

THE POLITICS OF EXCLUSION AND REPRESSION AND BEYOND – U.S. NORTH AMERICAN POLICIES IN THE GLOBAL CONTEXT

Petri Minkkinen*

Recibido: 9 Mayo 2006 / Revisado: 26 Junio 2006 / Aceptado: 1 Julio 2006

INTRODUCTION

In this article it is my purpose to explain how the United States policies in geographical North America (Mexico, USA and Canada –and to certain less formal extent also Central America and Caribbean) are interconnected to US global new imperialist and integral fascist policies and global resistance towards these policies. These policies in themselves can be seen representing both continuity (persistent historical territorial and non-territorial US expansion) and discontinuity (recent relative and absolute decline of US global power position and radical attempts to undo and prevent this unpreventable decline). The main argument of this article is that the politics of exclusion and repression inbuilt in new imperialism and integral fascism represented and promoted especially by the actual government of the United States can neither pre-empt nor undo her declining power position neither in North America nor globally. Despite this secular trend, radical, radical reformist and reformist social forces unsatisfied with the actual global condition and the general public as a whole should be aware and oppose the intentional policy of the actual US policy makers to promote such a global condition and perceptions of its nature that would allow and indeed force the dependent non-US ruling classes to adopt hard line ideology and hard line solutions they represent. In other words, the

US new imperialist and integral fascist ruling classes are in the process of trying to build a new historical bloc that would adopt their ideology and practices and create a hegemonic situation in which also the subordinate classes and social sectors would express their consent toward these policies. However, the new imperialist and integral fascist policies that maintain the First Real World War initiated by the first Bush administration, and the enduring material and human destruction and permanent insecurity caused by these policies will eventually undo the support and the possibilities to maintain these policies.

I begin by explaining what I mean by new imperialism, integral fascism and First Real World War. In relation to this discussion I will proceed by explaining the similarities between US decision to send more National Guard troops to her national borders and the Israeli policies against the peoples of Palestine and Lebanon. This is related to the problems created by capitalist globalization, such as the generalized socio-economic polarization and dissolution and consequent increased immigration the response to which of the rich capitalist countries is not to resolve the underlying problems but instead to construct barriers against the immigration as well as the general militarization of social problems¹. In this context I will also engage in a politically incorrect discussion on race and immi-

* Renvall Institute. University of Helsinki, Finland. E-mail: petri.minkkinen@helsinki.fi/petri.minkkinen@netsonic.fi.

¹ By the latter I mean unilateral and rich country lead military operations and unwillingness to tackle with these underlying social problems. In the actual world there are various problems that require external military intervention and I have proposed a non-imperialist and more democratic way to implement it through the Rapid-Deployment Forces of the United Nations. See Minkkinen, Petri, "The Decision-Making System of the United Nations Rapid Deployment Forces", *Alternatives* (forthcoming).

gration. Then I discuss the general antipathy especially among the US and but also the European ruling classes against democracy: the will represented by peoples in the polls is not respected when the winning party or coalition represents policies that are more or less in contrast with the perceived or actual interests of these ruling classes and dependent social sectors. In the end I discuss in more detail the policies of the United States in relation to the development of North American area and its extension in Central America and Caribbean which have traditionally been considered as integral parts of US sphere of influence and natural first tier areas for US territorial expansion as well as pacific conquest through economic and political means. In order to contextualize this discussion I will analyze the problems the US expansionist and new imperialist policies are facing in Europe, Eurasia and Latin America. I give special emphasis on the challenge the historical transformations in Mexico will produce for the US policies not only in North American area but also globally.

1. POLITICS OF EXCLUSION AND REPRESSION IN THE CONTEXT OF FIRST REAL WORLD WAR

With the pretext of the atrocities of 9-11-2001 the first Bush administration launched the First Real World War (FRWW) which includes wars of conquest, a war against terror and non-white others and a global network of internal civil wars. This global campaign can be seen as a First Real World War because it is a first worldwide war which is not – as were the so – called I and II World War and Cold War, which I have renamed as the I, II and III Eurocentric civil wars of the 20th century – fought primarily between the representatives of varying Eurocentric growth ideologies. Even though the FRWW clearly involves also economic objectives, such as promoting particular economic interests, especially non-deterritorialized economic interests, in the occupied territories and countries, it is primarily fought against the non-

white others in foreign countries and against the internal others –including non-white elements and internal dissidents– as well as promoting geopolitical interests especially but not only in Eurasia. Moreover, the new imperialist promoters of FRWW were interested in defending the declining US global position through aggressive globalized nationalism in the context of the crisis of global capitalism as well as implementing the politics of fear in order to curb down, repress and marginalize the increasingly strong global movement promoting alternatives to global economic policies based on marginalist neoclassical economism. In other words, in the latter case the purpose was to defend the declining US global position and defend global capitalism while replacing neo-liberal global capitalism with new imperialist global capitalism which was more in tune with the particular interests of the nationalist and pro-imperialist segments of the US ruling classes².

Moreover, when analyzed in the context of globalizing integral fascism, the most recent variety of domination of which based on the sense of superiority over the other races and increasingly also interracial and intraracial domination and subjugation justified on what can be called socio-racism, it can be seen how, in the context of Eurocentric globalization of the past 500 years the expansion and domination over the non-white others have obtained various modalities, while, at the same time, the basic tendency to foment and perpetuate the Eurocentric domination has remained more or less the same³. It is possible to analyze globalizing integral fascism as two basic modalities, light form of integral fascism and hard form of integral fascism. The light form of integral fascism is based more on economic domination, most recently in the context of neo-liberal political program based on neo-classical marginal economism and policy suggestions based on this ideological scheme. The expansion and domination is promoted more indirectly through national states, regional entities and international organizations, especially “economically” oriented and the overall objective ranges between

² See id., “New Imperialism and Beyond. Why New Imperialism Will Fail and Unseat Bush Administration?” *Historia Actual Online*, 4 (Primavera 2004) [article on line] Available from Internet at: <<http://www.online.historia-actual.com/hao/Volumes/Volume1/Issue4/esp/v1i4c6.pdf>>, 59-74; id., *KAKTUS, Bush ja Pohjois-Amerikan tulevaisuus. Kriittinen avointen historiallisten kontekstien tutkimus ja muuoksellinen politiikka*. Helsinki, Like, 2004; id., “The Decision-Making System...”, op. cit.

³ See and compare id., “El fascismo integral globalizante y la recreación de la dominación de pocos a los muchos”. *Relaciones Internacionales* (de próxima aparición).

economic liberalization and economic imperialism⁴. The racism proper and socio-racism are of a more subtle variety and the social control is delegated to economic forces and private social forces of the civil society. In the context of economic liberalization, the leading capitalists are protected through monopolistic practices while the majorities are forced on the mercy of market forces. The regulation of economy and increasingly economized social practices is left primarily to the market forces and the social control and dissident control is performed more by the private sector in the context of market fascism. In the context of representative liberal democracy the formal institutional democracy is developed, while, at the same time, the area within which democratic politics are applied is greatly diminished, for example through the new constitutionalism⁵. The hard form of integral fascism develops within and on the side of light form of integral fascism and becomes dominant as a defensive form in the context of socio-economic crisis which threatens the existence of the whole social system. Instead of indirect forms of expansion and domination, direct military forms become the central mode of social transformation and the promotion of geopolitical and particular economic interests. If in the case of Chile a military coup was orchestrated through proxies, now the total social transformation is attempted directly through new imperialist wars of conquest.

In the context of war and occupation the previous form of society is destroyed and a new is been attempted to construct piece by piece to serve the interests of the occupier, as in the case of Iraq through the II Iraq war. In the economic sphere, the non-deterritorialized interests regain their importance in relation to deterritorialized interests, the protectionist tendencies of the rich countries become increasingly punctuated, and, in the case of United States, an attempt is made to retrieve the economy from recession/depression through renewed military Keynesianism. In the context of generalized mistrust of the existing social order an attempt is made to suppress internal others and internal opposition through the fusion of private and public forms of social control and a coordinated policy is implemented against the human rights, civil liberties and personal rights with the pretext of the war on terror and non-white others. In the sphere of democratic politics, an attempt is made to undo democracy altogether, especially in the countries where democratic elections are about to bring into power political parties or groups whose policies are against the interests of Eurocentric powers. The electoral fraud and manipulation regain strength also but not only in the dominant promoter of globalized integral fascism, that is, the United States⁶ – where in practical terms an assault on democracy and an attempt to install a totalitarian form of government is been made⁷.

