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The US and British bourgeoisies were the first to impose anti-social neoliberal policies (under Reagan and Thatcher); then, a quarter-century ago, the implosion of the USSR made it possible for globalization to take on its full dimension. This has not resulted in a stable mode of international domination, but in a chronically chaotic situation. Some traditional imperialisms have continued to decline, while new capitalist powers are asserting themselves, heightening geopolitical rivalries. In several countries and regions, the universal violence of neoliberal diktats has led to the decomposition of the social fabric, to acute regime crises, and indeed to popular uprisings, but also to dangerous counter-revolutionary developments. The expansion of capitalism in Russia and China has given a further boost to the global ecological crisis - particularly to global warming - for which many peoples are already paying a heavy price.

We have in the past attempted to evaluate the political implications of capitalist globalization. With hindsight and the acceleration of geopolitical upheavals, it is however necessary to return to the subject. While offering first elements of analysis and response to questions that are posed to us today, the “theses” that follow do not claim to be exhaustive or to present finished conclusions. Their main purpose is to initiate an international process of collective reflection. They often rely on already shared analyses, but try to push further the discussion of the implications of these analyses. To this end, at the risk of oversimplifying complex realities, they “filter” present evolutions, which are often incomplete, in order to highlight what seems new.

**I. A new imperialist galaxy**

First observation, the situation today is quite different from those which prevailed in the early twentieth century or during the decades from the 1950s to the 1980s. Of particular note:

• A profound change and a diversification of the status of the traditional imperialisms: a United States “super power”; failure of the constitution of an integrated European imperialism; “reduction” of French and British imperialism; militarily “toothless” imperialisms (Germany especially, but also Spain in relation to Latin America); subordination of Japanese imperialism; crises of social disintegration in some Western countries (Greece) belonging historically to the imperialist sphere...

• The “tilting of the world”, the “heart” of global production of commodities is located in Asia and not in the West. The classic notions of “centre” and “periphery” are thus obsolete.

• The affirmation of new (proto) imperialisms - starting with China, which is now emerging as the second world power, but without ignoring the particular case of Russia.

• An uneven development of each imperialism, strong in some areas, weak in others. The hierarchy of imperialist states is accordingly more complex to establish than it was in the past. The United States obviously remains No. 1; it is the only one which can claim to be powerful in almost all areas, but it nevertheless registers relative decline in economic terms, a reduction of the military budget, and it is experiencing the limits of its global power.

The characterization of the new powers is not the only question that is posed to us. We also need to better reassess the changing status of the traditional imperialisms - and of the imperialist order in its entirety.

**II. Chronic geopolitical instability**

Second observation, capitalist globalization has not given birth to a stable international “new order”, quite the contrary.

• Inter-imperialist competition has revived and is all the more universal in that in most parts of the world (apart from Latin America to a large degree?), the time of “backyards”, virtually exclusive zones of influence, is over. China is demanding to enter the top league. The Japanese government is trying to reduce its military dependence on the US and to free itself from the pacifist clauses of the Japanese Constitution. The border between the EU and Russia has again become a zone of conflict

• The old (Brazil ...) or renewed (post-apartheid South Africa...) “sub-imperialisms”, among which some postulate following the “Chinese way” (India), can take advantage of the sharpness of the rivalries between powers in order to participate more aggressively in competition on the world market.

• The geopolitical alliances were yesterday “fixed” by the East-West conflict on the one hand and the Sino-Soviet conflict on the other (which explains, for example, in South Asia, the India-Russia axis versus the US-Pakistan-China one); they have once again become more fluid and uncertain. Latin American regimes have tried to loosen the corset imposed by Washington.  
  
• The eruption of the Arab revolutions, then the brutality of the counter-revolution in a number of countries of this region, have contributed to the creation of an uncontrolled situation in a vast area stretching from the Middle East to the Sahel (and beyond). After the implosion of the USSR, at first the bourgeoisie and the (traditional) imperialist states had a very conquering attitude: penetration of Eastern markets, interventions in Afghanistan (2001) and Iraq (2003) ... Then they became bogged down militarily and there was the financial crisis, the emergence of new powers, the Arab revolutions ... all leading to a loss of geopolitical initiative and control: Washington today acts more by reacting to emergencies than by planning to impose its order.

One of the questions that is posed to us by the evolution of the international situation is the link between the post-1989 turning-point (conquering imperialism) and the one that took shape in the mid-2000s (geopolitical instability).

