, especially since the first industrial revolution.

From competition between capitalist companies and in the inter-imperialist bipolarisation, to the dispute over geopolitical spaces and to the arms race and especially confronting the structural crisis of capitalism, the environment and the future of humanity are subject to the general logic of capital accumulation (which stimulates consumerism and the intensive destruction of natural resources, in the form of raw materials and energy).

Socio-environmental justice in eco-socialism cannot be the extension to all of humanity of the consumption pattern of the richest 5%. To achieve this, there would not be sufficient energy production or natural resources. It is necessary and possible for everyone to have all essential goods. It is possible and necessary to ensure diverse forms of leisure for all, as well as access to traditional cultural goods and cutting-edge information technologies. But it is neither possible nor desirable for everyone to buy a new pair of shoes every month or a multitude of superfluous technological devices with production guided by the bourgeois consumerist logic of planned obsolescence. We will therefore work to convince people that a global eco-socialist society should reject this social pattern that is both predatory and environmentally unsustainable, as it is a component of the struggle against the consumerist individualism of capitalism. But it is also necessary for the State to take concrete measures to control this process.

However, environmental degradation

cannot be reduced to the climate crisis. The logic of capital transforms human needs into commodities and ends up reducing the right to existence of all forms of life. There is an urgent need to promote the conservation of biodiversity, while using natural resources in a way that ensures minimal impact. Mainly because the conditions for the production and reproduction of life also depend on the balance of ecosystems. That is why we must permanently defend life and the planet and ensure the reproduction of biodiversity and that its natural resources and human production are appropriated on equal terms. Countries can be cradles of the agroecological revolution, of sustainable food production at a local level and for the world. This obliges and commits us to the responsible use of the potential for economic production extracted from the depths of the earth. Not in a predatory and irresponsible way, but respecting natural environmental conditions and their reproduction and producing agriculture and soil organically, in a dialectic of nature.

It is necessary to seek natural fertilisation, both for the preservation of the land and for the quality of organic products, maintaining the physical, human and economic health of each region and country. Regulation of the use and systematic manipulation of land is also increasing, and can be strengthened by an anti-landlord and anti-monopoly Agrarian Reform that begins with the principles of territorial self-demarcation of peoples, with technical, economic and mainly social controls and ecological responsibility.

It is necessary to confront GMOs (Genetically Modified Organisms) and their harmful monopolisation of products, both by denouncing and clarifying to society the risks of a future harmful to health with mutations, as well as the expected quality of products on the foreign market and the preservation of the planet's biodiversity. Studies should be conducted on the effects of genetic manipulation in food and its consequences, considering human consumption of transgenic products, given recent reports of unknown diseases, increasing cases of cancer, epidemics and pandemics.

The major powers and monopolistic companies are divided between denying

the environmental crisis or recognising the problem and taking "eco-capitalist" measures, particularly in supposed alternatives to the climate crisis, which are clearly insufficient to confront the environmental crisis that threatens us.

## Ecosocialism and the Transition

It is clear that the global capitalist system needs exponential growth to generate profits. This growth is caused by the exploitation of workers and environmental destruction, bringing destabilising impacts that could lead to the extinction of humanity.

There is a profound contradiction: the system needs to maintain the growth of its accumulation, but humanity needs a development that meets the demands of its own survival along with that of the planet.

Furthermore, imperialist countries export environmental damage to the periphery of the planet, also manifesting itself as ecological imperialism, which takes local wealth and transforms the nature of the periphery into a "zone of sacrifice."

Capitalism cannot solve the environmental issue, no matter how well-intentioned social liberal environmentalists are. Their eco-capitalist proposals, which promote a "sustainable green economy", which try to reform the system with supposed "green solutions" such as reducing greenhouse gas emissions, while maintaining imperialism and capitalism, do not solve the crisis. They simply stop or slow the level of global warming.

We are Marxists, and historical and dialectical materialism shows us that the reproduction of the material living conditions of the working class and the oppressed and the reproduction of nature are inseparable, since we are interdependent and eco-dependent beings.

Therefore, to avoid metabolic disruption of the planet a possible solution would be the rational regulation of social metabolism by nature. After all, everything we do has an impact on nature.

The goal of ecosocialism is therefore to transform the world by organising workers and the oppressed to seize political power, build their transitional state, take over the means of production, promote their ecosocialist conversion and



the construction of an ecosocialist ethic that promotes the satisfaction of the productive demands of the people, reversing the destruction of nature.

Thus, Ecosocialism defends a new civilisational model, which begins with our current struggle and implies the conquest of political power and the construction of a State so that the working class and all those oppressed according to the logic of capital, begin a transition, which will be political, economic, technological, environmental and cultural.

## Comments on the Ecosocialist Manifesto

The Ecosocialist Manifesto, since its first publication, has been an important text that outlines the needs and urgencies of an anti-capitalist struggle, which places as one of its central points the material limits of the planet on which we live, in the context of the crisis of capitalism. Given the premise that it is impossible to maintain a production model that exploits finite resources – common goods – under the logic of infinite accumulation, it must be profoundly radical, preparing a break not only in economic structures, but also in the cultural hegemony of our time, marked by individualism, the exploitation of capital over labour, national domination and oppression in general. These points must undoubtedly be recognised as what unites us in the face of the struggles of our time.

In this sense, our notes on the current text of the Ecosocialist Manifesto are based on the need to delve deeper into some important issues, which, despite the changes that have occurred since its first presentation, still persist. Furthermore, we share concerns about the idealistic tone that appears in some parts of the text, which has little or nothing to do with our concrete reality, especially in Latin America.

The change of title - previously «For economic decline in general» - suggested on previous occasions of collective discussion on the text, considering the possible political effects of a literal interpretation in dependent countries, was very well received. Furthermore, the need to assess the differentiation in policy implementation in different regions of the world was highlighted in the use of the concept of “unequal and combined” which now belongs to the Manifesto. Despite this

inclusion, these notes end up clashing with some information, ideas or positions presented in the text. For example, in paragraph 1.23, when it is argued that global total energy consumption must decrease, it must always be stressed that this must necessarily be an uneven and combined process.

This is because there is agreement that there are activities and places, especially in capitalist centres, which are more intensely superfluous consumers of energy, where there must be a considerably more radical reduction in their consumption. However, to meet basic survival needs, especially in underdeveloped countries, a relative increase in energy consumption in these regions will continue to be necessary.

## The State in the Ecosocialist Transition

A central point of our observation is the text's treatment of the «state» as an abstractly negative entity. If we think of our future goal of a communist (or eco-communist) society, we agree with its extinction. However, we know that being a political, legal and coercive organisation with a class character, we cannot avoid dealing concretely with the State, whether in the society in which we live (still capitalist) or in the transition to socialism. This is because the “State” of socialist transition to communism is not comparable to the capitalist State. However, in the manifesto, the State is not considered a necessary and indispensable instrument for the eco-socialist transition.

Although the text points out ideological premises, such as when it defends production intended to satisfy human needs, “democratically planned, defined by the public sector” (1.17), the practical way in which this would happen, especially in the absence of the State, is considerably lacking, making the text idealistic. As in previous versions, the text still generally mentions an abstract “public power” and sometimes an undefined “popular power,” or treats it as “government,” and the transition seems to be carried out through a highly decentralised, spontaneous, bottom-up process. This vision almost ignores the diversity of forms of organisation that exist as well as culture shaped by capitalist hegemony. While correct criticism of the bureaucratisation of the defeated processes of the experiences

carried out in the transition to socialism is essential, confronting capitalism and socio-environmental problems cannot be possible from idealistic proposals, such as a transition without a State (which is what the manifesto, in fact, expressed).

Another aspect to highlight is that the bourgeois state does not appear responsible for domination in the imperialist centres, nor in dependent countries, nor is it held politically responsible for environmental destruction or current eco-capitalist adaptations. The strengthening of the capitalist state and its use by corporations - whether through tax exemptions or through the corruption of the structures of bourgeois democracy, through the executive actions of governments, as well as the legislative and judicial spheres and the armed forces - that attack the rights of the people via legislation, budgets, investments, repression, etc., collaborating with the commodification of common goods, remain absent.

## Deindustrialization, arms industry, global crisis and the “Global South”

There is still some idealism regarding the goal of a very broad and deep deindustrialisation in the production of food, basic subsistence products and other cases. If we assume that the ecological crisis leaves us on the brink of unimaginable catastrophes, and if we recall the COVID-19 pandemic, which, for example, required a global increase in the production of hospital supplies, and also opened room to question the control of vaccine patents, how can we present this defense of a broad deindustrialisation without at least considering these urgent issues?

The focus on the environmental crisis as the backdrop to all crises (the multiple crisis), present in the first versions of the manifesto, which left the structural crisis of capitalism in the background, was adjusted to balance the approaches. Economic, social and class issues came to the fore in relation to the environmental crisis. In the same sense, the class struggle of workers, social and political, also appeared in a more balanced way with the environmental struggle. The class struggle is positioned as “the basis of the battle for hegemony”.

In this version of the text, the disputes over the deepening crisis of capitalism in the context of the climate emergency now

present China and Russia in a scenario of inter-imperialist dispute, and this contributes to a more material analysis of the global panorama. Thus, the construction of an anti-capitalist political project must consider the new era of inter-imperialist competition for global hegemony, with the United States and its allies on one side and China and its allies on the other. This new approach responds, at least in part, to our previous considerations, allowing us to move forward in the discussion.

The abstract defence of the end of the war industry in general and the generic and abstract disdain for cutting-edge technological production for industrial purposes, due to its negative environmental consequences, presented in previous versions of the manifesto, is no longer so forceful, and this is an improvement. However, in the eco-socialist transition it is essential that the working class state has a military defence apparatus, in addition to the capacity for war production to confront predictable imperialist

aggressions. This is a contradiction with environmental protection, but this contradiction cannot be resolved by ignoring the problem. In this latest version of the text, defence is focused on a controlled use of political power to protect against any aggression, being more realistic, especially considering the power of imperialism to use violence against exploited and oppressed peoples. In other words, it is not possible to build an eco-socialist transition without working-class states having military power to deter imperialist attacks.

We maintain our criticism of the text in relation to the maintenance of the characterisation of the division of the world between North and South. Despite explaining that the South are the dominated countries and that China and Russia are not considered as South/dominated, this concept is still very subject to confusion. This is because, as a rule, those who use this concept, especially the supporters of so-called "campism", treat China and Russia as leaders of the so-called Global

South. On the other hand, the text continues to use the concept of "colonialism" in most cases where "imperialism" should be used.

Ação Popular Socialista submits these comments aiming at a collective progress in building the resistance of exploited and oppressed peoples, recognising an emergency in the face of the multiple crises we are living through. There are considerable advances in the text, although some problems remain related to the eco-socialist transition programme, in terms of concrete alternatives, consistent with the different realities at the global level. Despite this, we highlight that the differences between the long-term objectives and those of the eco-socialist transition programme and the immediate struggles are clearer.

Ação Popular Socialista  
(APS – Brazil)

December 2024

# Utopian or scientific eco-socialism? – A critique of the FI Manifesto

## An utopian document

The Eco-socialist manifesto of the FI is a description of the existential threat that climate change and destruction of "Nature" poses to humanity and the principles of a eco-socialist future eco-socialist society, but it does not at all address how to get there, "what had as do be done." The fact that as long as fossil energy is cheap it will be used is not discussed. The reasons why the neither bourgeoisie does nor the labour movement does nothing to increase the price of carbon so that demand disappears is raised at all. The word price is just mentioned 5 times and the closest the Manifesto comes to any realistic discussion of the role of prices, real-wages and profits is "a reduction in the price of energy generally leads to higher energy and material consumption". Yes and so what? Should we increase energy prices in order to reduce material consumption? Not a word about

what should/must be done about energy prices. The key dilemma that increasing the price of fossil fuel without compensating mechanism is not posed at all, and what kind of compensating mechanisms the labour movement should fight for is left in deafening silence. There is nothing about what demands should be posed at the yearly climate summits (COP). Not a word about the EU or the Chinese emission trading

## Regulation, prices and income distribution

Climate policies must be formulated with the guideline that the policies must reduce emissions and/or degradation of nature, and improve income or everyday life of ordinary people, in particular those with low incomes. Because with out support from the latter group, the policy will not get enough political traction.