⁴ In the latter case the mode of domination and transformation comes close to direct military transformation, as in the case of Chile, where the economic imperialism – in the sense of total transformation of society at all levels (see Hinkelammert, Franz J., “El cautiverio de la utopía: las utopías conservadoras de capitalismo actual, el neoliberalismo y la dialéctica de las alternativas”. *Revista Pasos*, 50 (Noviembre-Diciembre 1993), 1-14) – was imposed through a military coup by local proxy military personnel though the mastermind of the coup was the Nixon-Kissinger administration and the CIA was directly involved in the orchestration of the coup. In the case of Mexico the transformation process was more indirect and based more on economic pressure, though the US embassy was also openly agitating for the revolt of the local capitalists in the early 1970's. See Minkkinen, Petri, *Meksikon 1900-luku. Vallankumouksellisen maan politiikka, talous ja ulkopoliittikka*. Helsinki, Gaudeamus (forthcoming).

⁵ On new constitutionalism, see e.g. Gill, Stephen, “The emerging world order and European change: The political economy of European Union”, in Ralph Miliband; Leo Panich (eds.), *Socialist Register: new world order?*. London, Merlin Press, 1992.

⁶ The traditional existence of electoral fraud in the United States has been discussed e.g. in Berlet, Chip; Lyons, Matthew N., *Right-Wing Populism in America. Too Close for Comfort*. New York/London, The Guildford Press, 2000; on the problems of the US elections of 2000 and the need to reform the US electoral system, see Minkkinen, Petri, “KAKTUS...”, op. cit; on the foreign electoral observation of and electoral fraud in the US elections of 2004, see *Proceso*, “Bajo la observación mexicana” (Homero Campa), 31 de octubre de 2004, 62-65; for the latter see also *Rolling Stone*, “Was the 2004 Election Stolen” (Robert F. Kennedy Jr.), June 1, 2006, in which the writer concludes that “After carefully examining the evidence, I’ve become convinced that the president’s party mounted a massive, coordinated campaign to subvert the will of the people in 2004”. Moreover, Kennedy reports that Lou Harris whom he describes as “the father of modern polling” told him that “Ohio was as dirty an election as America has ever seen”.

⁷ See and compare Minkkinen, Petri, “New Imperialism...”, op. cit; id., *KAKTUS...*, op. cit.; id., “El fascismo integral...”, op. cit. For a more comprehensive, detailed and also thematic (ideological, economic, political and socio-cultural) analysis of globalizing integral fascism, see *ibid.*

Even if it is possible to distinguish analytically and in practical terms a political program promoting neo-liberal capitalism and its globalization and a political program promoting new imperialist capitalism and its globalization as well as corresponding phases of light form of integral fascism and hard form of integral fascism, it is necessary to recognize their similarities with respect to promoting and perpetuating Eurocentric expansion and domination⁸. Here one may remember what Pablo González Casanova wrote in relation to the expansion of global economy promoted by the rich capitalist countries in their own terms which are contrary to the needs of poor countries which he analyzed as a global civil war against these poor countries⁹. This can also be analyzed in terms of pacific conquest, a concept which is familiar to the scholars of Mexican history and which denotes to the phase of economic and other indirect means of expansion and conquest promoted by the United States as an “alternative” to outright military expansion and conquest which used to be the standard practice during the phase of US continental expansion during the 19th century. Similar militaristic, jingoistic and also pre-emptive expansive militarism has been adopted also by the administra-

tions of George W. Bush in the context of the First Real World War. Crossing both of these forms of expansion and domination, the waves of immigrants originating at different times from different locations have been moving towards the United States. These immigrants have been tolerated in varying degree and in different ways by various social forces. However, the standard practice has been to consider the new immigrants, including the white European immigrants without British and Nordic descent, as inferior in relation to earlier conquerors and immigrants with this pedigree considered to be superior¹⁰. To be sure, one must also remember the genocide against the indigenous populations of North America and the importation of Negro slaves into the United States as well as the Mexican population which was forced to live within the territorial limits of the United States as a consequence of the US expansion, occupation and annexation. Moreover, the Mexicans were typically dismantled of their landholding properties and of other property rights in favour of the *norteamericanos* and in order to consolidate their dominance over these territories – against the letter and spirit of the Tratado de Guadalupe Hidalgo that was signed after the US-Mexican war of 1846-1848¹¹.

⁸ Despite the fact that the US was the leading Eurocentric capitalist power since the Second Eurocentric Civil War and has been the most ardent promoter of neo-liberal global capitalism and well as new imperialist global capitalism and that Europe and the European Union at its various phases of development has at least apparently and especially for intra-European purposes promoted socially more sensitive capitalism, both the EU and the US have persistently promoted world orders supporting the objectives that would preserve the Eurocentric predominance within each respective world order. While gaining leverage as a global power and at least apparently more open to giving more voice to other countries and entities outside the EU-US axis, there is no reason to presume the EU would be willing to reduce its global power in order to share it with these others. Quite the contrary, the EU has been willing to promote a multi-polar world order in order to lessen the post-war US predominance, one purpose of which is to foment its own leverage within this world order and, one may assume, to create a world order context within which it would be easier and less painful for the declining US to accommodate. On the other hand, the US is unwilling to promote a multi-polar world order due to their interest in recreating another “American century” and as I have explained (relying partly on the work of Immanuel Wallerstein) elsewhere, most of the recent catastrophic global problems are related to the clash between the reality of declining US global power and their willingness to counter this reality with a dystopic, violent and aggressive military counter-campaign in the context of the FRWW.

⁹ See González Casanova, Pablo, “Globalidad, neoliberalismo y democracia”, in Pablo González Casanova; John Saxe-Fernández (coordinadores), *El mundo actual: Situación y alternativas*. México D.F., UNAM y Siglo XXI, 1996, 50, who has used the term global civil war to imply a mode of economist or neo-colonial domination over the poor and poor countries.

¹⁰ See and compare Berlet, Chip; Lyons, Matthew N., *Right-Wing Populism...*, op. cit.; on the causes of migratory movements as a consequence of global capitalism and their relation to North America, see Minkkinen, Petri, *KAKTUS...*, op. cit.; id., “Toward a Political Community in North America”. *Revista de Historia Actual*, 3 (2005), 11-26.

¹¹ On the latter and the still effective demands by these Mexicans and their descendants (Chicanos) to implement Tratado de Guadalupe Hidalgo, see Gill, Mario, *Nuestros Buenos vecinos*. México D.F., Editorial Azteca S.A., 71-89; Gómez-Quíñones, Juan, *Política Chicana. Realidad y Promesa 1940-1990*. México D.F., Siglo XXI, 2004, 172. Among other things, this forceful attack on property rights and land rights –not to mention the land grab against the indigenous populations of North America– makes the permanent struggle of the US ruling classes against communism and communist menace quite unintelligent and deceitful. It is also one early reminder of the still continuing tendency of the US ruling classes to disrespect their international obligations.