**III. Globalization and crisis of governability**

The imperialist bourgeoisies wanted to take advantage of the collapse of the Soviet bloc and the opening up of China to capitalism to create a global market with uniform rules, allowing them to deploy their capital at will. The consequences of capitalist globalization could only be very profound - multiplied moreover by developments that, in their euphoria, these imperialist bourgeoisies had not wanted to foresee.

This project involved in fact:

• Depriving elected institutions (parliaments, governments ...) of decision-making power on key choices and requiring them to incorporate into their legislation measures decided elsewhere: by the WTO, international free trade treaties, etc. It thus dealt a blow to classical bourgeois democracy - which is transcribed on the ideological level by the reference to “governance” instead of democracy.

• Making illegal, in the name of the preeminent right of “competition”, the “appropriate methods” of bourgeois rule, flowing from the specific history of countries and regions (historic compromise of the European kind, the Latin American kind of populism, state dirigisme of the Asian kind, many kinds of redistributive clientelism...). In fact, all of these forms erect modulated relations with the world market, and thus barriers to the free deployment of imperialist capital.

• Radical geopolitical upheavals, fostered by an unprecedented mobility of imperialist capital, financialization, the increasing internationalization of production lines ... with, in particular, the “re-centring” of production in Asia and the weakening of Europe. These global upheavals are accompanied by new differentiations within regional groupings, particularly within the European Union.

• An unprecedented level of financialization. The development of fictitious capital, which is inherent in modern capitalism, has in recent years taken on considerable proportions. Without the link being broken, it is leading to a higher degree of distanciation of fictitious capital from productive processes, while the link between initial borrower and initial lender becomes distended. Financialisation has sustained capitalist growth, but its overdevelopment accentuates the contradictions of this growth.

• An endless spiral of destruction of social rights. The traditional imperialist bourgeoisies have really taken the measure of the weakening and the crisis of the labour movement in the so-called “centre”. In the name of “competitiveness” on the world market, they are taking the opportunity to conduct a systematic ongoing offensive to destroy the collective rights that were conquered, particularly during the period that followed the Second World War. They do not aim to impose a new “social contract” that is more favourable to them, but want to do away with such agreements and to get their hands on all the potentially profitable sectors which, belonging to public services, escaped them: health, education, pension systems, transport, etc.

• A modification of the role assigned to the states and of the relationship between imperialist capital and territory. With few exceptions, governments are no longer co-drivers of large-scale industrial projects or of the development of social infrastructure (education, health ...). Although they continue to support throughout the world “their” transnational corporations, the latter (given their power and internationalization) do not feel dependent on their country of origin as they did in the past: the relationship is more “asymmetric” than ever... The role of the state, always essential, is contracting: contributing to establishing the rules universalizing the mobility of capital, opening up the entire public sector to the appetites of capital, contributing to the destruction of social rights and keeping its population in line.

• So we are dealing with two hierarchical systems that are structuring the relations of world domination. The hierarchy of the imperialist states, already complex, as we have noted (point I) and the hierarchies of the large capital flows that encompass the planet in the form of networks. These two systems no longer overlap, even though the states are at the service of the second.

Capitalist globalization represents a new global mode of class rule, unfinished and structurally unstable. It leads in fact to open crises of legitimacy and of ungovernability in many countries and in entire regions; to a state of permanent crisis. The supposed centres of regulation on a world scale (the WTO, the UN Security Council ...) are unable to fulfill their role effectively.

A class does not permanently rule over a society without mediations and social compromises; without sources of legitimacy, whether their origin be historical, democratic, social, revolutionary... The imperialist bourgeoisies are liquidating centuries of “know-how” in this field in the name of the freedom of movement of capital, while the aggressiveness of neoliberal policies is tearing the social fabric in a growing number of countries. The fact that in a Western country like Greece, much of the population is deprived of access to health care and services, says a great deal about the uncompromising line of the European bourgeoisie.

At the time when there were empires, it was necessary to ensure the stability of colonial possessions – as well as (although to a lesser extent) that of the spheres of influence during the Cold War. Let us say that today, because of mobility and financialization, it depends on the time and the place... Thus, entire regions may enter into chronic crisis under the blows of globalization. The implementation of neoliberal diktats by worn-out dictatorial regimes provoked popular uprisings in the Arab world, open regime crises and violent counter-revolutionary ripostes, leading to acute instability.