Whether to use regulation or prices

must be decided in the specific context. To have a ban on private jets is "easy". The ban will only hurt the 0.1%. Allocation quotas, for petrol, numb of flights per year etc. etc. creates administration ("bureaucracy") and easily leads to a market in "quotas" where poor(er) people sell their quotas cheap, the rich(er) buys them cheap, hords them for future use – when the price of the quotas or the quantity they represent changes to the "worse" etc. It is often more difficult politically and cumbersome practically to increase quota prices or quantities.

Prices reflects roughly, in most cases "social necessary labour time", that is the direct social costs of production. Significant changes in relative prices strongly influences the behaviour. If it is much more expensive to take train – which is often the case – most people will use the car. The key problem with using prices to make people and firms to make "green" choices, is that price increases those with

normal and low income harder than those with high incomes.

Since the burning of fossil fuels is 80% of the emissions, the price polluters must pay for emitting one tonne of CO<sub>2</sub>, becomes the most important price. It must be continuously increased in the coming decades. Regrettably any discussion of the carbon price is practically absent from the discussions in the climate movement. This became extremely clear when the yellow vest movement erupted in France in November 2018.

In a split second, the left and the climate movement, in France and internationally, had to have a policy regarding the petrol price, namely whether it should be increased or kept at its 'status quo' level. The increase was clearly socially unjust, so should the climate movement demand lower petrol prices? Historically, the labour movement has always fought against price increases on goods and services that are a necessary part of working-class consumption. The yellow vest 'riots' should not have come as a total surprise; in 2014 France witnessed the riots of the 'red bonnets' over a similar unjust increase in the petrol price.

Now, almost four years after the yellow vests took to the streets, it is clear that the simple question of what the climate movement should recommend regarding the price of fossil fuels has become an elephant in the room. Should it be increased or not, that simple question has not got a clear answer, in fact it has practically speaking not even been posed. It has just been met with a deafening silence.

The immediate reason for that is of course that everybody realises that as long as fossil fuels are cheap, they will be burned. Everybody also agrees that a significant price increase will hurt those who must/do care more for the end of the month (fin du mois) than the end of the world (fin du monde) to use an expression that emerged in the movement.

Given these clear and sharp insights, the conclusions should also have been clear: what we need is a rising carbon price – to reduce emissions – combined with strong redistributive policies to reduce inequalities, not only increase acceptance but to also make a higher petrol price interesting to everyone with low income by redistributing all the carbon tax revenue. This is the last logical step, which Combes does not take and which too many heterodox economists have not taken, either

before the yellow vests or after. The disastrous consequence was that the left had no policy to offer to one of the strongest social movements in Europe since 1968. The women's movement is of course about much more than legal abortion, just as the workers' movement is about much more than the eight-hour day, but such synthesizing slogans are extremely important in order to achieve results for a heterogeneous mass movement.

There are of course many aspects of a carbon tax and dividend (redistribution) system that merit discussion, but in this context the important point is that without a carbon tax and dividend policy, the climate movement had nothing to offer the yellow vests on the key issue of the petrol price.

Still, almost four years after the yellow vests, there is still no discussion of why the French and international left was politically paralysed, why the French left did not receive any significant boost from this mighty anti-establishment movement. If one for example reads the special issue of *Globalizations*(1) on Economics and Climate Emergency, there are many well-known names in ecological and heterodox economics but no discussion of the carbon price or of how to bring voters influenced by right-wing populists over from the 'dark side' to the 'light/green' side by making these social groups benefit from a rising carbon price.

## The imperative of taxing carbon

The climate movement must realise that capitalism is an ever-expanding system. It has an eternal need for cheap energy. To produce a lot of renewable energy generally just increases the total consumption of energy. The fact that the relative share of fossil fuels in the total energy use is 82%, down from ca 85% in 1990. The amount of total energy used has grown by at least 50% in the same period. This shows the simple fact that as long as fossil fuels are cheap they will be burned. Cheap renewables are only added

1) *Globalizations* is not an ecological or climate policy journal, but this special issue, Volume 18, Issue 7, 2021, includes contributions from well-known heterodox economists interested in climate policy so it gives a fairly 'representative' impression of the state of the art when it comes to climate policy formulation in heterodox economics.

to the energy consumption.

Another important fact is that if solar and wind are not stored, they can never become so-called electricity "base load", that is supply the amount of that modern society uses continuously. The perverse effect of not building long term storage for solar and wind is that there for example in Germany are

## Taxing carbon or blowing up pipelines?

Since our present capitalist market economy is always wanting more cheap energy, in most cases, heavily subsidised wind and solar energy generally only add to total energy consumption. Andreas Malm argues in his book "How to blow up a pipeline" that:

Rather than displacing the coal and avoiding the CO<sub>2</sub>, a wind turbine adds another slice to an ever-growing energy pie; [it] will accomplish a tenth of a transition, unless there is a simultaneous 'direct suppression of fossil-fuel use'. (Malm, 2016, p. 382)

It is totally logical: when you do not want to suppress fossil fuel by making it prohibitively expensive by taxing it, eco-sabotage of fossil fuel production infrastructure becomes the only possible strategy to reduce emissions. You must suppress fossil fuel production to reduce supply.

The broader climate movement has had the more general slogan 'Keep it in the ground' and has thus far only been willing to use democratic methods including civil disobedience. Whatever way you reduce supply – the price of fossil energy will rise and such a general increase in the cost of living will hurt middle- and low-income households harder than affluent, not to mention rich and super rich, ones. In short it will be just as unpopular as Macron's petrol tax. There is an obvious danger that steeply rising energy prices will increase support for right-wing populist parties, with their more or less outspoken climate denialism.

It must be said that most members of the climate movement are critical of the type of terrorist acts of sabotage that Malm is proposing. They are, as Malm points out in his book, in favour of peaceful civil disobedience such as the actions carried out by Extinction Rebellion (XR) or Ende Gelände: blocking roads for a couple of hours, blocking coal mining infrastructure for a day and the like. These actions are of course important for raising



awareness if done in the right way.

The problem is that they do not have as their strategic objective to win ordinary people over to voting for parties/policies that really will get emissions down. What is needed is a political programme that combines the immediate material interests of 'the many' increasing their income with their just-as-material interest in a stable climate.

The reason why we still fly and mostly drive fossil fuel cars is because we are locked into structures in everyday life that make us do so, even though most of us know we really should not.

## **Workers against waste – from profit maximisation to leisure maximisation**

Capitalism is an atomistic, chaotic, and very wasteful system. We all have felt the frustration caused by incompatible mobile phone and laptop chargers. Every producer of those gadgets wants to force you to buy from them by having their proprietary plugs, making it rational to keep buying their products. Otherwise, you have to just throw away all the chargers and cables you have accumulated only to be locked into another producer's proprietary technological standard. The lack of standardisation/compatibility also long meant that if you forgot your cable or charger, often nobody in a meeting had the same charger as you. This kind of frustration was intensely felt by the EU Commission jet set. At a press conference in June 2009, European Commission Vice-President Günter Verheugen stated that the mobile phone market in Europe alone was responsible for thousands of tons of waste each year as phones were upgraded and chargers became obsolete due to lack of standardisation and constant changes. This should now come to an end, thanks to a voluntary agreement between the EC and the mobile phone producers Apple, Motorola, Nokia, Samsung.

Now, 13 years later we are slowly converging on USB C as the standard for mobile phones. A lot of copper will be saved and needless mining work, construction of mining machines, transportation, and user frustration prevented due to this initiative. When it comes to laptop chargers, not much progress has been made. The question for the climate movement is why did not we urge unions to adopt

such a resource-saving initiative so that workers would benefit from at least a part of the savings from this type of ecological standardisation, so that the reduction in waste would not become profits, but shorter working hours? For that to happen, workers would have to share the working time needed to produce compatible, quality goods. They would become in Marxian jargon 'associated producers' by suspending capitalist competition, by making companies agree on certain technological standards. If such standards lead to products lasting significantly longer, workers will also reduce production since the products will not need to be replaced so often. If the gains from standardisation, including design for easy repair and recycling, could be realised as more leisure time and not unemployment, workers would have an immediate material interest in degrowth.

Worldwide car sales fell from a peak of 97 million cars in 2018 to 80 million cars in 2021 (1) This decline is the result of a combination of people waiting for better and cheaper electric cars and the pandemic. When – it is already no longer if – autonomous, self-driving cars, so-called robo-taxis, replace private cars, car production could drop drastically to 50 or even 20 million cars per year (2). This would create enormous benefits for the environment and for workers if they could unite to share the work necessary to produce the cars that society really needs until other employment opportunities emerge. We do need more nurses and teachers, but learning new skills and competences takes time. In the meantime, workers should get the benefit of more leisure time from reduced resource use so they can become a mighty force driving the transition to sustainability. Such a leisure-time motivated 'degrowth' is an important research agenda for heterodox economics in this decisive decade.

Take for example the handful of big chains in the grocery retail market, which often have 80–90% or higher share of the market. Cooperation between the workers of the different chains could 'suspend' the competition surrounding a lot of issues, like banning plastic bags and regulating opening hours, ban advertising wars and thereby reducing the amount of money

wasted on advertising wars and increasing wages instead.

## **COP– without any concrete slogans?**

There should of course be no more bla-bla, but what do the climate movement propose besides that urgent action must be taken? Has there been any coordinated effort to put pressure on the national delegations to the COP to put forward the same handful of concrete demands. For example that the use of "offsets" should be banned in national and international climate policy. Everybody knows that offsets if they worked perfectly only would mean stabilising emissions. You plant trees to suck up the emissions from a coal power plant. But there is way to much CO2 already. So the power plant must stop completely emitting and the trees must take store CO2. But offsets do not at all work perfectly, they do not even work OK. Tons of research shows that offsets has been a major swindle. (Blomberg -these trees are not real). Another major issue at the Climate COP is "loss and damage". Already in 2009, in Copenhagen did the advanced capitalist countries "buy up" the rulers of a sufficient number of developing countries by promising to finance green transition via the Green Climate Fund. This and later efforts to raise a lot of "green finance" has failed. Targets have not been met and it is too often the case that traditional development aid has just been relabeled. The climate movement must raise the demand that all COP green finance, all "loss and damage" must be financed by taxing fossil fuels.

A major controversy at recent COPs has been that richer countries established a Green Climate Fund to help developing countries at COP15 in 2009. As was easily predictable, it proved to be very difficult to finance the fund. As a response, in 2011 Oxfam and WWF launched the idea of taxing international shipping and using the tax revenue to fill up the fund. They proposed to start with 25 USD. A similar taxation of fuels should be implemented in international aviation. It is clearly necessary to increase the tax, for example by 10 USD each year, to force shipping and aviation to transition to non-polluting technologies. Maybe the tax revenue should be redistributed to every citizen in poor countries directly. In the age of the mobile phone,

1) <https://www.statista.com/statistics/262747/worldwide-automobile-production-since-2000/>

2) <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6Ud-fPKnj3Q&t=432s>

this is technically possible. Handing out the money to corrupt governments is problematic, but perhaps necessary to get such a tax implemented by the COP. However, giving at least a share of the tax revenue directly to citizens of poor countries would give them a direct material interest in increasing the tax on international transport. Since not only the “wretched of the earth”, but most of the world’s population (90%) do not even fly internationally taxing air transport and redistributing the tax revenue will be a pure “profit” for them. A fossil fuel tax

on international transport would increase the price of imported goods; at first, the price increase on individual items would be almost negligible, but as the tax grows, the resulting price increase will favour local production.