In recent decades the Mexican immigration –which accelerated from the 1970's in the context of the emerging neo-liberal political program, the US induced rebellion of local capitalists and the growing economic difficulties– coupled with increasing Latino immigration for example from Central America has began to reconfigure ethnic-racial landscape of the United States. Latinos and especially Mexicans have emerged as a largest minority group, surpassing the position held previously by the African-Americans. Due to the growing resentment against the Mexican immigration among the political right supporting Republicans, also President William Clinton representing Democratic Party turned into a supporter of tighter border and immigration control in order to prevent Democrats critical on immigration moving toward Republicans. Even though the toughest backlash against immigration was imposed by the new imperialist George W. Bush administration in the context of the war on terror and non-white others, the tighter anti-immigration and border control policies were adopted already by the Clinton Administration, which was at the same time promoting neo-liberal capitalist globalization and regionalism, both of which increased the pressure for emigration in Mexico and increased the exploitation of labouring and non-owning classes also in the United States. In other words, the Clinton administration was promoting the policies of pacific economic conquest which, on one hand, fomented the backlash against neo-liberal political program and the global mobilization for alternatives, and, on the other hand, deepened the causes for emigration. Consequently, in the context of global economic crisis and increasingly strong movement for alternatives, the first Bush administration initiated the FRWW in order to prevent the US decline and to undo the realization of alternatives. Moreover, with the pretext of the war on terror and non-white others, it was able to foment

the construction of militarized Tortilla Wall against the Mexican immigration which served the purpose of responding to the demands favouring tighter control of immigration¹². At the same time, the same pretext allowed radically increased internal control of the immigrants and the political and ethnic internal others.

The control of borders and internal others is connected to the external expansion, among other things, through their relation to technological development and especially that of new control and military technology which is also one aspect interlinking pacific conquest and military expansion as well as light and hard forms of integral fascism. Technological development has historically often been connected to the development of military technology. Despite the relative decline of the public military expenditures of the US during the Clinton administration, in the overall context of pacific conquest and neo-liberal globalization the high-tech development was considered essential not only to foment transition to the so-called post-industrial society but also for the modernization of border control. This tendency has intensified during the Bush administrations, which at the same time increased massively the public military spending. This can also be analyzed in terms of dominant and dependent forms of integral fascism. The dominant form is been represented by the United States, which in the context of hard form of integral fascism has global and totalizing aspirations the purpose of which is to construct a new kind of world(-)empire¹³. Furthermore, we can analyze different categories of dependent forms of integral fascism. For example, the small technologically advanced countries of which in this context one can point at Israel which has emerged as small high-tech superpower¹⁴ with experience in the develop-

¹² However, the issue of immigration and border control is a complicated one both to the political conservatives-right represented by the Republicans and to the political liberals-left represented by the Democrats, as I discuss in the separate section on immigration and wall construction. Moreover, the current backlash against the immigrants and the Mexicans is not the first one as the US has occasionally engaged in massive deportations of the Mexicans, paradoxically especially from the territories the expansionist US had annexed from Mexico through illegal conquest.

¹³ On the discussion on new kind of world(-)empire, see Minkkinen, Petri, "New Imperialism...", op. cit; id., *KAKTUS...*, op. cit. Moreover, despite my description of the US as a dominant pole disseminating globalizing integral fascism, it is not my purpose to suggest the US would be successful with this respect; quite the contrary.

¹⁴ On more detailed the categorization, see id., "El fascismo integral...", op. cit., in which Finland is discussed as another example of a technologically advanced small country supporting the development of control technology through her transnational and largely foreign and especially US owned corporations. Mexico is discussed as a country in process of development with developed relations with the dominant pole of integral fascism, and which has adopted new methods and technologies of internal control with the help of the United States. Moreover, also the Mexican corporations have participated in the development of control technology.

ment of control technology. Moreover, Israel has been a testing laboratory of latest military technology and due to its special relation with the United States it also plays an important role in the US new imperialist policies in the Middle East and Eurasia. Israel is also one of the frontier locations of the Euro-US sphere¹⁵ in which the border control systems and walls are being constructed in order to fence out others considered inferior while, at the same time, internal control, supervision and militarization is strengthened¹⁶. Similar development has taken place on the US territorial borders, not only that with Mexico but also on the US-Canada border. Moreover, in the context of uprooting consequences of capitalist globalization and the war on terror and non-white others, the European Union has been developing similar though not yet as strong tendencies of fencing out the others and increasing internal control. In other words, in the context of the First Real World War, the new imperialists of the United States are making an attempt to construct a new hegemonic bloc (in Gramscian sense), within which the ideology and praxis of globalizing integral fascism in its hard form would be in the core of a new hegemonic consensus¹⁷.

2. EXCLUSION, WALL CONSTRUCTION AND TERROR AGAINST NON-WHITE OTHERS

Capitalist modernity uproots people around the world. In the case of neo-liberal pacific conquest this uprooting takes place through the destruction of local economies especially but not only

in the poor countries. On the other hand, in the case of new imperialist capitalism, uprooting and displacement takes place more directly through military conquest or military terror destructing local economies, especially in the countries inhabited by the non-white others. Moreover, in the first case, we can detect a certain degree of incentives for international transborder human movement when especially specialized key personnel is allowed to cross borders with relative ease, for example, in order to facilitate operations between different locations of production processes of the transnational corporations. In general, transborder movement of the upper social classes becomes easier whereas that of the lower social classes is not necessarily encouraged; an exception to that rule is the temporary movement of lower class rich country habitants in the form of tourism which can be seen also as a variety of reproduction of the labouring capacity of labour force¹⁸. However, international movement of rich country inhabitants is not generally forbidden through regulations, despite the fact that the United States has sanctioned international movement of its citizens in the case of Cuba. In the case of new imperialist capitalism and hard form of integral fascism we can detect a certain form of perverse equalization: in the context of external exclusion and strengthened internal surveillance promoted with the pretext of the war on terror and non-white others we all are treated as criminals and potential terrorists, for example in the entry points to the United States. Despite this perverse equalization, it is necessary to underline the racist and culture specific aspects of the war on terror and

¹⁵ In this context it is possible to consider a relatively coherent Euro-US sphere, despite the fact that there are differences between the EU and the US positions in relation for example to global governance.

¹⁶ One of the paradoxes of the present constellation is that many of the ideological and practical promoters of the new imperialist policies of the United States are Jews, despite the fact that anti-Semitism has historically been strong also in the United States. It can be said that the promoters of the new imperialist policies are also promoting militant form of Zionism while, at the same time, promoting their cruder geopolitical interests which co-inside with those of hard line Israelis. Moreover, the new imperialists of the US and the militant Zionists in Israel are implementing anti-Semitic policies against non-Jewish Semites in Middle East. At the same time the aggressive and expansive US policies have been and are radicalizing populations in Islamic countries, thus mixing crude geopolitical interests with the expectations of Armageddon which are strong in certain sects of the US religious Christian right (see and compare Minkkinen, Petri, *KAKTUS...*, op. cit.; for a more detailed discussion on Christian right in the US and its relation to Armageddon, see Berlet, Chip; Lyons, Matthew N., *Right-Wing Populism...*, op. cit.). One may assume that in the case the US continues with such policies in the present context of FRWW, they may eventually be able to make the Armageddon prophecy a self-fulfilling prophecy, thus making the present global war situation even more disastrous as it already is.

¹⁷ See and compare Minkkinen, Petri, "El fascismo integral...", op. cit.

¹⁸ Compare e.g. Baumann, Zygmunt, *Globalization. The Human Consequences*. Cambridge, Polity Press, 1998, according to whom in the context of capitalist globalization which promotes social polarization privileged social sectors can move around the world easily while those outside this privileged strata are forced to immobile locality, also in the rich countries.

non-white others, due to the fact that non-white others and especially non-Jewish Semites and other inhabitants of Islamic counties are subjected to special scrutiny. Furthermore, even with this specification, in the case of the United States, the Mexicans and Central Americans as well as Latinos in general –in addition to the historical discrimination against them at the entry points and within the borders– have been increasingly treated as potential terrorists, a practice which, among others measures, is intended to limit and regulate their immigration to the United States¹⁹. In the case of European Union, similar though not necessarily as drastic restrictions are targeted against the immigrants especially from Mahreb-countries and well as Sub-Saharan Africans²⁰.

