

افغانستان آزاد – آزاد افغانستان

AA-AA

چو کشور نباشد تن من مباد
همه سر به سر تن به کشتن دهیم
بدین بوم و بر زنده یک تن مباد
از آن به که کشور به دشمن دهیم

www.afgazad.com

afgazad@gmail.com

European Languages

زبانهای اروپایی

By Steve Ellner
30.03.2023

The Prioritization of U.S. Imperialism and the Pink Tide



Sources: Rebellion

Two contrasting leftist positions on the wave of progressive governments in Latin America known as the "Pink Tide" have become well-defined over the past two decades.

One position is favorable, while the other is highly critical, to the extent that the presidents of the Pink Tide—including Nicolás Maduro, Rafael Correa, Evo Morales, and Lula—are sometimes lumped together with conservative and right-wing leaders.

In The background, the differences are reduced to different perspectives on imperialism. The key question emerging from the debate has Primary Implications: Is the Struggle Against Imperialism U.S. top priority globally, regardless of the position taken on the Ukrainian war? If the answer is yes, then support for the governments of the Pink Tide, which have been subject to interventionism An all-out American, he is particularly compelling.

www.afgazad.com

afgazad@gmail.com

Otherwise, it can be said that perhaps globalization has led to other contradictions that have to be prioritized, since the main target has to be global capital, and not the political machinations of Washington. In addition, the environment, indigenous rights, gender equality, and participatory democracy – banners of what some call "the anti-globalization movement" – must be at the center of formulating the strategies and goals of the left in the 21st century. [1] The performance of the Pink Tide on these fronts has been far from exemplary, and this explains the reasoning of leftists highly critical of these governments. Anti-Pink Tide writers often deny that the problems and mistakes of these governments are related to U.S. imperialism. Prominent Uruguayan leftist theorist Raúl Zibechi, for example, wrote that the overthrow of Evo Morales in 2019 cannot be attributed to U.S. interventionism, any more than Cuba, Venezuela, or Russia can be blamed for the massive anti-neoliberal protests that rocked the region in the same year. According to Zibechi, accusations of this nature contribute to "a survival of the cold war, in which all popular action is attributed to one of the superpowers." [2] However, the destabilizing campaign in Bolivia promoted by the US, dating back to the beginning of the Morales government in 2006, has been well documented. as well as the role of the Organization of American States in the overthrow of Morales. [3]

The Thesis of the existence of many imperialisms that are equally nefarious, defended by anti-Marea Rosada writers, goes in contrary to the basic premise of the pro-Marea Rosada writers, those who allege that US imperialism today It represents the greatest contradiction in the world. The writers anti-Pink Tide pay little attention to the difference between the Destructive effects of US imperialism and the alleged imperialism of Russia and China. The countries of the Pink Tide, which They are on the front line in the struggle against imperialism Americans are sometimes seen as if they are simply exchanging one empire for another.

Those leftists who deny that Latin American progressive governments have some qualities Redemptive women are not limited to the so-called "ultra-left." There's anti-Pink Tide writers located in all positions of the Left side of the political spectrum. It also includes academics from all disciplines, as well as activists from the environmental, feminist and indigenous rights movements. The Common denominator is, first of all, its denial that there is anything significantly progressive about the governments of the Tide Rosada, and second, the little importance he gives to aggression imperialist as an explanation for the problems faced by these Countries.

Admittedly, the distinction between pro- and anti-Pink Tide positions is not always black and white. There is no doubt that many of those in the first category critically support the governments of the Pink Tide. At the same time, those in the second category recognize the devastating effects of U.S. intervention, but do not incorporate it into their analysis of the problems facing these governments. Moreover, the Pink Tide is far from being a monolithic group. Some analysts on the left, for example, consider Correa as a sell-out, while praising Morales; others make a similar contrast between the Sandinistas and the Venezuelan government; and others attack Morales while praising Chávez. [4]

However, the distinction between the two categories is important. First, because the anti-Pink Tide position minimizes the effectiveness of the international solidarity movement. Second, because the analysis of the differences between the two sheds light on an issue that Marxists, almost by definition, consider of primary importance: the identification of the main contradiction – among the many that exist – and the most important struggles in the world at any given time. [5]