Finally, climate movement should demand that all countries introduce a carbon tax as part of their NDC (nationally determined contribution) to the Paris Agreement, starting at 10 USD and increasing by 10 USD every year. One has of course to start to put political pressure on one’s

own national delegation. In the countries where there are already domestic carbon taxes, they should also increase by 10 USD. In no country is the tax as high as it urgently needs to be. The introduction of a carbon tax will create tax revenue that progressive forces can demand should be redistributed with an equal share to every citizen to their bank accounts every month. It is politically very important to make the system simple and transparent.

Anders Ekeland Norway

## The environment, population and our ecosocialist vision

In its current form, the manifesto does not address demographic issues which are closely tied to global inequality and environmental degradation. The purpose of this contribution is to call comrades’ attention to these issues. We feel that the manifesto should include reference to and analysis of the demographic transition (explained below). We plan on submitting a formal amendment to the manifesto to the world congress along these lines. Global warming, biodiversity decline and other elements of our ecological crisis have long been attributed to human overpopulation or rampant population growth by defenders of the imperialist status quo. These Malthusian arguments also attribute immiseration, wars and other social ills to demographics, rather than centuries of colonial, imperialist, and now neo-imperialist plunder and domination. Particularly during periods of social and ecological crises, such arguments are used to blame the working class or oppressed victims for the crises and their own misery and foist and impose population control measures on them. In fact, the relationship between immiseration, environmental disruption and demographics is the inverse to the causal chains invoked by the Malthusians. One aspect of this is the well-known phenomenon known as the demographic transition. Social scientists apply this term to the observation that population growth rates decline in proportion to wellbeing. Pioneering research in the 1970s by sociologist Mahmood Mamdani among peasant farmers in India, showed that high population growth rates are largely due to high infant mortality rates

coupled with economic insecurity, leading those impoverished peasant families to consider their offspring as additional family breadwinners (1). Researchers have since shown that income security, access to food, education, healthcare and housing, gender equality and women’s empowerment, among other indices of social wellbeing, all contribute to a demographic transition, as first death rates and then birth rates decline. Thus, high population growth rates are a result, rather than a cause of poverty. This is not to deny that dense and/or rapidly growing populations may put burdens on local or regional resources, or imply that populations can grow eternally, but confirms that human ecology is also subject to capitalism’s metabolic rift. Under capitalism, human settlement as well as population growth is driven by economic growth, rather than ecological sustainability.

A future ecosocialist society, governed through grassroots democratic planning may well consider demographic criteria in its deliberations, much as it may consider patterns of human settlement and other aspects of human ecology and ecosystem health. Malthusian theorists and some other mainstream sources also invoke overconsumption -- whether caused by too many mouths to feed or too much affluence -- as a cause of environmental degradation. The latter would argue that the demographic transition enhances, rather than resolving the problems of environmental degradation due to rising affluence, even if popu-

lation growth ceases. It is important to acknowledge that capitalist consumerism, rather than consumption, does indeed threaten the biosphere, but that capitalist consumerism is driven by production decisions in service to profits and economic growth. In turn, once again, human populations showing the highest densities and/or growth are not only inversely related to their social wellbeing, but to their ecological footprint. For example, according to Oxfam, «the richest 1 percent of the world’s population produced as much carbon pollution in 2019 as the five billion people who made up the poorest two-thirds of humanity.»(2)

Michael Friedman and Kay Mann. Solidarity, US

1) Mamdani, Mahmood (1972). *The myth of population control; family, caste, and class in an Indian village.* (New York: Monthly Review Press)

2) <https://www.oxfam.org/en/press-releases/richest-1-emit-much-planet-heating-pollution-two-thirds-humanity>

# For an anti-war movement that defends the right of peoples to self-determination – The case of Ukraine

## I) The failure of the Special Military Operation that was supposed to bring down Kyiv = “proof” that Ukraine exists

The invasion of Ukraine, up to the gates of Kyiv in February 2022, surprised everyone – including President Zelensky and NATO leaders. It was preceded by a double assertion in a long discourse by Putin in June 2021. On the one hand, Ukraine as a nation with the right of self-determination was, according to him, a “creation of Lenin”. And former President Medvedev declared in June 2022 that he doubted that in two years Ukraine would still exist on a world map (See the review {Top War} <https://fr.topwar.ru/197779-medvedev-a-kto-skazal-chto-cherez-2-goda-ukraina-voobsche-budet-suschestvovat-na-karte-mira.html>) But in addition, the Kyiv regime was declared illegitimate, the result of a NATO-backed “Nazi coup” in 2014, with an “anti-Russian” orientation.

Let us recall that after the Maidan uprisings in 2013-2014 and the dismissal (by the Ukrainian parliament) and flight to Russia of former President Yanukovich, elections in 2014 brought the oligarch Poroshenko to power. The militant reality of far-right movements within these events and their influence within the government is the subject of controversy. But that cannot obscure what can be verified and judged: new elections were organized in 2019, at the end of Poroshenko’s term. They brought to power against him, a Russian-speaking Jewish actor unknown in politics, Volodymyr Zelensky, winning more than 70 per cent of the vote across the country - especially in the «anti-Maidan» regions of 2014. In addition to denouncing corruption, «he emphasized unity between the different regions of Ukraine, between Russian speakers and Ukrainian speakers, going against the ethno-

nationalist dis-course”, as Hanna Perekhova tells us (Hanna Perekhova is a historian who grew in Donetsk, today occupied by Russia. She is a member of the Ukrainian left organisation Sotsialny Rukh. See in particular <https://www.sciencespo.fr/ceri/fr/content/dossiersduceri/lenine-est-il-l-auteur-et-l-architecte-de-l-ukraine-comme-le-dit-putine>)

Historian Timothy Snyder, a specialist in Central and Eastern Europe, pointed out in 2023 ([https://www.lemonde.fr/international/article/2023/04/07/timothy-snyder-pour-devenir-meilleur-un-pays-doit-perdre-sa-derniere-guerre-coloniale\\_6168694\\_3210.html](https://www.lemonde.fr/international/article/2023/04/07/timothy-snyder-pour-devenir-meilleur-un-pays-doit-perdre-sa-derniere-guerre-coloniale_6168694_3210.html)) “Ukraine is the country that has gradually emerged over the last thirty years – from independence in 1991 to today – and particularly since the Maidan revolution in 2014, with a consolidation of civil society and a renewal of generations. At the beginning of the war, the world was perplexed by questions such as ethnicity and language, which in fact do not matter much. What really matters is politics, experience.” He added: “Russia treats Ukraine as a kind of colony. Putin’s claims that there is no Ukrainian nation, no Ukrainian state, are classics of the rhetoric of colonial superiority. (Idem. Snyder concludes: “this is why Moscow needs to lose this war: to become better, a country must lose its last colonial war.»).

“From Ukraine to Palestine, occupation is a crime!” This is the universal axis of our positioning alongside our Ukrainian comrades. In complete independence from our rulers... So:

## II) A struggle on several fronts, with progressive organizations of Ukrainian society

At the same time, we are radically critical of the hypocritical supporters of

Ukraine who send weapons to Israel, and of their «values». We are also critical of a Zelensky government that identifies itself more with Israel than with the Palestinians, and indeed would even like to represent tomorrow for «Europe» - meaning the EU - a militarized Israel that would have become the armed wing of the Western imperial powers. Supporting requests for material and military aid to resist Russian aggression requires at the same time vigilance and independent self-organization from below, in connection with the progressive forces of Ukraine, against the Russian invasion and against all its reactionary instrumentalizations - within the resistance and at the international level.

To say that this war is first and foremost neo-colonial implies understanding that a lasting peace requires armed and unarmed self-defence against this colonization. It means recognizing Ukraine as an actor, against Putin and against any great power seeking to «negotiate» with him behind the backs of the Ukrainian people. Far from being a «proxy» of the NATO powers, Zelensky has demonstrated since the invasion in various stages and initiatives his own profile as a resister of a national struggle - the margins of which he has expanded through the autonomous production of the Ukrainian military industry and its inventiveness. But Zelensky is leading this struggle for the liberation of the country on neo-liberal socio-economic bases that we are fighting against with our Ukrainian comrades. We are not waiting for a socialist Ukraine that we can support - but we are working everywhere to develop anti-capitalist resistance and democratic socialist alternatives.

Hanna Perekhoda underlines this: “With my organization, Sotsialnyi Rukh (Social Movement), which is based on the prin-

principles of democratic socialism, we oppose the government's neoliberal and anti-social measures. (...) We encourage our allies around the world to exert pressure, on the one hand to ask for military, financial and diplomatic support for Ukraine as a country, so that it can defend itself, but at the same time, we refuse that this aid be subject to conditions of a neoliberal and antisocial nature. We are also conducting a campaign to cancel Ukraine's foreign debt (interview with Arthur Borriello on May 9, 2023, <https://entreleslignesentrelesmots.wordpress.com/2023/11/17/hanna-pe-rekhoda-sur-lukraine-pour-reflechir-aux-solutions-il-faut-au-moins-ne-not-to-be-wrong-about-the-causes/>).

### III-What "peace" negotiations?

Along with our Ukrainian comrades, we oppose negotiations between the great powers behind the backs of the people concerned. It is this people itself which will have to judge the conditions for a ceasefire and lasting peace - for Ukraine and its Eastern European neighbours who are also under threat.

Putin now wants to present himself as a «peace» negotiator. In June 2024, the {New York Times} returned to the negotiations attempted in Turkey in March 2022 and their sticking points, more than ever unresolved, or even aggravated (: <https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2024/06/15/world/europe/ukraine-russia-cease-fire-deal.html>). The NYT publishes the full drafts of the treaties dated March 17 and April 15, 2022, which show the competing proposals and the points of agreement between the two sides, as well as a private statement issued during the talks in Istanbul on March 29, which sums up the issues.) Ukraine demanded guarantees of international protection that draw lessons from the violation of the Budapest Memorandum of 1994, signed in the presence of the United States and Great Britain, by which Ukraine transferred to Russia all the nuclear weapons inherited from the USSR. Long periods of negotiations were planned on the territories annexed by Russia - without recognizing these annexations. But it is necessary to recall how the negotiation process of March 2022 was disrupted by what was happening on the ground.

True, Russian troops were withdrawing from Kiev. However, in its suburbs, in Buchá,

the crimes committed during the Russian occupation from February to March 2022 were being discovered: mass murders, rapes, torture of the civilian population. In addition, the evacuation of Kiev meant the re-grouping of Russian troops in the south and east of Ukraine, resulting on September 30, 2022, in the annexation of four administrative regions - the Donetsk, Kherson, Luhansk and Zaporizhia oblasts: they include the two self-proclaimed People's Republics of Donetsk and Luhansk dominated by mafiosi who are therefore only a part of these oblasts. Far from being stably and completely controlled by Russian forces to this day. The referendums that preceded the official annexation were not internationally recognized because they violated various rights (including the lack of identification documents, the absence of independent observers or recognized organizations, and votes by corresponding collected under the control of Russian soldiers alone and counted in Russia).

Since then, the atrocities committed in the occupied territory have multiplied - including the deportation of children to Russia and the pressure and violence to forcibly Russify these territories by ridding them of the part of the population that feels Ukrainian.