We can analyze the uprooting and displacement of people as forms of capitalist Stalinism. In the case of neo-liberal pacific conquest this process can be called economic Stalinism and in the context of new imperialist capitalism military Stalinism²¹. Besides the recent application of both varieties we can also detect historical examples of both variations. For example, the 19th century enclosures in Great Britain analyzed by Karl Polanyi can be seen representing economic Stalinism (or its legally imposed preparatory phase)²². Similar liberal-economic legal reforms took place in Mexico

during 1850's when, among other things, the Catholic Church's excessive landholdings, within which also indigenous peoples were protected a semi-paternalistic way, were redistributed through state measures and later during the Carlos Salinas administrations (1988-1994) attack on *Ejido*-landholding system through constitutional reforms. In general, the uprooting and displacement promoted by economic Stalinism takes place through economic destruction caused by unequal competition of economic forces in the context of economic "liberalization" or as a combination of the previous and legal changes supporting it. Military Stalinism, on the other hand, takes place through military conquest (or other military or paramilitary action which does not at least immediately result as territorial conquest) and expansion as happened in beginning of the broad historical context of Eurocentric globalization after the 1492 "discovery" of the Americas and in the later Anglo-European conquest of the indigenous territories in North America²³ as well as in the context of military conquest of the Mexican territories during the US-Mexican war of 1846-48²⁴. More recently military Stalinism has been promoted for example in the contexts of the US new imperialist II Iraq war and the proxy war Israel has waged against Hezbollah and more generally against the Lebanese²⁵. Common thing uniting economic and

¹⁹ For example, in May-June 2006 2179 undocumented immigrants were arrested around the United States in the context of Operation Return to Sender, whom according to the US Secretary of Internal Security were considered, among other things, as foreign criminals and threats to public security in hundreds of US neighbourhoods and communities (*La Jornada*, 15 de junio de 2006).

²⁰ However, it is necessary to keep in mind that in the case of European Union, many potential immigrants have been placed in detention centres such as those in Malta (see, e.g. *El País*, 25 de junio de 2006). These detention centres can be seen as one variety of concentration camp, as is also the case of illegal detention camps of Guantanamo, even if they are targeted towards a different kind of external threat. However, it is possible to say that the pretext of the war on terror and non-white others serves as a fomenting factor in both camp types.

²¹ This is also related to the discussion on what capitalism exactly means. For example in the context of world-systems analysis it has been possible to analyze Soviet communism/real socialism/state capitalism not as a something outside the capitalist world-system but as an integral variation within this system. On this discussion see Minkkinen, Petri, *KAKTUS...*, op. cit.

²² See Polanyi, Karl, *The Great Transformation. The Political and Economic Origins of Our Time*. Boston, Beacon Press, 1957.

²³ Expulsion and displacement promoted through military Stalinism can also be continued through legal action as happened as recently as in 1953 when the US House of Representatives wanted to end the Indian' "status as wards of the United States, and grant them all of the rights and privileges pertaining to American citizenship" (See Berlet, Chip; Lyons, Matthew N., *Right-Wing Populism...*, op. cit., 171, according to whom this can also be "Stated more bluntly, the new policy was the 'termination' of tribal communities and the renewed break-up of Native land holdings").

²⁴ To a certain degree the latter can be seen also representing military Stalinism within military Stalinism, as a renewed conquest of the territories colonized earlier by the Spaniards and settled by the Mexicans.

²⁵ Though these wars and conflicts are beyond the precise scope of this article, the long civil war of Somalia and the genocide of Rwanda can be analyzed, at least partially, in terms of military Stalinism and also in the light of intraracial aspect of integral fascism.

military forms of capitalist Stalinism is that they both uproot and displace people from their native or settlement lands either permanently or in a temporary manner and that they strengthen the migratory movements and recently, besides intra-country migration, especially that from poorer countries to the rich capitalist countries²⁶.

In the extreme hypothetical case, the capitalist globalization produces similar results as did the extinguished Soviet model. If in the latter case a hypothetical possibility was a complete and possibly global concentration of economic activity into a single public monopoly, in its completed phase the former produces a global private monopoly corporation²⁷. In a regionalized extreme case, the result could be a cluster of regional private monopolies, from the global point of view a regionalized system of private oligopolies. In a similar manner, it is possible to think that in the case of extreme economic Stalinism, the consequence of world-wide uprooting could be a concentration of all peoples into one mega-city somewhere in the world (probably in a rich world country) or in a regionalized case into a cluster of macro-regional mega-cities. Even in the less extreme cases, the unconstrained capitalist globalization will result as a mass-migration from the poor countries and areas to the rich parts of the world. This process produces inevitable transformations both in the exit areas and in the receiving areas which can be seen as positive or ne-

gative phenomenon depending on the particular world-views and from the point of view of class and material interests. Though capitalist class or private sector engaged in economic activity in general has differing and at least partially competing interests, it is possible to analyze the cases of monoculturalism (or, in this case, monoethnic society) and multiculturalism (multiethnic society)²⁸.

Monocultural societies are more homogeneous in relation to ethnicity or race based culture though not necessarily so in relation to social classes or groups. Thus being the internal class related social problems and conflicts are more visible and it is more difficult to transform social problems into conflicts between different ethnicities or ethnicity based social classes. This situation also inhibits the possibility to blame some ethnic group for social problems related to class related social inequalities. Therefore, in the context of monoculturalism, it is more difficult for the ruling classes to ignite interracial conflict and/or hatred as a pretext for not promoting emancipative social transformations which aim at increasing social equality. However, also in the case of monoculturalism it is possible to blame external others for the internally originated social problems²⁹. Here it is possible to point at traditionally monocultural Nordic countries in which it has been possible to promote social reforms within the existing social system³⁰. On the other hand, in the context of multiracial and mul-

²⁶ To be sure, in the context of capitalist modernity and capitalist globalization, the intra-country migratory movements take place also within the rich capitalist countries and, also, though in considerably more limited way, there is migration from rich countries to poorer countries.

²⁷ See and compare Minkkinen, Petri, *KAKTUS...*, op. cit.

²⁸ However, in practice, there are no pure cases of monoculturalism or multiculturalism –except possible in some isolated mini-cultures– and thus most if not all societies are closer to either of these pure types.

²⁹ In the contemporary world most social problems are not only internal though it is possible to say that the internal problems of some countries can be turned into global problems.

³⁰ However, in the context of capitalist globalization the welfare systems of Nordic countries have also been under considerable pressure and the relatively recent influx of considerable numbers of immigrants have begun to transform these countries from monocultural toward multicultural societies. However, of these countries one can point at Finland in which the new multiculturalism is still relatively thin and in which the welfare system has faced more severe cuts than in Sweden which can be considered a more multicultural society. On the other hand, the mainly Swedish speaking upper class in Finland was during the Finnish civil war of 1918 generally in the conservative “white” camp which blamed the Bolshevik elements of Russian revolution for poisoning the minds of Finnish labourers and small peasants which supported the “reds”. Thus in this case the external others were blamed for the conflict which arose from internal social problems, though, also in this case the external revolutionary atmosphere did play a role. Israel is another example of a country which has tried to maintain a monocultural society and in which the existence of external other (though in the case of Palestinians co-Semites) and especially that represented by those displaced in order to establish a Jewish state has allowed the militarization of this country and recently facilitated ignoring the increasing social inequalities as well. In a sense this is also related to the discussion by Kathleen and Bill Christison (*CounterPunch*, “The Rise of the Israel Lobby: A Measure of Its Power”, 13, 10, 16-31 May 2006, 8) that “The specific groups that now dominate the U.S. government are the globalized arms, energy, and financial industries, and the entire military establishments, of the U.S. and Israel – groups that have quite literally hijacked the government and stripped it of most vestiges of democracy.”

multicultural societies it is easier to do the inverse, i.e. promote suspicion between different races/ethnic groups and cultural groups. This has been the case for example in the United States where the colonialist and expansionist white ruling classes have traditionally played the race card in order to maintain the social system favouring them. Besides facilitating the justification of the unethical and illegal conquest Indian and Mexican territories, the race card has with some exceptions made it possible to maintain unjust social system³¹. Racial views of supremacy have also increased the coherence between the whites. Moreover, it has been possible to ignite racial suspicion and hatred against the Indians, the African-Americans and the Mexicans as well as all new groups of immigrants in order to promote social control of lower classes and inhibit social changes. New white immigrants –though of “lower” categories– have after the initial status of inferior immigrant, been elevated into the status of respectable white whereas the Indians, the African-Americans and the Mexicans have generally remained in the category of internal other. Therefore, the new flows of immigrants and the existence of traditional internal others have facilitated the maintenance of injustices in the context of the highly exaggerated component of the myth of American Dream, one variety of which is the presupposition that everyone can become a billionaire capitalist³².