To At first glance, it seems that, given the controversy about the war in Ukraine, this is not an ideal time to write a Article proposing the prioritization of the fight against U.S. imperialism. My opinion is quite the opposite. The Ukrainian war, horrific as it is, distracts attention from what is happening globally. The leftists who are critics of both the Russian offensive and Washington, for promoting NATO expansion, they are divided over which of the two Sides is more guilty. However, I try to demonstrate in this Article that the issue of Russian intervention in the conflict Ukrainian is basically apart from the debate on prioritization of U.S. imperialism. In other words, Russia can be severely condemned for its actions in Ukraine at the same time as U.S. imperialism is identified as the threat of Greater weight to world peace and progressive change. For that reason, The left and progressives in general can't wait until when the conflict in Ukraine is resolved (presuming that this will pass) and then prioritize the importance of the fight against U.S. imperialism. An examination of the phenomenon of the Tide Rosada and his relations with Russia, China and the US opens a window of opportunity to determine whether the thesis of hegemony U.S. imperialism denies the validity of the thesis of the "many imperialisms" or if the two are compatible.

Atilio Borón on US imperialism

Prominent Argentine political scientist Atilio Borón prioritizes the importance of imperialism while strongly supporting the presidents of the Pink Tide – such as Maduro, Daniel Ortega and Rafael Correa – who have been harshly criticized by leftist anti-Marea

Rosada analysts. A look at Borón's writings and oral comments sheds light on the close relationship between the prioritization of anti-imperialism and support for the Pink Tide, as perceived by a prominent representative of the Latin American anti-imperialist left.

Borón argues that although the US is in decline – demonstrated by the rise of the Pink Tide in its own "backyard" – the pernicious nature of US imperialism is more evident than ever. For many years, Boron says, after the fall of the Soviet Union, "when someone talked about imperialism, people looked at them sideways and said, 'He's living in the '60s.'" Borón adds that "people would say that globalization has ended all that." Indeed, Boron's comment lends itself to the view that the left's theories of globalization often detract from the strength of the anti-imperialist movement, with devastating effects (as Zhun Xu has posed). [6]

Borón also points out that in the twenty-first century "the reality of imperialism has become so evident that Washington's strategists now speak of 'empire.'" Not only is imperialism more evident than in previous decades, but in many ways it is more brutal. "What happened when Allende was president in Chile was hard, but it was child's play compared to Venezuela." [7]

Like other pro-Pink Tide writers, Borón stresses the importance of geopolitics as well as the successes of the Pink Tide countries in challenging the dominance of U.S. imperialism. For him, the importance of the Pink Tide and anti-imperialism in the region can only be understood and appreciated by taking into account the fundamental importance that Washington assigns to Latin America from the strategic point of view – although it rarely admits it in public. Boron quotes Zbigniew Brzezinski, who said more or less that "the United States established its primacy like no other empire in history because those nations were all threatened by land, or at least by short distance." Borón then notes that Washington's strategists refer to the Western Hemisphere as "a big island," with the U.S. "in the lead": "U.S. security depends on the solidity of different parts of the island." In an indirect reference to the Pink Tide, Borón says "if the countries [of the hemisphere] open a rift, if anti-Americanism flourishes, or if some parties are unwilling to defend U.S. foreign policy." "In the U.S., then American security is put in jeopardy." [8]

Borón, like other pro-Marea Rosada analysts, subordinates its criticism of progressive governments to Recognition of the importance of confronting imperialism. His Logic is as follows:

The US doesn't like Daniel Ortega. When the empire doesn't like someone, it has to be that he or she is doing something good, with all the flaws it may have. When there is

ideological confusion, as Cristina [Fernández de Kirchner] recommends, she looks north. If the U.S. is moving in one direction, then we have to go in the opposite direction. That's because the empire never improvises. [9]

Certainly, my enemy's enemy is not necessarily my friend, as anti-Pink Tide writers often point out. But throughout his career, Borón has been right to point to the paramount importance of anti-imperialism and refute allegations that the ebb of those struggles means "the end of the anti-imperialist cycle" or "the end of the Pink Tide." [10] Writers from both sides of the political spectrum made these statements after the defeat of the Sandinistas in 1990 and again with the setbacks of the Pink Tide since the electoral defeat of the Peronists in Argentina in 2015.