NATO cannot be a «solution» and will have to disappear with all the military blocs. But the accessions of Finland and Sweden were not considered by Putin as «declarations of war»: he had no «territorial dispute» with these countries, «unlike Ukraine» - because he considers Ukraine, or an undetermined part of its territory, as Russian. For his part, Sergei Lavrov affirmed in December 2024 that «the Ukrainian government was illegitimate» and that it could therefore not «be a negotiating partner» for Russia. Putin's goal remains a submission of Ukraine with a government in Kiev at his beck and call.

This unworthy and unjust peace would not deter new reactionary and imperial offensives by Putin's Great Russians. At the same time, it would stimulate the rise of far-right "anti-Russian" currents, which would also propagate racist hatred.

### IV. For a "decolonial" anti-war movement

Pacifism in the face of aggressive wars

supports the aggressor. Militarism does not understand the causes and nature of aggression. We must combat both in a concrete way (See the initiative Ukraine: A People's Peace, not an Imperial Peace).

The relationship of forces and the ideological and political fragmentation of the left is unfavourable to counter-projects for a peace that is lasting - therefore just and decolonial - from Ukraine to Palestine.

But we must build fronts in this direction - supported by movements from below which are trying to help the resistance, armed and unarmed, of civil societies, on egalitarian bases (This is the major contribution of the ENSU network (European Network in Solidarity) with Ukraine and against the war - see its site in several languages <https://ukraine-solidarity.eu/>) created in March 2022 and which has internationalized to other continents <https://ukraine-solidarity.eu/>).

It is not yet clear what the impact of Trump will be on the ongoing wars. But it is certain that his "withdrawal" from a "European" war and his support through NATO will mean increased European responsibilities for the future of the continent and EU policy.

Progressive and alternative responses to a militarised and neo-liberal EU cannot be "nationalist sovereignist" and indifferent to the fate of neo-colonised peoples.

We must therefore work towards the construction, particularly in Europe within/outside/against the EU, of a decolonial anti-war movement.

- working towards the socialization of the arms industries, against any logic of profit,
- in solidarity with the peoples under attack and their right to resistance, armed and unarmed,
- demanding political and democratic control of the budgets of each country and of the EU
- refusing to counterpose solidarity with Ukraine to the defense of social budgets
- demanding the cessation of all military aid to Israel but support for the Ukrainian resistance
- with the cancellation of Ukrainian debt
- and the rejection of any neo-liberal conditioning of aid policies

Catherine Samary,  
Membre du CI, France



# Amendment to the text on the international situation, on the defence of democratic rights against the extreme right

Add the following paragraph at the end of part II, 'The far right challenges "neoliberal democracies", workers and the oppressed'

As in the past, this struggle against the extreme right must include the defence of democratic rights such as the right to demonstrate and strike, voting rights and freedom of expression as a priority. While the extreme right in power today tends not to establish full-fledged fascist regimes on the model of the 1930s, extreme-right governments in India, Turkey, Hungary and elsewhere have for years managed to combine the outward forms of bourgeois democracy with effective repression of independent media, opposition parties and oppositional movements as well as critical scholars. This trend is now intensifying. Russia's war against Ukraine has led to fierce repression of anti-war voices and

dissent generally. The repression also targets gender and sexual dissent, as laws against "gay propaganda" are made more savage and adopted in other countries - while in countries like Indonesia and Turkey, space that had opened up for LGBTIQ communities has recently been closed down. In Israel, opposition to the genocidal war in Gaza is denounced as "antisemitic" and repressed accordingly, while pro-Israeli governments in North America and Europe wage similar campaigns. Trump's election to a second term in the US, combined with Republican control of all three branches of the federal government and Trump's tightening control over the Republican Party, poses open threats to freedom of expression and other freedoms. In Western Europe, following anti-democratic measures taken by the far-right Meloni government, the prospect of a strong showing by the AfD in elections in early 2025 poses a comparable threat in

Germany (especially if the traditional right's adherence to the cordon sanitaire falters). More generally, in country after country, refugees and immigrants, climate activists, activists in solidarity with Palestine and others are being targeted by repressive measures taken by right-wing (and other) governments, nominally directed against supposed "terrorist", "criminal" and "antisemitic" threats. Faced with these dangers, the defence of the rights of racialized and stigmatized people and of activists is urgently needed, going far beyond the ranks of those directly targeted, relying on grassroots mobilization - as in the heartening anti-racist protests in England - rather than only on juridical structures that all too often fail at decisive moments to uphold the rule of law.'

SAP (Netherlands)

## Comments on the draft resolution on the international situation

### Introduction

Comrades,

We greet you all, on behalf of Ação Popular Socialista (APS - Brazil), for the first time as permanent observers at an International Congress of the IV, after the approval given at the IC in October 2022 (we previously participated, in 2010 and 2018, as guests).

Below are our written contributions on the draft resolution on the International Situation, resulting from collective discussions in our International Relations Working Group (IRWG).

As regards the international situation, the text brings some important changes

with respect to previous versions, with which we agree: in particular the non-use of the division of the world between North and South, although the term "Global South" is still used; the characterisation of China as an imperialist country, which was not clear in previous versions; the definition of a polarisation between two imperialist blocs as a prominent aspect of the current international situation, as well as the withdrawal of the understanding that multilateralism exists. We also welcome the change in the characterisation of countries such as Russia, China and Nicaragua from "totalitarianism" to "authoritarianism," as well as the non-definition of Russia as "neo-fascism." We also welcome the withdrawal of the idea that

there was a "balance of power" in the world before the Zionist state of Israel's war against Palestine.

The question of the ecological crisis no longer appears as the background to all crises. We consider this a correct change, since the background is the structural crisis of capitalism, which has even deepened the climate crisis. Big capital has forced environmental destruction to the maximum in order to increase its profit rates.

However, some important differences of opinion remain.

### Geopolitical chaos or inter-imperialist (geopolitical)



## bipolarisation?

We regret the lack of a clearer axis to interpret the international situation. The text maintains the concept of geopolitical “chaos” already criticised above (page p. 7, column c. 2, paragraph 2). Although it appears less prominently than on other occasions, this concept does not clearly explain the current situation. We live in an inter-imperialist bipolarisation that has on one side the United States, the European powers and Japan and their allies and, on the other side, China, Russia and their allies, who promote rational actions in all aspects.

It is, first of all, a dispute over the hegemony of capitalism/imperialism in global terms and, especially, an attempt to confront the structural crisis of capitalism, which is a multiple crisis (economic, financial, environmental, energy, food and health) with risks of expansion of military conflicts. And it manifests itself at regional and national levels in various forms of political crises and the growth of authoritarianism, within regimes or in opposition to them, even in the form of neo-fascism.

Of course, the process could get out of control, but at least for now it is not chaotic. It is a set of actions by both blocs to promote economic, financial, technological, political, ideological and military dispute. It is important to highlight that the core of the dispute is over the vanguard of the ongoing techno-scientific revolution and the still initial questioning of the dollar as the dominant reserve currency and in commercial transactions, investments, financing and financial speculation.

To this end, they seek to manipulate already established international organisations such as the UN, the IMF, the World Bank, NATO, the OECD, the EU, the G-7, the G-20, the COP, as well as new bilateral and multilateral agreements and treaties and international or regional organisations and links, for economic or military purposes. These are the cases of BRICS and its NDB bank, CSTO, ASEAN, QUAD, AUKUS, SCO, TPP and others.

On the other hand, the text speaks of a “supposed” unipolarity prior to the current situation (p. 8, c. 3, par. 2). In our view, “unipolarity” was not “supposed” but real. It was created after the implosion of the Soviet Union, that is, since the early 1990s. A unipolar hegemonic global

imperialism led by the US, which was only broken some 20 years later, with the emergence of the China-Russia bloc. Regarding nuclear war, there is an overvaluation of the India vs Pakistan conflict, as if it were one of the hotbeds of a possible nuclear war (p. 8, c. 1, par. 1).

## War in Ukraine and Russia

The divergence of understanding on the issue of war in Ukraine remains one of the most important and appears at different times (p. 3, c. 1, last par.). In the section on the contribution of wars in the process of global warming, the emphasis in criticism is placed exclusively in relation to Putin and Netanyahu. This excerpt omits or downplays criticism of US imperialism and the actions of NATO, which remain the biggest promoters of war and military spending.

The question of Ukraine appears again (p. 7, c. 2, par. 2) in the view that the “qualitative leap” from the alleged “chaos” was Russia’s invasion of Ukraine, and that there was a second “leap forward” with Israel’s war against the Palestinians. But, as we have seen, this process of bipolarisation has been developing even before Russia’s invasion of Ukraine (2022), between the peak of the structural crisis of capitalism in 2008 and 2014. During this period, a set of events have occurred that have converged in this bipolarisation and in the worsening of the crisis and geopolitical dispute.

The draft resolution continues to ignore the fact that there is a NATO “proxy war” against Russia in Ukraine and not just Russia against Ukraine. It is a one-sided position, which ignores all the US and NATO provocations and the involvement of European and EU countries. This is evident as these countries are strongly present in the war militarily, politically and diplomatically and have great imperialist interests in Ukraine.

Ultimately, the text continues to wrongly portray Russia as solely responsible for the war (p. 9, c. 2, par. 2). Russia invaded Ukraine and our condemnation of this and our firm defence of the principle of self-determination of peoples and nations must be emphatic. That is what we have been doing. However, it is not right to ignore the coup promoted by the Ukrainian far right against a pro-Russian government in 2014, the attacks against pro-Russian populations in the Donbass region and the threats to the Russian military base in Crimea. All the

above provocations by NATO and the strong military, material and diplomatic support of the US and the EU and their main instrument of attack, which is NATO, cannot be ignored. In addition, it is also worth noting the authoritarian, oligarchic and conservative regime of Zelensky’s Ukraine, which has no features that can be considered less negative than that of Russia.

## Can Russia evolve towards fascism?

The previous version described Russia as a “neo-fascist” country living under “totalitarianism.” Now it says that “the ultra-repressive nature of Putin’s regime is evolving towards fascism” (p. 9, c. 2, par. 1). There was discussion in the way the issue was raised. But still no argument or basis is presented for it. Russia certainly has an authoritarian, centralising, conservative, oligarchic and imperialist regime, but that does not necessarily mean that it is “fascist.” As we have already commented and criticised in previous versions, there is a lack of clarity regarding what can be considered “fascism” and “totalitarianism.” On the other hand, if we say that Russia is evolving towards “fascism,” why not say the same about Ukraine?

## Totalitarianism and authoritarian character

We highlight as positive the replacement of the characterisation of countries previously called “totalitarian” to now be treated as “authoritarian”, as is the case of China, Russia, Belarus, Nicaragua and others (p. 10, c. 2, last par.).

We also propose replacing the word “infected” when speaking of the influence of “campism” on a left with an anti-Stalinist tradition (p. 10, c. 1, par. 1). It is not the most appropriate word, because of its connotation of illness, which distances the subjects from responsibility.

## NATO

It is claimed that NATO was strengthened “to respond to Putin” (p. 7, c. 2, par. 2). But the story is different. NATO has been strengthening since the end of the USSR, even before Putin was president of Russia. It has exerted constant pressure on Russia since the end of the USSR. It is clear that, after the Russian invasion of

Ukraine, NATO used this as a justification to strengthen itself even further, expanding its space and adding new countries to its configuration. But this was not just a response to Putin, as if NATO were merely a defensive organisation. In fact, from its very beginnings, it has always been primarily a tool of imperialist aggression. And this became even clearer after the implosion of the USSR.