Also in the case of multicultural society it is possible to turn attention from internal problems by blaming external others. In the case of the United States this can also be projected to the global level, as happened in the context of S-11-2001 and consequent implementation of new imperialist policies and hard form of integral fascism. However, in this case some internal problems were of glo-

bal scale, such as the perceived necessity to combat against the declining US global position³³. Moreover, with this pretext it was also possible make an attempt to counter the macro-regional and internal problem presented by the prospect of increasing Mexican immigration, which, in the context of increasing global and regional socio-economic polarization, will proceed and promote internal transformation also in the United States and promote peaceful *reconquista*, in a sense of re-migration to the Mexican territories obtained by the US through military expansion and forced acquisitions. Even if the tighter anti-immigrant measures had been implemented already during the Clinton administration, the new imperialist policies and the First Real World War promoted by the Bush administrations elevated these measures to a new and unprecedented level³⁴. However, within the classes engaged in economic activity there continued to be frictions in relation to the pro-immigration policies favouring labour imports and the policy line advocating tighter border and internal control policies. This friction has been visible in the vacillating immigration policy strategy of the Bush administration and effectively there have been attempts to combine these policy lines both of which promote the interests of the ruling classes: importing immigrant labour force which contributes to the lowering of labour standards and foments the possibilities to use interracial frictions to prevent social reforms and elevating border and internal control which allows the exclusion of unwanted external others and the control and suppression of internal others and transformative political activity. At the same time the Bush administration promoted policies which continue to uproot and displace peoples not only in Mexico but also globally, effec-

³¹ For example the New Deal policies of Franklin D. Roosevelt is a partial exception to that rule, even though the reform programs promoted did not benefit much Chicano-Mexicans because they excluded many agricultural day labourers (*jornaleros*) and those who did not have US citizenship (on the latter, see Gómez-Quiñones, Juan, *Política Chicana...*, op. cit., 51-52).

³² Another myth belonging to the category of “American Exceptionalism” is that the US workers and lower social classes do not unite to defend their rights (though not necessarily in the context of imported European ideas of socialism and communism). There is, in fact, a strong history of collective mobilization and radicalism but also a strong tradition of repression against it. On the discussion on the history of US ruling classes to maintain internal hegemony in Gramscian sense and its demise in the context of S-11-2001 and new imperialist and internal control policies, see Minkinen, Petri, *KAKTUS...*, op. cit.

³³ For a broader analysis of the reasons to implement new imperialist policies that had been planned already in advance, see id., “New Imperialism...”, op. cit; id., *KAKTUS...*, op. cit.

³⁴ Despite the fact that before the S-11-2001 the administration of Vicente Fox was promoting a large scale immigration reform in the United States and the Bush administration was responding quite positively.

tively fusing, in the militarized and repressive context of the FRWW, the negative consequences of peaceful conquest and new imperialist military conquest. These policies are contradictory which explains, among other things, why this new imperialist administration is advocating the adoption of hard line form of integral fascism globally.

Despite the claims of the new imperialist governments of Bush, the aggressive global nationalist policies of new imperialism and hard line integral fascism have not promoted either democracy or global (internal and external) peace and stability. Quite the contrary, the policies of Bush administration, which itself cannot claim governing on undisputed popular vote, have promoted war, terror and global instability. Moreover, it seems evident that by implementing these aggressive and repressive expansionist policies which, in turn, increase polarization, radicalization and effectively supports also the recruitment of organizations willing to resort to force in order to promote their objectives, they are, purposefully or not, creating circumstances in which it would be *seemingly* reasonable for other governments and entities to adopt these policies. However, this option is not and cannot be reasonable if one considers democracy and social stability based on social equality and human freedom desirable objectives due to the fact that policies based on new imperialism and integral fascism of hard form can only result as an authoritarian or totalitarian form of government which have not historically been sustainable and always create resistance to overcome such the purpose of which a social condition. Therefore, unless one prefers totalitarian form of government (nationally, regionally or globally) in the context of which a continuous cycle of revenge (repression and resistance in various forms) becomes a social norm, which seems to be the objective of the Bush administrations, such policies should be actively resisted instead of adopting them. Moreover, instead of adopting these policies promoted by the Bush administrations as a dystopic alternative, it is advisable to adopt real alternatives which prevent the negative

consequences of pacific conquest and new imperialism as well as consequent forms of integral fascism³⁵.

Before engaging this discussion and while noting that the policies of Bush administrations have failed or faced tremendous difficulties in Eurasia, Latin America, Europe and also in geographical North America including Mexico³⁶, it is necessary to analyze the negative consequences of capitalist modernity and capitalist globalization as well as the policies of border control, wall construction and terror on non-white others in the United States, Europe and Israel. It is evident that especially in the context of the FRWW and the war on terror and non-white others the logic of capitalist modernity which promotes global migration can be seen as one major cause behind the increased surveillance and control which – while having their own at least to a certain degree their own logic – tend to promote the existing and increasing private and public social control. The latter is seen necessary at least certain parts of the ruling and well-to-do classes in order to protect their privileges against the lower social classes and unwanted others, which, as we all in the context of hard form of integral fascism, are treated as criminals and potential terrorists. While this is most evident in the United States and Israel, similar tendencies are present in European Union. In the case of latter, and as a consequence of the aggressive US policies, there has been a perceived pressure to reinforce the existing Schengen area control. Within this Euro-American sphere, the elements in favour of the hard line aggressive policies of the Bush administrations tend to support the construction of the dual fortress of United States-European Union while promoting protectionist economic policies within the overall context of economic “liberalization”. Within this zone border control and wall construction are promoted in the US against the Mexican immigrants (while Mexico performs the function of buffer zone against the immigration from Central America) and in Southern Europe against the immigrants from Mahreb-countries (which, in a sense, also form a buffer zone against the immigrants from Sub-Saharan

³⁵ More on this in the section “Beyond Exclusion and Repression: Undoing New Imperialism and Integral Fascism”.

³⁶ In the case of European Union, the inclusion of Eastern European countries to the Union strengthened at least temporarily the pro-US forces within the Union. Moreover, the official Great Britain of Tony Blair has remained faithful to the new imperialist and also hard form integral fascist policies of Bush administration. On the other hand, the overall criticism of new imperialist policies has remained strong among the EU-Europeans and the electoral victories of left parties in Spain and Italy reduced further the official European support for the new imperialist war in Iraq. However, the NATO troops in Afghanistan have effectively supported the US policies in Eurasia.

Africa. Israel is a special case within this dual fortress scheme, which, while being a state conceived as monocultural state and serving the function of an Eastern buffer against the Islamic world, is also central element in the US new imperialist policies in the Middle East and Eurasia³⁷.

In the case of the United States, the discussion on immigration reform has been conflated with the plans to foment further the border control, which have included increased electronic surveillance at the entry points, registration of Mexican citizens and those of many other Latin American countries into specific data bases (similar broader scale scheme takes place through biometric passports), increased militarization of the border zone as well as outright wall construction. Moreover, the control on the border zone and outside the US territory has included co-operation with Mexican authorities not only in relation to Mexico-US border but also in relation to Mexico's borders with Central American countries as well as through "development plans" such as Puebla-Panama Plan (PPP). In reality, the PPP as the other development plans and economic liberalization schemes related to pacific conquest would in practice only promote uprooting and displacement. After the S-11-2001 the US borders with Mexico and Canada were temporarily closed and despite the relaxation of this total closure, the efforts to tighten border control have not ended. Quite the contrary, in the context of recent and ongoing discussion on immigration reform, new steps toward the construction of the Fortress USA were taken³⁸ through the new deployment of US National Guard Forces on the US-Mexican Border with a capacity to be redeployed rapidly to the US-Canadian border. The latter is clearly perceived as less volatile but still a possible entry point of "un-American" elements that could pose a threat to the "American Way of Life", which, far from being a route to happiness it was supposed to be, has in

recent years evolved as a territorial prison also for the US citizens despite the fact that progress has been made in decapitating the most extravagant features of the Bush governments policies inside the US.