Imperialism versus globalization

As Boron points out, globalization in both theory and practice tends to obscure U.S. imperialist actions. Indeed, transnational capital, by transcending the nation-state, seems to be incompatible with the concept of imperialism, at least the definition based on territorial scope proposed by Lenin. Some leftist theorists of globalization have predicted that as transnational capital vis-à-vis national capital is now dominant, that the emerging transnational state (consisting of organizations such as the G7, the World Trade Organization, etc.) is in the process of displacing the nation-state, which was the epicenter of imperialism. J.Z. Garrod, for example, asks whether transnational capital "can be understood theoretically using the concepts of imperialism, given the degree to which those conceptions remain linked to the notion of space based on national geopolitical structures." [11]

Globalization theorists who emphasize the growing strength of the "transnational state" may have rushed in. Recently, they saw the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) as evidence that the transnational state was not far from hegemonic, in the same way that transnational capital had become hegemonic. [12] But the TPP proposal came and went. Although transnational capital may have become hegemonic, the nation-state is not necessarily going through the same process, at least in the short or medium term. An extended delay can separate the supposed rise of transnational corporations and that of a dominant transnational State that responds to their interests. A similar phenomenon of backwardness characterized the centuries-long transition from feudalism to capitalism.

David Harvey presents another argument about globalization that calls into question the applicability of the concept of imperialism in the 21st century. According to him, the mobility of capital in which production has been relocated to the South on a massive scale

(particularly in East Asia) has produced a phenomenon of "shifted hegemonies within the world system." Consequently, the flow of capital associated with imperialism, as analyzed by Lenin, is now "more complicated and constantly changing directions." [13] In lectures Harvey has given over the past few years, he has stated that the notion of imperialism is a straitjacket that prevents the theorization of globalization in the 21st century. [14]

Too much Discussion of 21st century imperialism is based on predictions about the future rather than the realities of the present. For example The thesis of "many imperialisms" anticipates that, with the supposed The restoration of capitalism in China will become a aggressive, imperialist power. Similarly, some theorists of Globalization argues that, with the hegemony of capital transnational, the transnational state inevitably goes to replace the nation-state. Both predictions are possibilities of the future, but the left has to formulate strategies based on at present, not in hypothetical scenarios. At this time, Washington wields extraordinary power, and in many cases acts in favour of their own interests with a territorial approach, such as, for example, to safeguard the supremacy of the dollar.

In addition globalization has not eclipsed the divide between the North and the South as Harvey suggests. Only because Carlos Slim from Mexico has He became one of the richest people in the world, not means that Mexico has narrowed the gaps with the U.S. from the economic, social or military point of view. This is the case of other countries of the South, with the exception of China. Immigration massive towards the US and Europe, for example, is a demonstration Clear of the continuing huge income disparities between the class workers from the North and South.

"The many imperialisms" and the Pink Tide

The recognition that US imperialism is the most important contradiction in the world has implications for the strategy of the left – and two in particular. First, in the area of foreign policy, those political parties and governments (Russia, for example) that confront Washington, but do not represent a force in favor of socialism, and also carry out certain ethically and politically reprehensible actions, do not necessarily place themselves in the same category as the US and its allies. The left needs to underscore the distinction between the foreign policy of those nations and that of the U.S. And second, criticisms of progressive governments (such as the Pink Tide) have to be contextualized taking into account imperialist hostility, and the positive role of those governments in the anti-imperialist struggle must be emphasized.

Anti-Pink Tide leftists who see Moscow and Beijing as equal to Washington do not subscribe to this view. British Marxist academic Mike Gonzalez, for example, writes "not

only the U.S. but also China, Russia" and other capitalist countries "are waiting to seize the enormous [Venezuelan] wealth of oil, gas and minerals under the pleased eye of the neoliberal government," that is, the Maduro government. [15] Gonzalez also accuses Daniel Ortega of handing over his "country into the hands of Chinese multinationals." [16] Although Gonzalez and other leftist anti-Marea Rosada writers do not absolve Washington for its imperialist actions, neither do they credit Maduro, Morales, Correa, Ortega, and other Pink Tide leaders with confronting U.S. imperialism since, anyway, they are simply trading one imperialism for another. Gonzalez accuses some leftists, including myself, of ignoring investments to Latin America coming from China — "now the number two investor in the region" — and the alleged corruption that is associated with Chinese capital in Venezuela. [17]

Maristella Svampa is an outstanding scholar of leftist sympathy who sees ties with China as nothing better than dependence on the US. The main arguments of Svampa, who is far from being an apologist for Washington, make it clear that the anti-Pink Tide viewpoint is not limited to one current of the left in particular. According to Svampa, the original hope of "a multipolar world" was shattered by "the accentuation of unequal change" between China and Latin America. [18] She denounces the growing dependence of all Latin American countries, both left and right, on exports of unprocessed commodities, which is partly the result of China's insatiable need to acquire raw materials. For Svampa, the Pink Tide governments in some respects are worse than the neoliberals that preceded them, and are virtually without redemptive qualities. Like many other leftist anti-Pink Tide writers, Svampa says little about Washington's and its allies' hostile treatment of Pink Tide governments. In his latest book, which is highly critical of the Pink Tide governments, he says nothing about the matter. [19]

¿Is the new Cold War a repeat of World War I?