Criticism of NATO only appears in a context unrelated to the specific case of Ukraine, when the text raises the need to dismantle NATO and other military blocs. This is correct. However, criticism of NATO is diluted, since it is the main instrument of military aggression in the world today.

In fact, the previous version of the resolution stated that the most dangerous hegemonic power remains US imperialism, and it would be important to reaffirm this. It is therefore contradictory to make more general statements about the role of US imperialism, but without specifically characterising it in the cases of aggression it has been carrying out and, particularly, its presence in the proxy war in Ukraine and in the unconditional support for Israel in the devastating genocide in Palestine.

### Europe Under Threat

In point 4.6, the European Union is portrayed as a victim of the war. However, in reality the EU is a bloc led by imperialist countries and equally responsible for the war in Ukraine (and also in Palestine), which is a proxy war, with Russia on one side and the US, EU and NATO on the other (p. 9, c. 2).

It is true that Europe is suffering the most from this war after Ukraine. But that does not mean that it is an innocent victim. This war is also the great responsibility of the European states and the dominant political classes and elites.

### China, Party, State

### and Latin America

In the text, China is presented as a state capitalism, centralised by the CCP and the armed forces (p. 9, c. 1, par. 1). We understand that what centralises political, economic and social life in China is the party, within a merged party-state system. The armed forces have always played an important role, but they have always been directed by the party, just like the state. The armed forces are not a separate governing body, with influence equivalent to that of the party, as the text seems to say.

On the other hand, the party-state does not control everything in the economy. It is not centralised planning, as it was in the Soviet Union. This is because China's capitalist economic model also needs to meet the demands of market forces, which also determine what is actually done. In other words, they influence the policies that are planned and implemented. Planning is therefore carried out in a convergence of state-initiated planning policies with the interests and actions of the market, including the free market at national and international levels, including its movements outside the control of the state.

China is presented as the main trading partner of "all" Latin American countries (p. 9, c. 1, par. 4). But that is not the reality. China is the first or second partner of the vast majority of countries, but not all. It is the second largest trading partner in Latin America overall. This is because there is an imbalance, especially in the case of Mexico, which has a much larger economic relationship with the United States. Other smaller countries, such as Nicaragua, also have the United States as their largest trading partner.

### Colonies and nationalisms

Regarding the issue of colonial countries, which we have already discussed

in previous articles, the current proposal continues to use the concept of "colonial" and "semi-colonial" countries, without clarifying exactly what is meant by this. Which countries can still be called colonies? We still believe that it would be better to use the concept of imperialism and dependency (p. 8, c. 1, par. 4).

The terms "nationalism" and "nationalist dispute" continue to be used in a generic way. The criticism of so-called nationalism remains unclear, as if all types of nationalism were right-wing and imperialist. It is necessary to differentiate them from nationalist actions that have an anti-imperialist character or, at least, from the struggle for national sovereignty in dependent or semi-colonial countries (as is the case of the Sahel countries - former French colonies and, later, semi-colonies in Africa).

### Economic, Social and Political Revolution

The text highlights the problem of the lack of an organised anti-capitalist alternative with mass expression and representation. The absence of a force or several forces with these characteristics, which should direct the "economic and social" revolutions (p. 4, c. 1, last par.). We emphasise, however, that the direction of these revolutions is political, and the objective of promoting economic and social revolutions necessarily involves the conquest of political power and the construction of a state of transition from capitalism to eco-socialism. It must therefore be said that these revolutions are not only economic and social, but also political. This is also a major lacuna in the text of the Ecosocialist Manifesto.

Ação Popular Socialista (APS, Brazil)  
December 2024

# On the situation in Syria after the defeat of al-Assad – A first approach

It is understandable that, given the former Assad dictatorship and the deep

social crisis in Syria, people took to the streets to celebrate his downfall. But there

is no sign of a future of peace, democracy and social justice in Syria.

Following his surrender, faced with the implosion of his army, betrayals and the absence of allies at crucial moments, Assad fled to Russia for exile. The rapid implosion of the regime showed that the official Syrian government had lost virtually all bases of social and political support.

In addition to this situation, already of prolonged duration, the disposition of the victorious forces also took advantage of the international context, especially the more immediate situation of inter-imperialist bipolarisation.

Conditions favourable for Assad's overthrow began to open up with the prolongation of the proxy war in Europe, following the Russian invasion of Ukraine (with Russian attrition and reduced ability to intervene elsewhere). Furthermore, the genocide promoted by the Zionist state of Israel in Palestine and aspects of its war with Hezbollah and Iran have made it difficult for both to respond. And, even more immediately, there was the recent truce between Israel and Hezbollah, which further neutralised the latter from carrying out defensive actions inside Syria, forcing its complete withdrawal from Syrian territory.

Meanwhile, the conglomerate of opposition armed forces (especially its main column, Hayat Tahrir al-Sham – HTS, a Sunni Salafi jihadist group with a history of extreme violence and intolerance), was receiving military and logistical support mainly from Turkey and was preparing for an offensive.

With Assad defeated and on the run, the bulk of his government's political, military and bureaucratic elite is trying to negotiate spaces of power, or at least survival, with some of the victorious factions in the conflict.

On the side of the victorious forces, there are disputes/agreements to govern a fragmented Syria and the different territories occupied by each of them. The risk of sectarian attacks against Alawite Muslims (Assad's main base), Christians, Druze, Shiites and Kurds is increasing. All this amidst conflicts of economic, family (traditional patrimonial clans), political and religious interests and their respective international interconnections.

The Palestinians will find themselves in an even more difficult and isolated situation. The same is true for Hezbollah in Lebanon, which is in an even worse situation, in the territory it occupied in Syria,

from where it was forced to withdraw to Lebanon. Iran is losing alliances and becoming more isolated. The so-called "Axis of Resistance" (formed by Iran, Hezbollah, Hamas, the Yemeni Houthis and the Assad government) is weakened and will have greater difficulties in land communications.

Türkiye, on the other hand, is the most victorious external force. It emerges strengthened in its strategic objective of being an expansionist regional power, with the intention of retaking part of the territories of the former Ottoman Empire. It is consolidating the occupied territories within Syria, especially in the Kurdish region, and will try to maintain influence in order to somehow control the victorious forces of Hayat Tahrir al-Sham – HTS, led by Abu Mohammed al-Jawlani. And the risk of a new offensive against the Kurdish people, who are Türkiye's main enemy in the region, is increasing. The Kurds are a nation-people who legitimately fight for self-determination and their nation-state. Now, they may suffer further attacks from both the Turks (the Turkish state and its proxies inside Syria) and from fundamentalist jihadism, which is free to confront the Assad government.

The Zionist state of Israel is another big winner, at least for now. It is becoming stronger because of its colonialist and genocidal actions against the Palestinians; it benefits from the isolation of Iran and Hezbollah; it maintains control over the Syrian territories in the Golan Heights, already occupied since 1967; it is advancing in the occupation of new territories, entering Syria; and it has taken advantage of this to promote bombings to destroy the Assad government's arsenals of weapons and ammunition, so that they do not fall into the hands of the new Jawlani government. After all, no one can say with certainty what the relationship between its forces and Israel will be like in the future.

The imperialist bloc led by the US, NATO and the EU is celebrating, and the US will maintain its military bases in Syria, both in the south and inside Kurdish territory. But they know that the winners are not, let's say, so reliable. The Arab countries that are their allies, such as Saudi Arabia, also feel victorious.

The new government led by Hayat Tahrir al-Sham – HTS, headed by Abu Mohammed al-Jawlani, is trying to unify the Syrian state and disarm all factions.

Moreover, Jawlani is seeking to change his image. We recall that until the seizure of official state power in Syria, he was considered a terrorist by the United States, the EU, Israel and Russia, among others. By the time he conquered Damascus, he had already changed his Muslim clothes into a more "neutral" military uniform. Now he has started wearing westernised clothes, such as a jacket, and appears in interviews in the imperialist media with a trimmed beard and neatly combed hair. He is trying to change his image and both Western and Russian media have started treating him as a "rebel leader" and no longer as a "terrorist."

But it will be virtually impossible to unify Syrian territory under a single government and without the presence of foreign armed forces. All states that have a military presence inside Syria (Türkiye, Israel, Russia and the United States) intend to maintain their bases and/or occupied territories.

The Kurds have, over the past 10 years, achieved relative autonomy over most of their territory in Syria and will likely maintain their political-military struggle and organisation, as their struggle was not simply against the Assad government. They are seeking the formation of their own state or, at least temporarily, broad autonomy. Moreover, for the United States, Israel and Iran, a fragmented Syria seems better than one unified by a government that is or could become "problematic."

Russia is negotiating the details of maintaining its large military bases in Syria. Its only naval base in the Mediterranean Sea (in Tartus) and an air base at Hmeimim (near the coastal city of Latakia) are central to its presence in the Middle East, the Mediterranean and its connection to Africa. It will probably try to negotiate other interests, as it can expect some greater compensation, in addition to the maintenance of its military bases, since, let's say, it had a position of conciliation and omission that contributed to the final, almost peaceful fall of Assad. And after all, Türkiye (which was treacherous towards Russia) is a semi-ally and received the status of a "partner country" of the BRICS, and Saudi Arabia has already been invited to become a full member of the BRICS. Of course, we know that both states play a game of doubles between BRICS-Russia-China and NATO-US-EU. And they have their own interests in the region and

inside Syria.

China, which has not had any direct military intervention in the region, is not slow to establish relations with any type of government. It will probably offer a win-win bilateral trade and capital exports (investments, loans and financing) agreement using the discourse of "reconstruction" of Syria, the search for so-called "multilateralism" and a supposed "shared future" in a "harmonious" world. In this way, it attempts to guarantee routes for the "New Silk Road" and the best possible positioning for an ongoing inter-imperialist dispute with the United States.

The end of Assad's rule thus leaves several lessons, especially concerning two types of idealistic and erroneous interpretations of reality.

On the one hand, it highlighted the error of those who, until the day of Assad's fall, continued to say that this was

a supposedly «anti-imperialist» government, which defended popular interests and had a social and military base to carry out a counteroffensive. Or there were those who believed that Russia, Iran, Iraq and Hezbollah would carry out a strong and comprehensive military intervention to save the dying regime and its president.

On the other hand, it reveals the illusion of those who celebrated his fall, assuming that there would at least be a democratising solution to the crisis. Firstly, they do not consider the jihadist, violent and intolerant configuration of the groups that took power and the risks inherent in the ethnic and religious diversity and highly conflicting interests in the region, much less their relations with imperialist forces. They did not realise that the most democratising and popular energies that were present in the first mass demonstrations of opposition to the Assad regime

were, relatively quickly, trampled, either by the violent and criminal repression of the Assad government, or by the insurgency of fundamentalist and terrorist groups supported by the United States and other spurious interests.

This analysis presents a strong hypothesis for the immediate situation and the near future. But, as we have seen, there is a panorama full of contradictions: the future of the structural crisis of capitalism, as well as the anti-imperialist, class and democratic struggle against all oppressions, always leaves open space for subjects who fight against imperialism, capitalism, dictatorships and against all forms of oppression.

Ação Popular Socialista  
(APS – Brazil)  
December 2024

# Class independence between progressivism and the extreme right

The preparation of the draft resolutions of the World Congress over several years has certainly allowed them to be enriched. We have repeatedly pointed out the need to clarify various aspects in relation to Latin America. Although there have been important mentions in the final versions of the drafts, we feel the need to go into more detail.