The particularity of globalized capitalism is that it seems to accommodate itself to crisis as a permanent state of affairs: crisis becomes consubstantial with the normal functioning of the new global system of domination. If this is really the case, we must profoundly change our view of “crisis” as a particular moment between long periods of “normality” - and we have not finished measuring, and suffering, the consequences of this.

**IV. The new (proto) imperialisms**

The traditional imperialist bourgeoisies thought after 1991 that they would penetrate the market of the former so-called “socialist” countries to the point of subordinating them naturally- even wondering whether NATO still had a function in relation to Russia. This hypothesis was not absurd, as was shown by the situation of China at the beginning of the 2000 decade and the conditions of accession of the country to the WTO (very favourable to international capital). But things turned out differently - and this does not appear to have been initially or seriously considered by the established powers.

In China, a new bourgeoisie has been constituted from *within* the country and the regime, mainly via the “bourgeoisification” of the bureaucracy, which transformed itself into a *property-owning* class by mechanisms that are now familiar to us. Therefore it has reconstituted itself on an independent basis (the legacy of the Maoist revolution) and not as a bourgeoisie that was from the start organically subordinated to imperialism. China has thus become a *capitalist power*, and moreover a permanent member of the UN Security Council with a right of veto (all of which is true also for Russia).

Can we call it a new imperialism? It is obviously necessary to define what we mean by this term in *the present world context*. But since China has become the second world power, it seems more and more difficult to deny it that status, regardless of what may be the fragility of the present regime and of its economy. For many members of the left opposition to the Russian regime, the same can be said for Russia, although it remains economically dependent on exports of primary goods (of which petroleum products account for two-thirds). Can we in this last case talk about “weak imperialism”?

The BRICS have tried to act together in the arena of the world market, without much success. The countries that make up this fragile “bloc” do not all play in the same league. Brazil, India and South Africa can probably be described as sub-imperialisms – a notion that dates back to the 1970s - and regional gendarmes, but with a significant difference in relation to the past: they benefit from a much greater freedom to export capital (see the “great game” that has opened up in Africa, with competition between the United States, Canada, Britain, France, India, Brazil, South Africa, China, Qatar, Turkey ...).

Two conclusions here:

1. The competition between capitalist powers is reviving, with the affirmation of China especially, but also of Russia in Eastern Europe. These are really conflicts between capitalist powers, therefore qualitatively different from those of the previous period.

2. More generally, concerning the free movement of capital, the bourgeoisies (even subordinate ones) and transnational corporations of the “South” can use the rules conceived after 1991 by the traditional imperialist bourgeoisies for themselves, particularly in terms of investment, making competition in the global market more complex than in the past. As far as the flow of commodities is concerned, the generalized setting of workers in competition with each other admittedly remains largely driven by the enterprises of the traditional imperialist centres, and it is they and not the firms in producer countries who control access to the consumer markets of the developed countries; today however, this is less true for China and indeed India or Brazil.

**V. New far right forces, new fascisms**

One of the first consequences of the phenomenal destabilizing power of capitalist globalization is the equally spectacular rise of new far right forces and new fascisms with a (potential) mass base. Some take relatively traditional forms, such as Golden Dawn in Greece, within which there are new xenophobic currents and those based on falling back on national identity. Others emerge in the form of religious fundamentalism, and this is the case in all the “great” religions (Christian, Buddhist, Hindu, Muslim ...), or of “national religious” fundamentalism (the Zionist far right)... These currents represent today a considerable threat in countries like India, Sri Lanka and Israel, and have been able to influence the policy of governments as important as that of the United States (under Bush). So the Muslim world has no monopoly in this domain; but it has taken there a particular international dimension, with “cross-border” movements like the Islamic State or the Taliban (see the situation in Pakistan), and networks connecting up more or less formally, from Morocco to Indonesia and indeed to the South of the Philippines.

In general, we have to further analyze the new far right movements, whether they are religious or not: they are not mere replicas of the past, but expressions of the present time! This is particularly true for religious fundamentalist currents. It is important to define them politically in order to understand the role they play (remember that not so long ago, a significant part of the international radical left saw in them an expression of an “objectively” progressive, although ideologically reactionary, anti-imperialism). It is also necessary to combat “essentialist” interpretations of the “clash of civilizations”.