The main reference point for anti-Pink Tide and anti-China Marxists is Lenin's economic analysis of the pre-1914 European imperialist powers, although empirical studies such as those of Minqi Li in the *Monthly Review* point to fundamental differences between the economy of those countries and that of China today. The basic discussion revolves around economics, such as the limitless pursuit of superprofits (which Li points out as the fundamental characteristic of imperialism according to Lenin, and the driving force it does not apply to China). [20] However, the political and military dimensions of imperialism are generally not part of the discussion by either right or left analysts. These dimensions –

political and military – in the case of the governments of the Pink Tide demonstrate the fallacy of the thesis of the "many imperialisms".

No There is a need to convince readers of Rebelión.org of what destructive of the political and military aspects of imperialism American, consisting of actions and policies that do not have much equivalent in the case of Russia and China. By the way, the Chinese and Russian military movements that are classified by Washington politicians and analysts as examples of aggression The imperialists are largely confined to their borders, as in the case of Ukraine and Taiwan. This contrasts with interventionism. U.S. military that goes beyond its "backyard."

Only it takes some facts to show that the U.S. has no world-wide equivalent, and the reason why the left It has to prioritize US anti-imperialism: 750 bases military in 80 countries and colonies worldwide outside their Borders; substantive support for numerous right-wing coups d'état against governments considered adverse to interests Americans (many of whom are progressive); The regime of sanctions against countries considered adversaries that in effect they represent a blockade; An astronomical military budget that unleashes a domino effect throughout the world; financial support and extensive military to Israel (which contributes extremely to the destabilization of the Middle East, without referring to atrocities committed against Palestinians), to mention but a few Facts.

One argument of anti-China writers from both the right and the The left is that Chinese imperialism is possibly not the news as aggressive as that of the USA. In the U.S., but only because It is at an incipient stage. A position coming from the The left, for example, sees China as a case of "imperialism in the future." construction". The leftist analyst Esteban Mercatante says:

Even though China lacks the U.S. global police force, it is not yet possible. UU... This country can be characterized as an imperialism under construction, which means that the development of various dimensions that allows it to project a capacity for intervention is equivalent to that of other imperialist countries such as Britain and Japan. [21]

An even less favorable analysis of China comes from *Guardian* editor Simon Tisdall in an article published in 2021 titled "The New Stage of China's Imperialism." Tisdall argues that China is "transforming into a second-stage empire" in which, once dominant, it will have a powerful military component and is "potentially more dangerous" than empires of the past. [22] This argument ignores the law of uneven development, which has historically meant that countries like Germany and Japan in the 19th century, in their quest to catch up with the more developed countries, were more aggressive than their imperialist

rivals. If China (and Russia) were simply trying to catch up and surpass the US within the system of inter-imperialist rivalry, then one would think it would be more warlike globally, not less.

The position of defending national sovereignty from the Pink Tide by Russia and China and their support for the multipolar world has no equivalent in the pre-World War I period of inter-imperialist rivalry. While Washington accuses China of supporting authoritarian and corrupt regimes in Africa (as if the US doesn't have a sordid history of doing the same), in Latin America there are ideological implications to the Russian and Chinese presence that are pro-left. This dimension is a far cry from the alleged Chinese and Russian policy of "making the world safe for dictatorships" by promoting an "alliance of autocracies" as alleged by the *New York Times* and *Washington Post*. [23]

In contrast, other scholars have noted that China "has friendlier relations with a greater degree of cooperation with governments of the left and center-left... such as Bolivia, Cuba, Ecuador, Nicaragua and Venezuela, and less friendly, but respectful, relations with countries... of more conservative and pro-U.S. governments." [24] However, conservative governments did not always respond with the same degree of respect. This was the case for Jair Bolsonaro and members of his inner circle who accused China of trying to achieve global dominance and insinuated that that country was responsible for the COVID-19 pandemic.

An example of support for progressive principles in the area of foreign policy is the forums held between China and the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States (CELAC), which is an organization supported by the presidents of the Pink Tide and which proposes a progressive strategy of Latin American integration. An example of Russia and China's commitment to defending national sovereignty in the region is their financial support for the highly indebted Maduro government at a time when its political survival was in doubt as a result of the Trump administration's destabilizing campaign, and when opposition leaders, At least initially, they indicated that when they came to power they would break contracts with both countries. [25] These Russian and Chinese initiatives cast doubt on the validity of the thesis of the "many imperialisms". There is definitely no equivalent in the foreign policy of the pre-1914 European imperialist countries.