For several months we have been working on a text entitled «Thesis on the political situation in Latin America and the role of the progressive current» based on an initial project by comrade Daniel Libreros. By doing so in consultation with comrades from various countries and sections, the text has become too long, although it reflects diverse experiences and analyses, but it has reached a point where it exceeds the dimensions and time to be presented as a project for voting at the World Congress, as we announced to the Secretariat of the Bureau at the time of our intention to do so. That is why we have decided to summarise what we have previously prepared and focus on the topic that originally concerned us: our policy regarding the current of progressi-

sm in Latin America.

We are now told that the priority is to combat the rise of the extreme right. Our point of view is that this cannot be separated from the analysis and the position to be adopted in relation to the progressive governments and movements that have emerged in recent years. The rise and strengthening of extreme right-wing movements, even to the point of taking over the government, cannot be explained without pointing out the failure and limits of progressive governments. It is the inability of progressives to meet the expectations of the masses in the face of the discredit of neoliberal policies and traditional right-wing parties (and the absence of the revolutionary left as a viable alternative) that has opened the door to the advance of the extreme right. The advance of the extreme right cannot be stopped if we appear to be identified with or subordinated to progressivism. In other words, it is essential to maintain political and class independence from progressivism, even by uniting in struggles, in order to stop the right.

We have used the concept of progres-

sivism to refer to currents in Latin America that, in the face of the concentration of wealth and the reduction in the quality of life produced by neoliberalism, after three decades of hegemony, appear to be those who can overcome neoliberalism or simply present themselves as «post-neoliberals», as representatives of the aspirations of the masses for a change of regime. Although they use anti-neoliberal rhetoric, being located in the middle of the structural changes imposed by neoliberalism and incorporated into an institutionality implemented since the beginning of the nineties through state counter-reforms that occurred in the region and that guarantee a transfer of wealth to speculative financial capital, these produce the dispossession of rights and conquests, even legal ones, of both the working classes and the people. The progressives maintain the central lines of neoliberalism: submission to international financial institutions, payment of external, internal and public debts, extractivism and its policy of displacement of peoples and ecocide, even with the increase of legal and extralegal violence, along with



maintaining ecocidal megaprojects, all the while developing in parallel some welfare policies such as social programmes that ultimately are functional to capitalism and do not end the devastating social inequality. Finally, progressivism, with this logic, derails the aspirations for liberation of the working classes and indigenous peoples and communities, as well as the struggles of youth and women against capitalist patriarchy, marginalising them from anti-capitalist perspectives and politics. Additionally, when there are situations in which the working classes and peoples have developed autonomous forms of social and political representation, progressivism strives to deactivate them, divide them, even persecuting them and repressing their struggles.

Depending on the history and traditions of each country, these progressive currents are nourished by previous experiences of populism, nationalism and anti-imperialism or experiences of Bonapartism and take particular names and references for each case but overall they have derailed the struggles from an anti-capitalist perspective. But the failure of this policy, which does not break with the pattern of the domination of dependent capitalism (and not only because of the corruption of the progressives), opens the door for the extreme right to appear as an alternative for the masses.

After the failure of some early experiences of progressive governments, the second wave or late progressivism is more limited. If Hugo Chávez proposed «21st century socialism», López Obrador proposes a movement of national regeneration.

The draft resolution for the World Congress correctly states that progressive governments «are not governments of workers and oppressed people, and therefore are not 'our governments'. We do not participate in them and we do not owe them our unconditional support.» It is true that mass sectors see these progressive governments as an alternative, especially electorally or as a brake on the extreme right. But the problem is that due to the failures of their policies or because of their class limitations or because they are in any case located within the central lines of neoliberalism, the masses finally become disillusioned with these governments and in the absence of credible alternatives, especially electorally, from the revolutio-

nary and anti-capitalist left, the masses turn and listen to the dangerous demagoguery of the extreme right.

The united front should not be confused exclusively with the electoral front or the anti-fascist front. A united front policy is absolutely necessary in the struggle of social movements for democratic or anti-neoliberal demands, especially when these are demands made against progressive governments, with one particularity: obtaining any such demand confronts the imposed neoliberal institutionality and therefore the class conciliation policy of the progressive leaderships. «Critical support» for them is based on the illusion, distorted by the facts, that supposedly pushed by social or popular pressure they can achieve favourable results for popular movements when what is at stake is to overwhelm them. Giving «critical support,» beautifying the image of progressivism, identifying ourselves as part of its political movement, only makes us part of the problem in the disillusionment of the masses with respect to these governments. The unity of action that we propose in the struggle for the demands of the movement, even with sectors that support these governments electorally or politically, requires the presentation of an alternative struggle that is proper to the movements, that is, autonomous, politically independent of both the progressives and the right. But the condition is to maintain political independence even in united actions.

«Critical support» for progressive governments is highly questionable in these circumstances. It is not the same as unity of action or a united front within the movement. Critical support for a government would really require a clearly anti-imperialist or anti-capitalist action or deed and not just support around an image or statement that seeks to curb the right. During his asylum in Mexico in the 1930s, Trotsky offered clear examples and references in this regard. In 1938 he offered full support to the government of General Lázaro Cárdenas when it expropriated the oil industry from British and United States imperialist companies. He did this even in the face of the imminent war against the Nazi fascist axis, in which Mexico would side with the allied imperialist powers. An example of Trotsky's staunch anti-imperialist support for oil expropriation is summarised in his famous article «Mexico and British Imperialism.» But less than

two years later, on the occasion of the presidential election to decide Lázaro Cárdenas' successor, Trotsky's position was clearly one of political independence from the Party of the Mexican Revolution (predecessor of the PRI), stating that there was no alternative for the working class in those elections.

So «critical support» is justified in the face of a clear anti-imperialist measure or a break, even if partial, with the political regime and not in the face of an electoral promise or as support for a governing party.

It is true that they are not working class governments, as the draft resolution says, but the demarcation from progressivism is necessary not only in terms of the government but also with respect to the progressive political party or movement. Since progressivism, like the *sui generis* Bonapartism to which Trotsky referred, claims to be above classes, it relies on multi-class political parties or movements of class conciliation, which supposedly represent the entire nation, the people. The failure of progressives to confront neoliberalism must be explained precisely because to achieve this, an anti-capitalist party and programme is required, not one of class conciliation. Thus, progressive organisations end up implementing a corporate, vertical (*caudillista*) and antidemocratic practice in party construction. The authoritarian drift of Maduro's government in Venezuela is an example of the above. At the same time as it outlaws historical currents of the socialist left, it claims that the PSUV corporately represents all the people. This anti-democratic practice appears to be justified by the binary vision typical of all progressive currents in Latin America, with which they blackmail claiming that there are only two political options (especially in the electoral field): the right or progressivism itself, suppressing the anti-capitalist, revolutionary option. Everywhere, they use blackmail claiming that questioning support for a progressive party or movement is implicit or explicit support for the right. This has been the discourse of progressivism in Ecuador.

In the case of Mexico, the victory of Claudia Sheinbaum, the successor to the project of López Obrador and his party Morena, supports this dynamic, already known with the experience of the PRI during the last century, that is to say, that of a state party that corporatises every-



December 30, 2024

Daniel Libreros, Movimiento Ecosocialista de Colombia (Ecosocialist Movement of Colombia) ; Mario Unda and Carlos Rojas, Movimiento Revolucionario de los Trabajadores (MRT, Revolutionary Workers Movement) ; Jaime González, Manuel Aguilar Mora, Ismael Contreras, Álvaro Vázquez and José Juan Grijalva, Liga de Unidad Socialista (LUS, Socialist Unity League) of Mexico ; Andrés Lund, Josie Chávez, Rosario Villalobos, Fernando E. Tecuatl, Javier Contreras and Edgard Sánchez, Partido Revolucionario de los Trabajadores (PRT, Revolutionary Workers Party) of Mexico

thing. Even sectors of the old socialist left are trying to repeat the failed experience of «transforming» Morena, as they previously attempted with the PRD and the PRI itself. Groups that define themselves as socialist revolve around the state party or seek positions or candidacies through that party. The challenge for the socialist left is precisely to become a necessary anti-capitalist reference while defending its party, political and class autonomy.

Again referring to Trotsky and his struggle in the 1930s against the popular front policy of Stalinism, he described this type of party as a «popular front party» because it was a party of class conciliation and subordination to the bourgeoisie. Our perspective must be that of an anti-capitalist, revolutionary, eco-socialist and feminist party, even if it is only a small

revolutionary group, but at the same time promoting an alternative social and political pole to progressivism and the right.

Certainly the current situation is becoming more complicated with the advance of far-right movements. But the central issue to be discussed is that the policy developed by progressive governments, both in meeting neoliberal demands and in demobilising resistance, leaves the path open to the right. The anti-fascist front or the anti-fascist international that Maduro promotes responds to the regime's interest in legitimising itself in the face of its discredited authoritarian course. An anti-fascist front with Maduro, Daniel Ortega, Russia, like the one that was created in Caracas is a mockery whilst it also supports the campist vision shared by the progressive currents in Latin America.

## A gap to be filled

This is not a disagreement with the documents under discussion for the 18th World Congress, with which there is overall agreement, but highlighting that a very important theme is only touched on in the text on the world situation: that of an additional crisis that adds to and intersects with the polycrises analysed in the document. This is the devastating crisis facing the Left, a theme which is only touched on in Chapter V (The emergence of «campism»), but which requires a major in-depth study.

1. The classist («radical») left is going through an international crisis not unlike the crisis of 1914-1920 between anti-imperialist internationalists and nationalist socialists and the crisis of the 1920s-30s between Stalinists and anti-Stalinists; crises which were faced with courage and determination at the time, in 1914-15 by Lenin and his men and in the 1920s and 1930s by Trotsky and the Trotskyists, preventing the red thread of revolutionary Marxism from breaking with irreparable consequences.

The current crisis is less obvious; it is taking place in an extraordinarily marginalized left (with important exceptions), reduced in size, in mass roots, in the theoretical and political authority of its leaders. It appears less heartbreaking and dramatic than those of the last century, but this is only an appearance, because the Left is pushed to its limits, and its debates take

place in a «bubble» involving a few thousand militants. On the contrary, the crisis runs very deep. Indeed, combined with the growing marginality of the Left, it risks having existential effects on the Left as a whole, whatever its «camp».

2. The crisis is the result of the Left's overall and subjective inability to cope with a situation that is profoundly different from the one in which «today's Left» was formed and grew up.

The increasingly obvious distortions of the «camp» of a large part of the left are certainly the most painful symptom of this crisis. After the ruinous collapse of the bureaucratic regimes in the East, our revolutionary optimism had led us to believe that the failure of these societies marked the definitive end of Stalinism and of that political culture which had dominated the international workers' movement for decades in the most diverse forms. Instead, the same political, programmatic and ethical deformations that characterised Stalinism have reappeared in grotesque form in campism. Campism seriously distorts the basic values of the Left.

To define oneself as a leftist, socialist or communist, even before theory, the first reference is ethics. The Left, particularly the Marxist Left, is, or at least should be, the most rigorous crystallisation of secular moral and intellectual philosophy, of the sense of the «just», even before the necessary. Or rather, for the Left, if something is

necessary, it is because it is right.

The campists, on the other hand, chose (like the social democrats since 1914 and the Stalinists since the 1920s) to subordinate the «right» to what was deemed «necessary» and adopted an ethically distorting orientation. It is mainly for this reason that their reading of the Russian-Ukrainian conflict was not understood by their own social reference base, the working and popular classes, who, at least during the first year of the large-scale war, felt an automatic empathy with the Ukrainian people, victims of a brutal aggression on the part of what was considered to be one of the most powerful armies in the world.

3. The fascination of a large part of the left with the BRICS is part of the same moral drift, which makes them see this contradictory alliance as an «anti-imperialist» landmark and not as what it is, a collection of imperialisms and sub-imperialisms that are intrinsically or at least predominantly autocratic, militaristic and oppressive.