These movements are far-right and counter-revolutionary currents. They have contributed to bringing to a halt the dynamic of the popular revolutions born of the “Arab Spring”. They do not have a monopoly of extreme violence (see the Assad regime!) nor of “barbarism” (the imperialist order is “barbaric”). But they exercise over society a control and a terror that comes “from below”, which in many cases recalls the fascisms of the inter-war period, before they came to power.

Like all political terms, that of fascism is often overused or interpreted in various ways. However, our own organizations are discussing this question - how fundamentalist and far-right nationalist movements are evolving, which of them can be defined as fascist or not - for example in countries like Pakistan and India.

Whatever the most appropriate adjectives to describe the new extreme right movements, their growing power poses to our generation of activists political problems with which we had not been confronted in the previous period - that of large-scale “antifascist” resistance. We have to work on this and to do so we need to pool national and regional analyses and experiences.

More generally, the renewal of the radical right strengthens a dangerous reactionary thrust that aims to put into question in particular the fundamental rights of women and LGBT people, often relying on the institutional churches concerning abortion (in Spain, where a reactionary proposed law abolishing the right to abortion was defeated, in Italy ...) family law (advocating a return to a very conservative view of the role of women ...) and even triggering real witch hunts against homosexuals (Iran, African countries where evangelical currents are powerful ....). The reaction is thus frontally attacking the right to self-determination of women and of individuals (recognition of the diversity of sexual orientation), rights that were won after prolonged struggles.

This rise of the reactionary right is encouraged by the ideology of national security advocated today by bourgeois governments in the name of the fight against terrorism and “illegal” immigration. In return, these governments use the fears thus generated to strengthen the law-and-order state, to establish regimes where police have more and more power and to get authoritarian measures accepted: entire populations are now treated as “suspicious”, subject to surveillance.

**VI. Authoritarian regimes, demand for democracy and solidarity**

Capitalist globalization has provoked the crisis of so-called democratic institutions (where they existed) and of bourgeois parliamentarism. Faced with this loss of legitimacy, the dominant trend is towards the establishment - sudden or creeping – of authoritarian regimes not subject to popular sovereignty. The right to choose is simply denied to peoples in the name of treaties and regulations endorsed by their governments.

The democratic imperative - “real democracy now!”- thus acquires a more subversive dimension that is more immediate than was often the case in the past, making it possible to give it an alternative, popular content. Similarly, the universality of neoliberal policies and the accompanying commoditisation of “common goods” make possible the convergence of forms of social resistance, as seen in the global justice movement. The consequences of climate change, which are already being felt, also offer a new field of potentially anti-capitalist convergences.

However, the lasting effects of the defeats of the workers’ movement and of neoliberal ideological hegemony, the loss of credibility of the socialist alternative, counteract these positive trends. It is difficult to situate within a longer-term perspective the success, sometimes considerable, of protest movements (occupation of public squares, civil disobedience ...). The acuteness of oppression can, in this context, strengthen “closed”, identity-based resistance, where an oppressed community remains indifferent to the fate reserved to other oppressed people (as in the case of “homo-nationalism”). The religious character taken by many conflicts also contributes to the division of the exploited and oppressed.

The neo-liberal order can only be imposed if it succeeds in destroying the old solidarities and stifling the emergence of new solidarities. As necessary as these are, we cannot consider that solidarity will develop “naturally” in response to the crisis, nor internationalism faced with globalized capital. A concerted and systematic effort must be made in this domain.

**VII. Internationalism against campism**

There is no longer a “non-” “or “anti-” capitalist *great power* (a category to which Cuba does not belong). We must draw all the conclusions from this.

In the past, without ever aligning ourselves with Beijing’s diplomacy, we defended the People's Republic (and the dynamics of the revolution) against the Japan-US imperialist alliance - we were *in this sense* in its camp. We were opposed to NATO, whatever we thought of the Stalinist regime; we were not however “campist” because that did not limit our struggle against the Stalinist bureaucracy. We were simply acting in a world where there was an articulation of lines of conflict: revolutions/counter-revolutions, East/West and Sino-Soviet blocs. This is no longer the case today.

“Campist” logic has always led to the abandonment of victims (who happen to find themselves on the wrong side) in the name of fighting against the “main enemy”. This is even truer today than in the past, because it leads to lining up in the camp of a *capitalist* power (Russia, China) - or in the Western camp when Moscow and Beijing are seen as the primary threat. In this way aggressive nationalism is encouraged and the borders inherited from the era of “blocs” are sanctified, whereas they are precisely what we should efface.