Within the overall context of the FRWW and the war on terror and non-white others, it is possible to point at the evident similarities in the border control plans of the United States – which, while having a history of genocide, anti-Semitism and repression and persecution of internal and external others, has a national self-conscience conceiving itself representing New Israel with a providential purpose – and the actual war prone behaviour of the state of Israel which (and together with the USA and EU did not approve the democratic victory of Hamas in Palestine) had again launched a war-like operation against the Palestinians of Gaza and soon after a more clear traditional war against Lebanon³⁹. It is evident that the Israeli military aggression in Gaza and Lebanon of which especially the latter has been described as a defensive war are related to the overall new imperialist policies of the US in Eurasia. Despite the fact the new imperialist wars of conquest in Afghanistan and Iraq have not ended (though the US may withdraw at least some of its troops from Iraq relatively soon), there may be some spare capacity of the US new imperialist occupation forces to launch a military campaign against Iran which has all the long been the ultimate target of "democratization" in this area. Both in the US and in Israel there have been attempts to link the Gaza and Lebanon "problems" to Iran and its alleged support for Hamas and Hezbollah. Moreover, despite the ceasefire and the strategically delayed decision to deploy UN peace enforcement forces to Southern Lebanon, there is no reason to presuppose the new imperialist US government has dismissed the plan to invade or otherwise "democratize" Iran, even if the

³⁷ Russia is also related to the anti-Islamic (and also internal surveillance and repression) parts of the FRWW and the war on terror and non-white others and while Russia has competing interests in Eurasia, its policies against the Islamic elements of Chechnya have been carried out in tacit informal cooperation with or at least with approval of the US. Also India is an element in the war and exclusion against the Islamic world inside India as well as in Pakistan and there has been some discussion that Pakistan has already served its purpose in the war on terror and non-white others and the US has shifted its priorities more towards India.

³⁸ Incidentally the initial purpose was to send new troops to Mexico-US border just before Mexico's presidential elections of July 2, 2006. However, as this notorious coincidence arose to public discussion, the troop deployment was carried through earlier than planned.

³⁹ Both of these operations are at least supposedly derivatives of kidnapping of Israeli soldiers – one in the case of Gaza and two in the case of Southern Lebanon – while at the same time Israel have imprisoned hundreds of Palestinians and Lebanese.

counter-war waged by Hezbollah has been described as a victory⁴⁰.

The strategically delayed decision to act and deploy international UN forces to Lebanon in partial manner (that is, only to be placed in Lebanon and to promote disarmament only on the side of Hezbollah and to stop arms sales only to Hezbollah, without similar measures on Israeli side) underlines the necessity to proceed with the realization of international non-imperialist rapid deployment forces, as I have outlined in a scheme for the United Nations Rapid Deployment Forces (UNRDF) and their decision-making system. These forces could be deployed, among other things, as non-imperialist forces in the Middle-East in order to allow more impartial solution to present problems in Middle-East, which are related to the broader US new imperialist policies in Eurasia. This would be important due to the fact that a new imperialist power supporting Israeli policies can hardly be expected to fulfil such a task. As the Israeli policies in Lebanon have been described also as politics of genocide, it would be possible to deploy the UN rapid deployment forces not only to the Lebanese side of the border in order to stabilize this area and to stop the Hezbollah counter-attack but also on the Israeli side of the border in order to inhibit Israeli incursions to Lebanon and to stop Israel's bombardment not only against Hezbollah bases but also against Lebanese civilian population, which has suffered enormously of the Israeli aggression. Moreover, as it has again proved to be the case, the new imperialist United States has inhibited the possibilities of the UN Security Council to act rapidly in order to implement immediate ceasefire and allowed Israel to do the dirty work against Hezbollah, a strategy which supports the general US objectives in the area and especially to undermine and ultimately overthrow the Iranian government⁴¹, it is important to change the decision-making system deciding on the use of UN peace keeping forces as well as the emerging UNRDF. The combination of democratic and expert selection of the decision-makers of the organ deciding on the use of the UNRDF would, as I have suggested, allow rapid decision-making of the

use of these forces in the cases of genocide or other serious breach against human rights and human life. This would represent considerable improvement in relation to the actual system in the context of which especially the permanent member-states can prevent efficient decision-making in order to serve their new imperialist designs or other self-interested policies.

Moreover, the European Union could take more active role in the Middle-East peace process. The EU could, for example, renew its economic support not only to Lebanon but also to the present Palestinian government. This would, among other things, help to reverse the tendency that the EU and the US do not respect democracy as has clearly been the case with Hamas-led government of Palestine. This is important also due to the fact that the political radicalization in Eurasia is clearly a result of the US expansionist policies and overall capitalist globalization. Moreover, the European Union should consider economic sanctions against Israel, due to its militarist and expansionist policies in the Middle-East. However, it became evident that the pro-US countries supporting the new imperialist policies of the United States within the European Union (such as the Great Britain, following the policies of Tony Blair government to give its unconditional support to the US expansionist policies, and Poland, supporting, among other things, the torture policies of the Bush governments) did their utmost to hinder efficient EU mandate to stop the Israeli policies of aggression. Thus, not only national governments of the EU member-states but also the representatives of EU foreign policy and the member-state holding the EU chairmanship should be actively involved not only in resolving the actual crisis in the Middle-East but also in the promotion of the creation of the UNRDF and their decision-making system. Moreover, the European Union, other governments and entities as well as global civil society should act in order to end the policies and practices of peaceful conquest as well as new imperialist military conquest and related forms of capitalism and integral fascism, as causes and consequences leading towards the wall construction and generalized

⁴⁰ Both the Israelis and Hezbollah have described their actions before the ceasefire as victorious.

⁴¹ While at the same time the US government is using the Security Council to promote the policies against the Iranian plans to develop country's nuclear power, thus playing the dual game within the UN system and using proxy's to inhibit the development of EU Middle-East and Eurasian policies that might hinder US new imperialist designs.

systems of control and repression. This requires too, among other things, respecting and promoting democracy, also, but not necessarily only, in its actual liberal democratic representative form, as a way to the citizens to select their political leaders according to the will of people as expressed at the polls.

3. FORMAL DEMOCRACY ALLOWED BUT ONLY IF YOU VOTE AS WE WANT

Despite the fact that at the discursive level all or most relevant actors are in favour of democracy, in practice it has become evident that the rich capitalist countries are highly ambivalent in relation to liberal representative democracy which in principle has emerged as a predominant form of political democracy⁴². In a sense this is nothing new because the attitude of ruling classes and dominant powers in relation to democracy has varied in different historical contexts. After the Second Eurocentric Civil War and in the context of the Third Eurocentric Civil War the United States often imposed military dictatorships in Latin America and orchestrated coups against democratically elected governments for example in Guatemala and Chile. The latter took place in the context in which the excesses of democracy were criticized in the United States by the Trilateral Commission, neo-liberal/neoconservative social forces strengthened in the United States and the US government and economic forces not only staged a military coup in Chile but also propagated for a rebellion of local capitalists in Mexico during the first part of 1970's⁴³. Throughout the 1980's the United States operated indirectly (or semi-directly) in order to prevent social transformations in Central America, especially in Nicaragua, and

supported authoritarian regimes in order to prevent social changes in other countries of the region and promoted pacific conquest in Mexico. Recently, in the context of pacific conquest and neo-liberal capitalist globalization there was a moment during which liberal representative democracy was relatively generally accepted, in a limited way in the form of capitalist democracy, neo-liberal new constitutionalism or low intensity democracy⁴⁴. However, the electoral fraud by the ruling party PRI was accepted by foreign powers in Mexican presidential elections of 1988 and a military intervention which was related to elections was realized by the US in Panama in 1989. During the 1990's democratization (for example in Mexico) and representative democracy were tolerated and even supported for example in Latin American countries because in the context of limited representative democracy the political representatives elected by popular vote had no real possibilities to make decisions that could threaten in serious manner the internal and external economic and other vital interests. At the same time the Western powers such as the US and France accepted a military coup to cancel parliamentary elections in Algeria which the Islamic Salvation Front (FIS) had won and later supported army and paramilitary terror –masqueraded (at least partially) as Islamist terror in order to discredit them– against country's population⁴⁵.