Experts in Washington allege that the Russians and Chinese support the Pink Tide, not out of a belief in some grandiose principles, but as a result of geopolitical calculations. Its support for progressive governments is seen as opportunistic, not least because Russia tries to be, in the words of a director of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace,

"the friend of the whole world that opposes American global domination." [26] This thesis concerning Russia's motives does not reconcile with what is really happening. The apparent good relations between Moscow and right-wingers like Trump, Fox News and Marine Le Pen also don't say everything about what's going on.

In the highly polarized environment in Latin America, the dividing lines are clear. The Russians and Chinese – since when Xi Jinping became president in 2013 – have been aligned with progressive governments in Latin America. In contrast, conservative and right-wing governments have been close allies of the US (and so obediently followed Washington's orders, for example, to promote "regime change" in Venezuela) and, in some cases, have shown hostility towards Washington's adversaries, specifically Russia and China. That is why, despite Moscow's inconsistencies and China's seemingly apolitical position in its foreign policy, there is one principle in between that clearly distinguishes Russia and China from the US: their joint advocacy for the principle of multipolarism, exemplified in their call for the "democratization of international relations." [27]

With the continued decline of the US on all fronts (except the military), Russian and Chinese positions globally may change. By the way, Li does not rule out the possibility – although according to him remote – of China becoming a "semi-peripheral" nation to an imperialist nation. However, the left in the US and elsewhere cannot analyze world events based on assumptions about what friends and allies may become in the distant future, or even in the medium term.

The flag of sovereignty and the multipolar world defended by Beijing and Moscow creates opportunities for governments of the left, such as those of the Pink Tide, and facilitates their navigation in a hostile world. No powerful governments committed to transformation revolutionary. However, the governments of the Pink Tide do not have claims to emulate the economic model associated with China or Russia (unlike the case of the communist movement in the period post-1917).

¿How translates into practice the anti-Pink Tide position of the left?

The Controversy over US anti-imperialism is not restricted to academic debate or articles in the media of communication; has manifested itself in social conflicts and politicians throughout the region. In several countries, the position anti-Marea Rosada leftist who rejects the prioritization of the The struggle against U.S. imperialism contributed to the setbacks from 2015. The leftists who defended the Anti-Pink Tide views went beyond criticism punctual for specific failures, since they condemned those governments in

absolute terms without acknowledging his progressive qualities (such as, for example, its anti-neoliberal policies) and in some Cases strengthened the hands of the radical right.

One example was the decision of a mainstream of the anti-neoliberal indigenous movement led by self-proclaimed "ecological leftist" Yaku Pérez in Ecuador not to support the candidacy of Andrés Arauz of Rafael Correa's party in the second round of the 2021 presidential elections. That decision sealed the victory of conservative banker Guillermo Lasso. Perez stated in a reference to Correa, "a banker is preferable to a dictatorship." His main reason for not taking sides in the election was that as president, Correa opened the Yasuní National Park, inhabited largely by indigenous people, to oil drilling and suppressed protests against the project. But by assuming this position, Pérez ignored Correa's anti-imperialist credentials. While Pérez tried to discredit Correa's policies in the domestic field, it would have been more difficult to criticize, from a leftist point of view, the anti-imperialist initiatives of the former president. In 2009, he ordered the U.S. to abandon the Manta military base and at the same time Ecuador joined the Bolivarian Alliance for the Peoples of Our America (ALBA), which represents a progressive version of Latin American integration. As a candidate in the 2021 presidential election, Perez, who some analysts alleged was to the left of Correa, advocated trade deals with the U.S. while denouncing China's "aggressive policies around extractivism and human rights." [28]

Analysts and anti-Marea Rosada activists from the left also had a dire impact in the case of the overthrow of Evo Morales in 2019. While many of his adversaries in social movements and the left entered into resistance to the semi-fascist regime that succeeded Morales, others refused to acknowledge that what happened was a "coup." That was the case of Pablo Solón, Morales' former ambassador to the United Nations, who broke with him over developmental plans for the Tipnis rainforest. Solon's ecological critiques – which included the issues of genetically modified organisms (GMOs), biofuels, and mega-dams – overshadowed the issue of US imperialism and neo-fascism, both of which were at stake in the coup. Solon applauded the street protests that erupted against Morales' re-election in October 2019 and led to the coup, claiming that Morales was "addicted to power." [29] After the coup, Solón, who identified himself as a leftist, opposed granting Morales permission to return to Bolivia and naively and mistakenly predicted that the de facto president, right-wing Jeanine Áñez, would accept indigenous cultural symbols, asserting that "the government and society want peace." [30]