Campism can also lead to support in Syria the murderous Assad regime - or the coalition under US hegemony, including in particular Saudi Arabia. Other currents content themselves with condemning the imperialist intervention in Iraq and Syria (which we must certainly do), but without saying what the Islamic State is doing and calling for resistance to it.

This type of position makes it impossible to pose clearly *the whole range* of solidarity tasks. To recall the historic responsibility of imperialism, from the intervention in 2003, the undeclared objectives of the present intervention, to denounce one’s own imperialism, is not enough. It is necessary to think about the concrete tasks of solidarity *from the point of view of the needs (humanitarian, political and material)* *of the populations who are victims and of the movements engaged in struggle*. Which cannot be done without attacking the Assad regime and the counter-revolutionary fundamentalist movements.

**VIII. Capitalist expansion and climate crisis**

The reintegration of the Sino-Soviet “bloc” into the world market has led to a huge expansion of the geographical area in which capital dominates, which is the foundation for the optimism of the imperialist bourgeoisies. It is also the foundation for a dramatic acceleration of the global ecological crisis, on multiple terrains. We have arrived at a point where the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions must begin without any further delay in the major emitting countries of the South and not just of the North.

In this context, the settlement of the “ecological debt” to the South must not favour world capitalist development and benefit either the Japanese-Western transnational corporations implanted in the South or the transnational corporations of the South (such as Brazilian agribusiness, etc.), which would only generate ever more social and environmental crises.

There is certainly always the need for “North-South solidarity “, for example in defense of the victims of climate chaos. However, more than ever, it is a common “anti-systemic” struggle that is on the agenda in “North-South” relations from the point of view of the working classes: that is to say a common fight for an anti-capitalist alternative, another conception of development in the “North” as in the “South” (the quotation marks are there to remind us that the heterogeneity of the “North” and the “South” is now such that these concepts can be misleading).

The starting point is the socio-environmental struggle to “change the system, not the climate”; its base is composed of social movements and not just specific coalitions on the climate. We must therefore work on the articulation between the two. If we do not “ecologise” the social struggle (following the example of what can already be done in peasant and urban struggles), the numerical expansion of “climate” mobilizations will remain on the surface of things.

The effects of climate chaos are already being felt and the organization of the victims, their defense and help with their self-organization, are also part of the base of the ecological struggle.

The consequences of a global fossil fuel based energy system on are now absolutely clear. As a result of the rising global temperature the ice caps are shrinking, sea levels are rising, deserts are expanding, water is become more scarce, agriculture is under threat and extreme weather events are becoming more frequent. The effects of super-typhoon Haiyan in the Philippines surpassed in scale what we had already been warned about. The future that is announced is already part of the present. This has destabilizing consequences that extend far beyond the regions that are directly affected and gives rise to a chain sequence of tensions (for example the refugees from Bangladesh and the conflict with India on the question of migrants).

Scientists agree that a global surface temperature rise of 2°C over preindustrial levels would trigger climate feedbacks, which, once started, will be impossible to stop. With this in mind there are a number of major issues that remain entirely unresolved.

Melting ice sheets and glaciers threaten a catastrophic rise in the sea level. Even if the global temperature increase stabilised at 2°C the rise in the sea level by the end of the century is likely to be something between 0.6 and 2.2m. If a 2°C increase was exceeded such levels would be much higher. Coastal cities around the globe are under threat from this as are island communities and low lying countries and regions. Over 50% of Bangladesh would be under direct threat.

Now a completely new dimension is added to this with signs of the destabilisation of the vast Western Antarctic ice sheet, the melting of which could raise the sea level by 7m.

As the earth’s temperature rises we can expect a devastating impact on fresh water resources with increasing droughts and heatwaves. The glaciers are retreating at an unprecedented rat and the aquifers are drying up. The rivers are losing their capacity. More than 50 percent of the world’s freshwater comes from mountain runoff and snowmelt. Wars over water resources will become far more prevalent.

The problem of how to feed the rising global population of the planet without increasing resorting to factory farming (agribusiness) and the ever increasing use of pesticides and herbicides and GM food that destroys the biosphere. In the Global South the key issue is food sovereignty. This would give people the rights and means to define their own food systems. It would give control to those who produce, distribute and consume food rather than the corporations and market institutions that dominate the global food system. It would mean an end to land grabs and would require extensive land redistribution to put the land in the hands of those who produce the food.