Not to mention the persistent myth of «socialist» China, which avoids seeing the classist, despotic and inhuman character of its self-proclaimed «communist» ruling class. The same applies to Venezuela, Nicaragua, etc. Added to this is the shameful sympathy for Putin and neo-Tzarist Russia, which is somehow seen as the legitimate heir to the Soviet Union, when in fact it is

the terminal expression of the cancer that has been eating away at the creature of Lenin and the October Revolution since the 1920s.

All these myths can only seduce those who, more or less consciously, put “geopolitical interests” before the social, political and civil rights of the masses of people in the BRICS+ countries, to the feeling of these peoples oppressed by their social, political or military elites.

**4.** Much has been written about campism and its erroneous conception of imperialism, which paradoxically takes up Kautsky’s theory of “super-imperialism”, believing that the only imperialism active on the planet is that of North America with its cartels of European and Asian alliances. The “super-imperialist” interpretation has been disproved by history on several occasions: the two world wars were tragic and bloody demonstrations of the fact that imperialism is a phase of capitalism which is always expressed in the plural, in a plurality of imperialist states competing economically, politically and militarily for control of the world. This has also been the case in less bloody crises, such as that over the Suez Canal in 1956. The tendency towards war reduces the plurality of imperialist states to two trusts. It is impossible to wage war between three or more subjects or alliances. But the imperialist states are relatively numerous and today include some of the states which once, albeit undeservedly, called themselves “socialist”.

**5.** But the crisis of the left is also expressed in that part of the left which refuses to take into account national liberation, anti-colonial and anti-imperialist struggles. In the theoretical and moral disorientation of the Left, there is a sector which puts forward an interpretation which we could call “ultra-internationalist”, which believes that the struggle can only be directly socialist, that any objective of national liberation is intrinsically nationalist, i.e. bourgeois, and therefore misleading in relation to the objective of “world socialist revolution”.

For example, they oppose the struggle of the Ukrainian resistance against the Russian invasion, seeing it, against all objective analysis, as a proxy for the United States. For them, the struggle for the national dignity of an oppressed people is not an advance, but rather a regression towards bourgeois objectives which should not involve revolutionary internationalist socialists.

To this end, they try to cling to certain elaborations of Rosa Luxemburg, forget-

ting that Rosa matured her positions when the crisis of bourgeois nationalism had not yet reached its peak.

Such a vision, if adopted by internationalists, would have placed them outside most of the great events of the class struggle and most of the revolutions of the 20th century, driven precisely by the desire to assert national dignity, albeit combined with social objectives (China, Cuba, Vietnam, Algeria, Mozambique, Angola, etc.). And even the Paris Commune of 1871 had as its initial motivation opposition to the humiliation that victorious German imperialism wanted to impose on the French nation defeated by Napoleon III.

**6.** But one of the most obvious symptoms of the Left’s crisis can be seen in its approach to the question of democracy. There is no point in insisting here on the fraudulent character of ‘bourgeois democracy’: true democratic achievements are not the result of the actions of the bourgeoisie, but rather the result of the relentless struggles waged by the working classes.

The campist left (but also, for its ‘extremism’, the ‘ultra-internationalist’ left), borrowing its position from the Stalinist tradition, sees democracy above all as a useful tool in the class struggle, which can more easily develop and express itself in a context of democratic freedoms than in an authoritarian or even totalitarian context. His behaviour and his models (Assad, Xi Jinping, Ortega, Maduro, Putin) betray this entirely instrumental approach to democracy.

For us, for revolutionary Marxism, the struggle for democracy is a constitutive element of the struggle for socialism and, even more so, for ecosocialism. Not only because it facilitates the struggle, but precisely because of the objective itself, a society in which everything is defined and managed by the broadest democratic participation of the masses. The experiences of the 20th century have put an end to any dirigiste, top-down and, consequently, bureaucratic conception of socialism. The ecosocialist objective (which has nothing to do with “information technology and soviets”), and the profound transformations in mass behaviour that it implies, require, even more than Lenin said more than a century ago in *The State and Revolution*, a form of widespread, permanent and deep-rooted democratic participation. “The society we want”,

said the Fourth International 39 years ago at its 12th Congress, “cannot under any circumstances be a society in which democratic freedoms are stifled, or even called into question, or in any case more restricted than those which the masses have succeeded in conquering under capitalism.”

**7.** This “moral crisis” of the left overlaps and aggravates the consequences of its defeat by aggravating political and ideological fragmentation, with sectors deluding themselves into thinking that they can rebuild their social roots by pursuing the reactionary preoccupations that the far right has inculcated in large sectors of the masses (here, the most obvious example is the experience in Germany of the Bündnis, Sahra Wagenknecht).

But this can also be seen in more confused and less clear-cut ways in other countries. The Italian case is a case in point, with the unsuccessful but no less culpable attempt by a large part of the Italian radical left to try and compete with the Putinism of sectors of the right (Lega and Berlusconi), which resulted in the presentation of a list for the 2024 European elections in which representatives of left-wing organisations and representatives of the Putinist right converged.

Or in the decision by the Left Group in the European Parliament to accept the membership of the 5-Star Movement MEPs, who had not succeeded in creating a group with the German BSW.

**8.** With the political and geopolitical reference points that we have mentioned, the Left is totally incapable of working fruitfully on the reconstruction of a new utopia capable of driving new struggles for transformation, as were the socialist ideals of the end of the 19th century and a good part of the 20th century. By defending the supposedly “anti-imperialist” camp, their programme risks appearing more like a nightmare than a liberating utopia, destroying the “principle of hope” referred to by Ernst Bloch in his famous essay of the 1950s.

Like democracy, the environmentalism adopted to a greater or lesser extent by certain formations of the Left also appears to most as a propaganda flourish, if we think of the way in which the regimes of reference of this Left treat the environment.

In some countries (in Europe, France is perhaps the most obvious example), the left in its various expressions may

continue to appear positively as a useful tool for defending the residual social and democratic gains imposed on the ruling classes over previous decades against neoliberalism and the far right. But in the vast majority of countries, it appears to be a marginal force, practically out of the game, essentially turned towards the past, nostalgic for an irredeemable past, incapable of speaking to the popular concerns of today, especially those of the younger generations, who often and rightly hold it jointly responsible for the negative situation in which they live.

All this translates into a vertical crisis

of credibility and roots, symmetrical and functional to the growth of the right and the far right, particularly in the working classes, in the suburbs, in businesses, where the left is no longer in a position to intervene, a crisis that also concerns those who, like us, have totally different ethical, political, programmatic and social assumptions.

The aim of highlighting this crisis and this divide, and even attempting to compare it with the other crises of the Left in the 20th century, is not to propose a sectarian and ideological approach for our forces. On the contrary, the disas-

trous political and social situation calls for maximum unity against neoliberal policies and the far right, what we call a "united front". A defensive unity which must be built despite and beyond the differences we have mentioned, but which must not make us forget or minimise the deep, radical, strategic and ethical divisions described above.

Fabrizio Burattini (Sinistra  
Anticapitalista, Italian  
section of the FI)

# Amendment to "Our orientation and tasks in social movements"

## Amendment 1

Why social movements are strategically important? (§2):

There are different forms of social movements: those defending collective working/living conditions (trade unions, neighbourhood movements, peasants/farmers movements, environmentalist movements) or movements of the oppressed (women's, LGBTI, indigenous, racialized, disabled). These movements overlap and intersect in many different ways as do those who are involved in them.

Explanation: This paragraph draws what we consider to be an artificial distinction between 'movements for living and working conditions' and 'movements of oppressed people'. Even if this is not the objective, this dichotomy runs the risk of perpetuating the hierarchy of a struggle against exploitation (primary) and struggles against oppressions (secondary). Moreover, this is a distinction which is not really re-exploited in the rest of the text, which in our view reinforces its superfluous aspect.

That said, it is important and useful, from the point of view of strategic analysis, to be able to distinguish and articulate at least three dimensions of struggles: struggles against exploitation in the workplace, struggles to defend places where people live (and the living within them), and struggles against oppression. These three dimensions can coexist, and in practice often do in really

existing social movements: a struggle by women care workers has both a class dimension and a feminist and often even anti-racist dimension. Similarly, a struggle against gentrification and police violence in a working-class district of a large city simultaneously has a territorial, anti-racist and anti-capitalist dimension. Another example: an indigenous people's struggle against the destruction of their habitat and living environment by giant capitalist mining companies has anti-colonial, territorial and anti-capitalist dimensions all at the same time. Our approach is to support these multiple dimensions of struggle, to amplify them and to aim for an explicit junction of the different aspects and terrains of struggle in a global confrontation with the dominant classes based on exploitation, oppression and the destruction of living spaces and life.

Nonetheless, we think that keeping the list of different social movements may be useful to the text in illustrating what it's all about. However, as such a list is not intended to be exhaustive, we also suggest adding 'for example', which leaves the list of social movements open-ended.

We therefore suggest replacing the above paragraph with the following:

**There are a multitude of social movements: for example trade unions, neighbourhood movements, peasants and farmers, ecologists, women's movements, LGBTI movements, indigenous movements, racialised movements, disabled movements. These social move-**

**ments often have several dimensions: against exploitation in the workplace, for the defence of living spaces and the living, and for liberation in the face of oppression (particularly of women, LGBTI people, indigenous people, racialised people and people with disabilities). Our approach is to support these multiple dimensions of struggle, to amplify them and to aim for an explicit junction of the different aspects and terrains of struggle towards a global confrontation with the ruling classes, which rely on exploitation, oppression and the destruction of living spaces and life.**

## Amendment 2

Why social movements are strategically important? vi). (§1):

We fight for all social movements to take an intersectional approach without losing focus on their own particular demands.

Explanation: We believe that the use of the term 'intersectional' is ambiguous. Intersectionality refers to a multitude of theories and practices, some of which are entirely compatible with our Marxist approach, but others of which flirt more with a liberal conception of identity. As it stands, it seems awkward to us to use the term without defining it, and so we propose replacing it with the notion of convergence of struggles, which puts more emphasis on intervention within social movements.

We therefore propose replacing the above paragraph with the following:

**Our intervention in social movements must emphasise the convergence of struggles, without losing sight of their respective demands.**

## Amendment 3

4. General dangers in the movements  
c) Ultraleftism /fragmentation (§1):

While we are in favour of intersectionality and mutual support – sometimes referred to as ‘a movement of movements’ this is not the same as the movements adopting demands on everything.

So, for example, it is excellent that within La Via Campesina there are women’s and youth sections and specific events taking up their specific needs within the framework of campaigning around land and food sovereignty. On the other hand, within Ende Gelände, the direct-action environmental movement in Germany, some people have suggested it needs to take a position on every political issue

going in a way that has the danger of fragmenting and blunting the movement.

Explanation: in French, the term ‘ultragauchisme’ does not refer to any well-established concept in the Marxist tradition. We therefore suggest replacing it with gauchisme. Furthermore, the initial text does not mention the leftist phenomenon. We therefore suggest adding a section summarising some of the fundamental features of contemporary leftism. In the paragraph on fragmentation, we have replaced the term ‘intersectionality’ with ‘convergence of struggles’, in line with the explanation given in amendment 2.’