The anti-Pink Tide position also affects the performance of the international solidarity movement. Although many of the tenacious critics of the Pink Tide denounce U.S. imperialism in a forceful way, they are not part of the solidarity movement in significant numbers. [31] Although the Cuban and Venezuelan governments undeniably prefer to work with leaders of the anti-sanctions movement who are politically aligned with their positions, this does not apply to the base of those movements. William Camacaro, a longtime activist with the Venezuelan solidarity movement, told me, "Those leftists who lash out at progressive governments overshadow the enthusiasm of people willing to work in opposition to sanctions." He added, "Looking at the highly divided American left, members of groups that look favorably on the Maduro government are the most active in the anti-sanctions movement here in the U.S." [32]

This does not mean that criticism of the governments of the Pink Tide they must be set apart, or that the Pink Tide has always defended progressive policies. So, the credentials Correa's anti-imperialists must not overshadow his mistakes, as, by For example, its overreaction to protests by indigenous groups in against megaprojects with potentially devastating effects. By the way, the pros and cons of the Pink Tide cannot be placed in a balance when the cons include issues of Principles regarding the violation of basic rights. In addition as Fidel Castro warned shortly before his passing, It can blame imperialism for all the problems of the country or for cover up errors. Finally, criticism of the actions of a Government that confronts Washington does not always prevent work of solidarity in opposition to U.S. intervention, such as, For example, in the case of the Ukrainian conflict.

The precarious and unique position in Latin America

The series of electoral victories of progressives over the past year and a half in Honduras, Chile, Colombia and Brazil confirm the validity of an argument in this article: Latin America stands out as the only region in the world where numerous progressive governments committed to anti-neoliberalism challenge US hegemony in the 21st century. Some sectors of the left harshly attack these governments, sometimes with valid arguments regarding their failures and limitations. These criticisms, however, are more convincing in the area of domestic policy – especially the few results of efforts to promote economic development – than in the area of foreign policy.

Nowhere was the erroneousness of the anti-Pink Tide thesis so evident as in the case of the election of Lula, whose role at the international level is the source of much concern in Washington. When he was first elected in 2002, Lula immediately calmed stock market fears by resuming all IMF deals, but his recognition of Palestine on the basis of the 1967

borders, and his support for an international currency as a rival to the dollar, alarmed President Obama, and greatly angered others in Washington. With its international influence now in decline, Washington is even more right to fear Lula's advanced positions on these issues and his call for a multipolar world. [33] Brazil, together with other Pink Tide governments, challenged Washington by re-establishing relations with Caracas and thus stopping the policies that Washington had managed to impose in the region in favor of "regime change" in Venezuela. Colombian President Gustavo Petro, after snubbing Secretary of State Antony Blinken, during his official visit to Bogotá in October 2022, by criticizing Washington's policy toward Cuba, then traveled to Venezuela twice to meet with Maduro. Petro's actions were humiliating to Washington, though no spokesperson for the Biden administration publicly admitted it. Anti-Pink Tide leftist writers ignore the importance of the total change in Latin America's position in international politics, as do those who write the official hopeful statements of the Biden administration. But it is a momentous change that has to be incorporated and emphasized in any critical analysis of progressive governments in the region. The recent right-wing offensives – including the soft coup against Peruvian President Pedro Castillo in December last year and then the riots in Brasilia, which in some respects were more dangerous than the attack on the capitol in Washington by Trump supporters on January 6, 2021 – clearly demonstrate the importance for the left of identifying enemies and distinguishing between friend and foe at the current stage.

Conclusion

The vast majority of political scientists skilled in the field of international relations reject the notion (dating from Immanuel Kant) that democratic countries are more peaceful in their international relations than non-democratic ones. But there is a similar postulate that serves as a cornerstone of neo-conservative thought and guides U.S. foreign policy in general: that democracies are more peaceful in their relations with other democratic countries, but are obliged to emulate the aggressive behavior of non-democrats (supposedly Russia and China). [34] None other than former President Jimmy Carter critically called this strategy "fire-with-fire." [35] The case of the Pink Tide is particularly revealing as it so obviously demonstrates the wrongness of that line of reasoning. In fact, the contrast couldn't be more apparent. The U.S. destabilizes progressive governments in Latin America in the name of "responsibility to protect" and "humanitarian intervention." Russia and China defend the same governments in the name of the principle of national

sovereignty. This is far from a case of emulating the bad guys (supposedly Russia and China) for pragmatic reasons.