In the context of new imperialist capitalism and hard form of integral fascism, democracy, which was previously most often tolerated in its limited form, is increasingly seen as a potential threat, which must be eliminated or made otherwise redundant. It can be suggested that those social forces in favour of new imperialist expansion and hard form of integral fascism tend to prefer the

⁴² Not to speak of other forms of democracy, for example more direct democracy or various possible forms of transnational democracy.

⁴³ See Minkkinen, Petri, *Meksikon 1900-luku...*, op. cit.

⁴⁴ On these see e.g. Dryzek, John S., *Democracy in Capitalist Times. Ideals, Limits, and Struggles*. New York/Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1996; Gill, Stephen, "The emerging world...", op. cit.; Torres-Rivas, Edelberto, "Centroamérica: democracias de baja intensidad". *Estudios Latinoamericanos*, III-5 (1988), 30-37; on the democratization of Mexico in global context, see Minkkinen, Petri, "La democratización de México en el contexto mundial. *Relaciones Internacionales*, Cuarta Época, 72 (Octubre-Diciembre 1996), 33-47.

⁴⁵ On the role of Western powers in Algeria, see Mosaddeq Ahmed, Nafeez, "Algeria and the Paradox of Democracy. The 1992 Coup, its Consequences and the Contemporary Crisis". *Media Monitors Network* [document on line] Available from Internet at: <<http://www.mediamonitors.net/mosaddeq4.html>>; On the 1996 constitution of Algeria, which justified *post facto* the decision to ban FIS in March 1992, see Bouandel, Youcef; Zoubir, Yahia H., "Algeria's elections: the prelude to democratization". *Third World Quarterly*, XIX-2 (1998), 177-190, whom, however, think that the provision of new constitution were "aimed at securing the parties commitment to democratic principles" and that its drafters had in mind FIS's promise to abrogate the republican constitution and ban secular parties.

promotion of geopolitical and particular economic interests through crude military force – even if pacific conquest is applied when possible – as well as general promotion of a future without democracy within the overall pretext to promote formal representative democracy. At the same time when the process of democratization in Mexico culminated in the electoral defeat of the previous ruling party Institutional Revolutionary Party (PRI) in the federal elections of 2000, the new imperialist forces in the United States secured their entry to power resorting to election fraud and manipulation and succeeded to elevate George W. Bush into presidency. Therefore, the practical contempt of democracy began already in the native state of new imperialists, which soon, with the pretext of 9-11-2001, began to export their worldview in the context of the First Real World War which included wars of conquest, the war on terror and non-white others and a global network of internal civil wars. The results of new imperialist conquest and concomitant anti-democratic “democracy promotion” have however been mixed. In Afghanistan and Iraq they succeeded in removing from power previous governments and installing puppet regimes⁴⁶ but failed miserably in ending and winning the wars in these countries. On the other hand, as the global economic crisis and the movement of alternatives to neo-liberal pacific conquest had begun to bring electoral victories to the leftist governments, the new imperialists have not, despite their failed attempt to organize a coup against the government of Hugo Chávez in Venezuela, been able to undo the transformations taking place in Latin America⁴⁷. Moreover, the overwhelming opposition against the illegal war in Iraq and the general understanding that the US war on terror and non-white others was not a remedy but has instead increased global instability, brought to political po-

wer left or left-leaning parties in Spain and Italy. Despite the fact that the Bush government succeeded in obtaining a second term in the elections of 2004, which were, as those of 2000, fraudulent (at least in the decisive key states Florida/Ohio), also this government and the obedient Blair government of Great Britain are about to face a similar electoral defeat given the abysmal failures of new imperialist conquest policies and the control policies of hard form integral fascism.

Unlike in the case of Bush administrations in the United States, the elections in the member-states of European Union have been credible in a sense that no electoral fraud has been taken place. However, as in the US elections of 2000, in Italy the juridical system had to step in order to decide winner of the elections⁴⁸. Moreover, it is possible to say the European Union is generally a least slightly more credible in its discourse and practices of democracy. However, also the EU has been biased in its relation to democracy in Islamic countries. Even if the cases of Algeria and Palestinian State are different, it is possible to see a general bias against more radical Islamic groups which are not as complacent with the objectives of economic expansion of European countries or with the general policies of the European Union. However, from the point of view of respecting democracy and popular vote in the elections, it is highly inconsistent and discouraging that the European Union did not tolerate the victory of radical Hamas in the elections of the Palestinian State, which were generally considered clean and free of fraud, whereas the EU was ready to accept the electoral victory of the new imperialists in the fraudulent US elections. On the other hand, if the decisive issue is the willingness to engage in terror in order to promote political objectives, one may ask, in what way the local scale defensive terrorism of Hamas is more harmful than

⁴⁶ Though the constitution building and election process in Iraq were described as victories of Bush administrations policies, these manipulated processes realized in the context of military occupation and thus allow the use of description “puppet regime”.

⁴⁷ This is at least partially related to the historical reality that in the context of war which involves confrontation between rich capitalist countries, the dependent countries have had a possibility to improve their position in global economy (See e.g. Minkkinen, Petri, *KAKTUS...*, op. cit; id., *Meksikon 1900-luku*, op. cit. The 9-11-2001 and new imperialist wars against Afghanistan and Iraq (especially the latter) caused frictions between the US and European countries and directed the main US attention to Eurasia. In this context the economic crisis in Argentina, which was neglected in the North (the US and the IMF in particular), paved way for the multistage change of government in Argentina and also strengthened the general tendency towards the political left in Latin America.

⁴⁸ As was the case also in Costa Rica (see Tello Díaz, Carlos, “El recuento de los votos. *Proceso*, 29 de julio de 2006) and is the case also in the Mexican elections, in which the state election process tries to impose a right wing candidate into presidency through electoral fraud.

the state terrorism and violent promotion of particular interests through new imperialist militarism and hard form integral fascism of the United States?⁴⁹ Also the United Nations has been involved in the promotion of democracy for example in the Democratic Republic of Congo. Despite the fact that many Congolese have accused the UN of favouring President Joseph Kabila, the UN was able to promote a cease-fire in the context of post-electoral violence of the elections, in which no candidate obtained a majority and in which runoff elections will be organized in October 2006⁵⁰.

From the point of view of North America and also more generally of the Americas and the future global development, a focal election point and the defence of democracy are the Mexican elections of July 2, 2006 in which especially the presidential elections have proved to be highly problematic and fraudulent and in relation to which there has been curious external neglect on and at least partial external partiality. In relation to the Mexican presidential election the ruling and political classes of European Union and the United States made an attempt to legitimate an electoral victory of the right wing party PAN candidate despite clear pre-electoral, election day and (at that time possible but now with certain temporal perspective evident) post-electoral fraud and an attempt to impose a state election candidate against the popular will as expressed in the polls. For example, not only new imperialist George W. Bush and conservative Canadian Prime Minister Stephen Harper but also Spain's socialist Prime Minister José Rodríguez Zapatero were ready to accept PAN-candidate Felipe Calderón's supposed victory on the basis of IFE's president councillor Luis Carlos Ugalde's (who has close familiar ties to Calderón) declaration that Calderón was a winner, even if Ugalde was not in the position to do so and the Federal Electoral Tribunal (el Tribunal Electoral del Poder Judicial de la

Federación, TEPJF) had not qualified the electoral process⁵¹. On the other hand, when it became evident that this announcement was premature and that the process was not concluded, even George W. Bush had to reverse his viewpoint and accept the possibility that López Obrador could be the real winner and the Spanish government sources informed they had no intention to prejudge final result. Moreover, Zapatero faced a wave of criticism in Spain for his premature congratulations, also from his own Socialist Workers Party (Partido Socialista Obrero Español, PSOE)⁵². Also the *Financial Times*, which, despite its nature as a representative of business class interests, was ready to accept Por el Bien de Todos coalitions (composed of Partido de la Revolución Democrática (PRD), Convergencia and Partido de Trabajo (PT)) candidate López Obrador's and clear majority of Mexicans legitimate demand of a total recount of all votes (voto por voto, casilla por casilla)⁵³.