### c) Fragmentation

**While we are in favour of the convergence of struggles and mutual support - what is sometimes called ‘a movement of movements’ - this does not mean that movements adopt demands on all issues.**

**For example, it is excellent that within La Via Campesina there are women’s and youth sections and specific events that respond to their specific needs as part of the campaign around land and food sovereignty. On the other**

**hand, within Ende Gelände, the environmental direct action movement in Germany, some have suggested that it must take a stance on all political issues, which risks fragmenting and blunting the movement.**

### d) Leftism

**We must also take care to fight against leftist logics within social movements, which are characterised by: a permanent search for radicality for radicality’s sake (in the political line and in the methods of struggle); the refusal of compromise, and of any alliance with other progressive fringes of social movements, perceived as not radical enough; and a disconnection from and distrust of the class consciousness of the masses. In a period marked by a decline in revolutionary movements, this type of logic tends to take on greater importance, seeking to counterbalance the relative weakness of mass movements with abstract radicalism.**

Gauche anticapitaliste/  
SAP - Belgium

# Amendements to text on social movements

## 1) Text on Sociali Movement :

### 6. Conclusion

para 8 We also note that our collective discussion is underdeveloped on two particular questions of oppression – around racism and racialization and around disability.

The former is particularly complex because the history of self-organization is not only very different in different parts of the Global South but also within the Global North (**because it doesn’t concern the same populations**). Different historical and current factors such as the nature of the colonial relationships, the presence of a **pre-colonial** population, an Afro-descendant population resulting from a slave-owning economy, the different forms and causes of migratory movements, all shape how racism is experienced and the forms of anti-racist struggles and movements. **Nevertheless, two major world**

**events were to have a strong influence on and divide these movements: the United Nations ‘World Conference against Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia and Related Intolerance’ in Durban in 2001 and the attacks of 11 September 2001. At the Durban Conference, the heated debates and conflicting claims centred on whether Zionism was a form of racism, whether the rise in anti-Semitism was due to the oppression of the Palestinians by the various governments of the Israeli state, the demand for an individual apology from every state that has engaged in slavery in the past, and recognition of slavery as a crime against humanity, with reparations; the reaffirmation of the rights of refugees and the need to protect ethnic, cultural, linguistic and religious minorities; discrimination against Roma and Travellers; and explicit recognition of the link between sexism and racism. For its part, the attacks on the Twin Towers**

**of the World Trade Centre in New York was used as a pretext to amplify a new form of racism, which in some countries (France and Belgium) would have great difficulty in being recognized as such: Islamophobia. We are witnessing two major shifts in the fight against racism: in the 1990s, the abandonment of biological racism (there is no such thing as the human race), to be replaced by cultural racism; and later, religious racism; and in the 2000s, the overtaking of moral anti-racism, based on State anti-racism and its fight against xenophobia (stereotypes and prejudice) and interpersonal discrimination, by a more radical movement, driven by younger generations of racialized people. They want to confront institutional, systemic and structural racism, especially that developed by the State, its apparatus and its governments.**

**In 2020, a third event shook up the anti-racism scene: Black Lives Matter, the largest anti-racist mobilization since the**



1960s and the struggle of black Americans for civil rights. All over the world, hundreds of thousands of demonstrators took to the streets to demand radical and lasting changes to the place of black and Afro-descendant people in our societies (decolonization of minds, education, museums and public spaces). These struggles have highlighted police violence and racist practices in particular. From now on, the fight against racism must concern all forms of racism: ethnic and religious minorities; migrants/asylum seekers and rejected asylum seekers; anti-Semitism, Islamophobia, Negrophobia and Romanophobia (at least in Europe). While supporting the self-organization of oppressed and racialized people, we must try to unify these struggles into a radical, broad, pluralist and unitary movement (converging struggles), while defending an intersec-

tional Marxist approach. It's up to us to make the links between imperialist policies and wars to support dictatorships and control and/or plunder raw materials for Western, Russian and Chinese multinationals; structural adjustment policies and debts in the global South, global warming, etc., as well as the various causes of migration to the metropolises. Hence the importance of opening up borders and defending freedom of movement and settlement, while at the same time demanding that the countries of the Global South be allowed to develop and keep their intellectuals.

Finally, fighting fascism means fighting the far-right parties and all the structures (media, state policies, government parties) that help to normalize their presence and their ideas in the political arena. It means thinking strategically

(in the long term) and tactically (in the short term) about our alliances to fight the fascist threat. What's essential in our anti-fascist struggles is to make this connection between the primary targets of state authoritarianism and repression, and the specific targets of the far right: migrants and racialised people, women, LGBTQIA+ people, ethnic and religious minorities, and trade unionists and other left-wing activists. We will not be able to strengthen our anti-fascist struggles without the presence of those who experience these oppressions most violently, and it is necessary to recognise the importance of racism in society in general and in fascist ideology in order to be able to stand up to these oppressions.

Antiracist Commission Gauche  
anticapitaliste / SAP- Belgium

# LGBTIQ organizing = Appendix to social movements text

This appendix does not claim to be a total picture of the state of the LGBTIQ struggle or movement but to tease out some of the key factors facing the movement and the left today based on our collective but partial experience

At the level of the attitude of the ruling classes we are at a contradictory point over LGBTIQ politics as to some extent we are with other social questions. On the one hand homophobic, misogynistic and particularly transphobic politics are central mobilisers for key far right movements. Trump and those around him are the most visible of these but we should not downplay the role of evangelical Christian currents in Africa and Latin America or the attacks on the parental and adoption rights of same-sex couples in Meloni's Italy.

On the other hand other states claim to defend LGBTIQ rights within a 'human rights' framework while focusing on the idea that i) the LGBTIQ family can replace the state in providing social reproduction ii) the pink market is a useful place for capital to make profit. This tendency which has existed for decades is adapting to the far right agenda if not quite as grotesquely as on migration. At the same time it has always been an agenda most

directed at and accommodating to cis gay men.

The LGBTIQ movement has very few international structures or events which make assessing the political balance of forces difficult. This is compounded by the fact that the World Social Forum and the associated regional forums which did provide some focus for radical groups within the movement no longer function in the same way. Never the less there are some overall trends we can note

On the negative side we need to note – and find more effective ways of calling out and opposing – the development of a visible antitrans current. This tendency is not confined at all to Lesbian, Gay and very occasional Bi individuals – many of its most prominent figures are Cis women – and is very often a minority amongst activists but is nevertheless deeply pernicious. And politically we can see how it fits into the wider picture with some apparently happy to make common cause with far right activists and at the same time wanting to promote a vision of 'sex rights' which plays on notions of gender and sexuality as fixed (sometimes god given), which echoes the need to 'protect' children and young people and which is deeply divisive. Most of these currents are

also sex negative and deeply hostile to sex workers

On the more positive side however there are a number of developments to catalogue

Amongst young people despite the countervailing growth of far right ideas there is in many contexts a more positive attitude to people exploring sexuality and gender expression. This has led to the development/proliferation of new identities such as non-binary and a-gender which didn't really exist in the same ways in previous periods as well as in some contexts to somewhat separate social formations for trans fems and trans mascs. There are some dangers here in terms of fragmentation – compounded by the fact that lessons from earlier periods of struggle do not have strong channels for exploration. Further the level of atomization and isolation imposed by late stage capitalism on the most marginalized can result in sectarianism born of frustration

Some lessons and indeed ways of organizing that came to the fore around HIV/AIDs especially in advanced capitalist countries had an impact in some of the more positive collectivist organizing in response to the covid pandemic in terms of fighting for state provision to protect



those most at risk. M-Pox did not really have the same impact but in a world where the environmental crisis means other pandemics are inevitable we should build on this.

The visible involvement of many queer activists including trans and lesbian militants in campaigns to defend an extend fights for bodily autonomy. The fight to defend and extend abortion rights in law and in practice has continued to be crucial in many territories and continents. At the same time the involvement of queer activists in these campaigns has often won broader support for the fight of trans people, particularly trans youth to life affirming health care.

During the Black lives Matter movement the visibility of specific mention of Black Trans Lives was particularly hearing. We are not able to draw conclusions about what this says about the

relationship between Black/Indigenous/ Queer and Trans movements in different territories

Radical queer and feminist activists have often been visible in solidarity with Palestine, rejecting the pinkwashing of Israeli society on the pretext of the undoubted sexism and heterosexism of Hamas. These activists rightly point out that Palestinian women and LGBTIQ people are equally the victims of Israeli genocide, that the oppression of Palestinian LGBTIQ people under Israeli rule (inside and outside the 'Green Line') is compounded by the apartheid laws that target them as Palestinians, and that Israeli society is far from a model of women's or LGBTI rights even in comparison with capitalist democracies in Western Europe or the Americas. These organisations and contingents build on work done over a longer period of time

both by queer activists and organisations from the region and those working inside the international solidarity movement but have become much more apparent as the movement has grown internationally in the last year and more. While there have been some tensions in some countries (eg initially in Denmark) overall this has been a development that has made a key section of queer movement more visible than before, clearly aligned to an anti-imperialist approach and more accessible to communities that may have previously been walled off from it. The points raised by these activists need to be integrated into the discourse of the wider solidarity movement.'

Terry IC Britain, Olivia IC Denmark, LGBTIQ Commission

## Amendments to the Text on Partybuilding tasks

### E/ Thematic commissions - insert the phrase in bold

(para 2) We are in a contradiction between wanting to build stable bodies that undertake this political elaboration in an ongoing way and wanting to continually integrate new comrades and maintain an organic relationship to the leadership bodies. Some commissions (Ecology, LGBTI) are elected on the proposal of national organisations, the women's commission is the meeting of women comrades of the IC which then designate working groups for the organization of the biannual seminar. The Anti-racist commission launched during the pandemic has not really got off the ground (**but it should be relaunched incorporating our anti-fascist work**).

### I/ Our parties

#### Insert parts in bold

(para 3) We reiterate that the women-only meetings are an important and necessary tool for women comrades - and others suffering patriarchal oppression

- racialized and youth to understand, articulate and combat all forms of this oppression by their action within the collective framework of the party. **As far as attracting racialized people into our organisations is concerned, in addition to combating the xenophobia (stereotypes and prejudices) of our own activists, we need to place the fight against all forms of racism at the heart of our writings, actions and mobilizations (and not as a secondary and/or subordinate struggle to the class struggle) and we need to incorporate into our activities and actions the issues that affect them most (structural racism, police violence, international solidarity with Palestine), but also with the countries of origin of their migration or ancestry (particularly if these are former or current colonies), as well as the question of the decolonization of minds, museums and public spaces. Finally, we must recognize that religious minorities are also victims of racism, and that women must be free to own their bodies and dress as they wish, and to exercise or not exercise their religion by wearing or not wearing the veil. In all cases, we are fighting against their exclusion from school, employment and**

### promotion, leisure and sport.

(para 4) Our goal is not simply to recruit women, **racialized and youth** or to achieve specific goals or targets in the number of women, **racialized, youth** members or of women's, **racialized, youth** presence in our leadership bodies. It is also to ensure that the political work of our women, racialized and youth comrades is fully recognized and that they are valued as central leaders of our organizations.

(para 5) We consider as basic principles that our first response is that we believe women **and/or racialized comrades who say they are victims of sexist and xenophobic violence in all its forms** and we ensure that they feel comfortable in continuing to be active; the procedures and protocols that we put into place are clear and transparent - those accused are informed of the accusation and victims can express themselves freely; the overriding principle is to be true to our commitment to fight oppressions leaving aside concerns about the "party's reputation"; the outcome of our procedures is that women and all comrades victims of specific oppressions feel comfortable in

our parties and that there is an ongoing education process for all comrades.

(para 6) The extent to which we are able to counter the social dynamic of exclusion of women, younger, **racialized** people, those with a lesser level of formal education, from political activity and leadership, and to ensure that they feel at ease in our organizations, will be crucial in our goal of building organizations that can have a real weight in the class struggle in its broadest sense, the struggle against all forms of exploitation and oppression.

Antiracist commission Gauche  
anticapitaliste/ SAP - Belgium