Similarly the anti-Pink Tide writers of the left do not distinguish between the actions of the US and those of Russia and China, at the same time that minimize differences between Latin American governments Progressives and conservatives. They question whether the Pink Tide be progressive in its approach to its economic and social policies, But it's hard to deny the progressive nature of politics. external to those governments. Also, from a perspective leftist, the thesis of the "many imperialisms" applied to the foreign policy of the Pink Tide is not at all convincing, so Two reasons. First, the defense of national sovereignty and the right of self-determination against Northern interventionism it was a cause proclaimed by Lenin (and Marx) who, at the time of the globalization is especially relevant. Second, in America Latin America, Russia and (though perhaps to a lesser degree) China have become aligned with progressive governments while Washington is closely aligned with right-wing governments (as was the case of Colombia) in the context of extreme political polarization that It has characterized the region in the twenty-first century.

The prioritization of anti-imperialism, analyzed in this article, has another implication for the strategy of the left, especially as it is applied to Venezuela under Maduro (and also Cuba). The left needs to stress the importance of Maduro's success in formulating a strategy to survive Washington's brutal campaign to intimidate the country in order to impose its interests. This recognition does not mean that Maduro is exempt from criticism, but it does represent a critique of the writers and politicians of the anti-Marea Rosada left who minimize or completely ignore its positive aspects. [36] Indeed, this success in resisting imperialist aggression and interventionism characterizes the Pink Tide in general, which has demonstrated a staying power that, for a bloc of countries, is unprecedented on the continent.

Notes

[1] In fact, the number one priority in the 21st century world is the climate challenge. But it can be asserted that any real progress in curbing climate change depends on respect for national sovereignty and cuts in military spending, which are fundamental goals of anti-imperialism.

[2] Raúl Zibechi, "Un siquiatra para los geopolíticos," *La Jornada*, 8 de noviembre de 2019.

- [3] Linda Farthing and Thomas Becker, *Coup: A Story of Violence and Resistance in Bolivia* (Chicago: Haymarket, 2021), pp. 54–59, 166–67.
- [4] Jeffery R. Webber, *The Last Day of Oppression, and the First Day of the Same: The Politics and Economics of the New Latin American Left* (Chicago: Haymarket, 2017), pp. 157–272.
- [5] Marxist dialectics recognizes the changing pre-eminence of contradictions within the framework of totality. See, Bertell Ollman, "The Eight Steps in Marx's Dialectical Method," *The Oxford Handbook of Karl Marx*. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2019), pp. 99–105.)
- [6] Zhun Xu, "The Ideology of Late Imperialism: The Return of the Geopolitics of the Second International," *Monthly Review* 72, Number 10 (March 2021): p. 18. <https://monthlyreview.org/2021/03/01/the-ideology-of-late-imperialism/>
- [7] Atilio Borón, "Latin America in the Context of Imperialism," YouTube video, 1:19:17, June 22, 2017, [youtube.com/watch?v=GVwTwwTjzlo](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GVwTwwTjzlo).
- [8] Atilio Borón, "Latin America in the Context of Imperialism,"
- [9] Atilio Borón, "América Latina en el contexto del imperialismo."
- [10] Atilio Borón, "América Latina en el contexto del imperialismo."
- [11] J. Z. Garrod, "A Critique of Panitch and Gindin's Theory of American Empire," *Science and Society* 79, Issue 1 (2015): p. 49.
- [12] William I. Robinson, "Debate on the New Global Capitalism: Transnational Capitalist Class, Transnational State Apparatuses, and Global Crisis," *International Critical Thought* 7, Number 2 (2017): p. 172.
- [13] David Harvey, "A Commentary on A Theory of Imperialism," *A Theory of Imperialism*, by Utsa Patnaik and Prabhat Patnaik (New York: Columbia University Press, 2017), p. 169.
- [14] Salar Mohandesi, "The Specificity of Imperialism," *Viewpoint Magazine*, February 1, 2018. <https://viewpointmag.com/2018/02/01/the-specificity-of-imperialism/>; John Bellamy Foster, "Late Imperialism: Fifty Years After Harry Magdoff's *The Age of Imperialism*," *Monthly Review* 71, Issue 3 (July–August 2019): pp. 8–9. <https://monthlyreview.org/2019/07/01/late-imperialism/>
- [15] Mike Gonzalez, "Being Honest About Venezuela," *Jacobin*, July 8, 2017. <https://jacobin.com/2017/07/Venezuela-maduro-helicopter-attack-psuv-extractivism-oil>