Possibly the biggest single most damaging aspect of the environmental crisis is the impact it is having on biodiversity – ‘the sixth extinction’ as it is increasingly known. An increase in global average temperature of around three degrees, for example, would means that 50% of all species – plants and animals – will be driven to extinction. A quarter of all mammal species are at risk. The acidification of the oceans that is taking place means that coral reefs are dying off, as are organisms that rely on calcification for their shell structure. It is a crisis in which our own future as a species cannot be separated.

**IX. A world of permanent wars**

We are probably not going towards a third world war along the lines of the First and Second World Wars, because there is not a conflict for the *territorial* division of the world in the sense that there was in the past. But the factors pushing towards war are very profound and diverse: new conflicts between powers, competition on the world market, access to resources, decomposition of societies, the rise of new forms of fascism escaping from the control of those who brought them into existence, a chain sequence of the effects of climate chaos and of humanitarian crises on a very large scale...

We have well and truly entered a world of permanent wars (plural). Every war must be analyzed in its specificities. We are confronted with very complex situations, as today in the Middle East where, in the framework of a single theatre of operations (Iraq-Syria) there are interlocking conflicts with specific characteristics (Syrian Kurdistan, the region of Aleppo, etc.).

Wars are here to stay, with many faces. We need to look again at how they are conducted, particularly by popular resistance movements, in order to better understand the conditions of a struggle, the reality of a situation, the concrete requirements of solidarity ...

However, we must have “points of stability” in order to continue to have a compass in a very complex geopolitical situation: class independence against imperialism, against militarism, against fascism and the rise of identity movements' that are “anti-solidarity”(racist, Islamophobic and anti-Semitic, xenophobic, casteist, fundamentalist, homophobic, misogynistic, masculinist...).

**X. The limits of the superpower**

The common set of rules of the global capitalist order does not prevent some countries from being more equal than others; the United States takes the liberty of doing things that it does not allow elsewhere. It plays on the place of the dollar, controls much of the most advanced technologies, has at its disposal unmatched military power. Its state continues to maintain global sovereign functions that others no longer have - or no longer have the means of having.

The United States remains the only superpower in the world - and yet, it has lost all the wars that it has engaged in, from Afghanistan to Somalia. The fault lies perhaps in neoliberal globalization, which prohibits it from consolidating socially (in alliance with local elites) its temporary military gains. This is perhaps also a consequence of the privatization of armies, of firms of mercenaries playing an increasing role, as well as the “unofficial” armed gangs in the service of particular interests (big companies, big families...).

It is also the case that this power, as “super” as it might be, does not have the means to intervene in every direction under conditions of structural instability. It would require secondary imperialisms capable of supporting it. But the constitution of a European imperialism has been aborted; France and Britain have now only very limited capacities; Japan has yet to break the civic resistance to its complete remilitarization.

Whoever says war should say anti-war movement. Since the wars are very different from each other, the building of anti-war movements in synergy does not go without saying. The way activists in (Western) Europe approach this question seems pessimistic, a consequence of how “campism” has gnawed at and rendered impotent the principal campaigns undertaken in this field. But there are anti-war movements, particularly in Asia - and in Eurasia; the overcoming of the frontiers inherited from the era of the blocs will take place particularly around this question.

**XI. Humanitarian crisis**

Neoliberal policies, war, climate chaos, economic convulsions, social breakdowns, exacerbated violence, pogroms, the collapse of social protection systems, devastating epidemics, women reduced to slavery, forced migration: children slowly dying of thirst, abandoned along with their parents in the middle of the Sahel... Triumphant capitalism, unbridled, is giving birth to a world where humanitarian crises multiply, causing degrees of suffering that are unimaginable for those who have not experienced them – and unspeakably atrocious for those who have experienced them.

The breakdown of social order has impacted the state head-on in countries like Pakistan (which has nuclear weapons); or again Mexico where the mafias, in symbiosis with the political class, use terror to impose their domination - hence the denominations of failed states, of mafia-ridden states, of narco-terrorism.

This modern barbarism must be met with a widening of internationalist fields of action. Militant left currents and social movements in particular must ensure the development of solidarity “from people to people” with the victims of the humanitarian crisis.

After a period when the very concept of internationalism was often disparaged, the global justice wave, then the multiplication of “occupations” of public squares or districts, have restored it to its full importance. Now it is necessary for this revived internationalism to find more permanent forms of action, on all the terrains of contestation.
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