- [16] Mike Gonzalez, *The Ebb of the Pink Tide: The Decline of the Left in Latin America* (London: Pluto, 2019), p. 2.
- [17] Gonzalez, *The Ebb of the Pink Tide*, p. 111–12.
- [18] Maristella Svampa, *Neo-Extractivism in Latin America: Socio-environmental Conflicts, the Territorial Turn, and New Political Narratives* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019), p. 18.
- [19] Svampa, *Neo-Extractivism in Latin America*.
- [20] Minqi Li, "China: Imperialism or Semi-Periphery?" *Monthly Review* 73, Issue 3 (July–August 2021): 50–58. <https://monthlyreview.org/2021/07/01/china-imperialism-or-semi-periphery/>
- [21] Esteban Mercatante, "China's Place in the World Order," YouTube video, 1:11:33, November 1, 2020, [youtube.com/watch?v=VRgmTEP9VyA](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VRgmTEP9VyA).
- [22] Simon Tisdall, "In China's new age of imperialism, Xi Jinping gives thumbs down to democracy." *Guardian*, 12 December 2021. <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2021/dec/12/xi-jinping-china-beijing-new-age-of-imperialism>
- [23] Steven Lee Myers, "An Alliance of Autocracies? China Wants to Lead a New World Order." *New York Times*, March 29, 2021. <https://www.nytimes.com/2021/03/29/world/asia/china-us-russia.html>; *Washington Post*, "Russia and China Announce a Bid to Make the World Safe for Dictatorship," [editorial]. February 7, 2022. <https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/2022/02/07/putin-xi-the-dictators-meet-at-olympics/>
- [24] Richard L. Harris and Armando A. Arias, "China's South-South Cooperation with Latin America and the Caribbean," *Journal of Developing Societies* 32, Number 4 (2016): p. 522.
- [25] Douglas Farah and Kathryn Babineau, "Extra-regional Actors in Latin America: The United States is not the Only Game in Town," *Prism* 8, number 1 (2019): p. 106.
- [26] Dmitri Trenin, quoted by Angela Stent, *Putin's World against the West and with the Rest*. New York, 2019.
- [27] "Joint Statement of the Russian Federation and the People's Republic of China on the International Relations Entering a New Era and the Global Sustainable Development," February 4, 2022.

[28] Brendan O'Boyle, "Yaku Perez: The New Face of Ecuador's Left?" *Americas Quarterly*, February 1, 2021. <https://www.americasquarterly.org/article/yaku-perez-the-new-face-of-ecuadors-left/>

[29] Juan Karita, "Evo Morales Returns Triumphant to Bolivia After Exile." *Wall Street Journal*, November 9, 2020.

[30] Democracy Now, "After Evo: As Right-wing Senator Declares Herself President, What's Next for Bolivia?" November 13, 2019. https://www.democracynow.org/2019/11/13/bolivia_evo_morales_coup_debate_pt2

[31] I reach this conclusion partially based on my experience in the Venezuelan solidarity movement, and specifically my interaction with over twenty solidarity groups in the U.S. and Canada in 2018.

[32] William Camacaro, interview, February 19, 2022.

[33] Steve Ellner, "What Washington Fears Most of President Lula da Silva," *Rebelión.org*, November 7, 2022.

[34] This thesis is called "the theory of democratic peace".

[35] Joshua Muravchik, "'Scoop' Jackson at One Hundred: The Conscience of a Neoconservative Giant," *Commentary* 134, number 1 (2021): p. 27.

[36] In 2020, the Communist Party of Venezuela (PCV) broke with the Maduro government and placed it basically in the same category as the Venezuelan opposition. In its analysis of the government, the CPV downplays the importance of imperialism, as I put it in my article titled "Objective Conditions in Venezuela, Maduro's Defensive Strategy and Contradictions among the People," to be published in *Science and Society*.

Steve Ellner is a retired professor at Universidad de Oriente in Venezuela and is currently associate editor of the journal *Latin American Perspectives*. He is the author of *The Chávez Phenomenon: Its Origins and Its Impact* (2014). His latest books are *Latin American Extractivism: Dependency, Resource Nationalism, and Resistance in Broad Perspective* (edited, 2021); and *Latin American Social Movements and Progressive Governments: Creative Tensions between Resistance and Convergence* (co-edited, 2022).

Published in *Monthly Review* (March 2023)

Translated with the help of Carmen Sánchez de Ellner and Michelle María Ellner
Rebelión has published this article with the permission of the author through a [Creative Commons license](#), respecting his freedom to publish it in other sources.

Rebellion 29.03.2023