As was the case of the previous Mexican federal elections these elections were observed by national and foreign electoral observers. For its part, the European Union election observation mission suggested that the electoral process was legitimate and that, among other things, the rapid vote counting (through the Program of Preliminary Electoral Results, PREP) realized by Instituto Federal Electoral (IFE) and other independent organizations was compatible with the official results. Moreover, the leader of the EU observation mission, euroMEP José Ignacio Salafranca Sánchez, representing also Spanish right-wing party Partido Popular (PP), suggested a few days after the election-day that so far there were no reports of incidents or irregularities that would compromise the vote counting process or have an impact on the results of the elections. However, he refrained from announcing a winning candidate and the EU observation mission informed that they are in favour of recounting all of the votes if it is done

⁴⁹ Moreover, most if not all European states have during some period of their history engaged in state terrorism. Also Israel has a history of terrorist guerrilla leaders and a present of state terrorism, and the objective of radical Zionists has been to push the Palestinians away from the territories belonging to the envisioned Greater Israel. In this latter case, what is the difference to the anterior and at least alleged actual objective of Hamas to push the Israelis to the Mediterranean, which has been at least the expressed reason of the EU to withdraw resources from the Hamas lead Palestinian government and effectively to discredit the democratic popular will of the Palestinians as expressed at the polls.

⁵⁰ *The New York Times*, 22 August 2006.

⁵¹ See *La Jornada*, 8 de Julio de 2006; on the denouncement by the Coalition leaders that the Program of Preliminary Electoral Results (PREP) is no instrument to declare a winner of the elections, see *La Jornada*, 4 de julio de 2006.

⁵² *La Jornada*, 11 de julio de 2006.

⁵³ *La Jornada*, 11 de julio de 2006.

within the parameters allowed by the law. The mission also recognized the right of Coalitions candidate Andrés Manuel López Obrador (AMLO) to question the elections through legal mechanisms and expressed their regrets that the recount had not been carried out as it would give more certainty on the just nature of the elections⁵⁴.

Even if the EU observation mission recognized the need for recount as demanded by López Obrador, the initial suggestion of the just nature of the elections was clearly contradictory with the observation results of local and other international election observers, academics, and civil society organizations among many others. For example, the Mexican pro-democracy election watchdog Alianza Cívica reported a great variety of traditional and new forms of election fraud and manipulation. Moreover, they criticized the partiality of IFE as well as the lack of transparency of this electoral body in relation to the election results. They also pointed out that the Mexican citizens were increasingly annoyed about the irregularities of the election-day and the vote-counting which aroused serious doubts about the winner of the presidential election. Therefore, Alianza Cívica concluded it is necessary that the Mexican society can have certainty on the election result⁵⁵. It is thus evident that this organization was of the opinion that the demand of the Coalition and its candidate López Obrador, as well as various other organizations related to the elections and a broad sectors and even the majority of Mexican society, on the total recount of all votes is well grounded and legitimate. As the impartiality of the IFE cannot be trusted for

various reasons such as the familiar and nepotistic relations between the PAN-candidate Calderón and the head of IFE as well as IFE's election related software provider Hildebrando, and that since 2003 López Obrador's party PRD has been underrepresented in the IFE because its representative in IFE has only a voice but not the right to vote, it became evident that the key decision-maker in these elections is the highest election related juridical body of Mexico, that is, the TEPJF. It accepted to analyze the main demand of the Coalition on the necessity to recounting all of the votes⁵⁶, which would give certainty on how the Mexicans really voted.

The government of Vicente Fox ruled Mexico since the fall of 71-years authoritarian rule of various governments headed by a president coming from PRI in the elections of 2000. His government was supposed to be a transition government from the authoritarian but formally democratic period towards a democratic political system in Mexico. Fox's party PAN had made a deal with the ruling party PRI accepting the fraud based victory of PRI's Carlos Salinas de Gortari in the presidential elections of 1988. After his victory, Fox soon turned out to be unable to govern effectively in the political and governance system deeply penetrated by the *priistas* and eventually also his government made a deal—or was forced to make a deal, given the ungovernable situation, depending on the point of view—with the corrupted PRI strong man Roberto Madrazo, who was also PRI's candidate in the presidential elections of 2006⁵⁷. Moreover, as Carlos Salinas had returned to Mexico from his exile which began after the end of his presidential term in 1994⁵⁸, the Fox government

⁵⁴ *La Jornada*, 8 de julio de 2006. Even if the EU observation mission announced to be in favour of recounting all of the votes if it is done within the parameters allowed by the law, there is a problem in relation to the selection of PP member as a head of the mission. Though it is possible that this did not affect the missions evaluation—which, despite their positive view on recounting the votes, suggested at least in the beginning that the election process was legitimate (which was not the case)—there is room for caution because PP's leader and Spain's earlier Prime Minister José María Aznar (who supported the US war of conquest in Iraq) wanted Calderón to be Mexico's president. Moreover, Calderón's brother-in-law Diego Hildebrando Zavalá's (known as *cunado incómodo*) company Hildebrando which has provided election related software to the IFE, is related through a Spanish firm Meta4 to the US consulting company McKinsey, the operations of which in Spain are controlled by Juan Hoyos, a friend from childhood of Aznar (whose son works at McKinsey in New York). Hildebrando's Spanish business associates have also given private financial support to Calderón's party PAN (See Delgado, Álvaro, "La conexión española". *Proceso*, 18 de junio de 2006, 13).

⁵⁵ Alianza Cívica, "Observación del proceso electoral 2006".

⁵⁶ *La Jornada*, 30 de julio de 2006; *La Jornada*, 1 de agosto de 2006.

⁵⁷ See e.g. Delgado, Álvaro; Guzmán, Armando; Gil Olmos, José, "Sellado el pacto de Tabasco entre Fox y Madrazo". *Proceso*, 12 de agosto de 2001, 28-29.

⁵⁸ Voluntary or not so voluntary exile used to be common for the ex-PRI-presidents, because in a strongly presidential system it was not considered proper that an ex-president that had selected his successor would remain visible in order to give the new president room to rule on his own authority.

established close relations with the circles close to Salinas, despite the fact that Fox had in the early 1990's considered Salinas as his main political enemy and promised to refrain from political life during the presidency of Salinas. Due to the continuing PRI leverage inside the governance system of Mexico, the real and apparent reform attempts of the Fox government were effectively aborted. Moreover, it became increasingly evident that Fox himself turned into a product of the seemingly dead PRI system while losing his support inside and outside his own transition team. He also continued with the right-wing economic policies adopted by the PRI during the 1980's and adopted the anti-democratic and anti-human rights politics of PRI. Moreover, in the context continuous *pactos* between the PRI and the PAN and their mutual attempts to undermine the emergence of PRD and especially during the Fox government, the popularity of López Obrador, the Fox team has done almost everything at its disposal to undermine AMLO's possibilities to win presidency in Mexico⁵⁹.

The most notorious was the process called *desafuero*, in the context of which an attempt was made to disqualify the then mayor of Ciudad de México López Obrador legally from his possibilities be a candidate in the 2006 presidential elections. This attempt was based on unfounded criminal charges and manufactured evidence related to the supposed mismanagement in relation to normal infrastructure development project in Ciudad de México. Fox himself had initiated, through the Federal Attorneys Office (Procuraduría General de la República, PGR), a process against AMLO in the House of Representatives of

Mexico's Congress in order to invalidate his future bid for country's presidency. In other words, the Fox government engaged in the misuse of country's juridical system in order to promote its political objectives. In the end, however, after more than a year long political battle turned into a juridical battle the Fox team had to give in due to internal reasons and possibly also for external reasons. PGR's Chief Attorney Rafael Macedo de la Concha had to resign and López Obrador succeeded in retaining his essential political rights⁶⁰. It is supposed that the pressure both from the United States and Cuba influenced Fox's decision to reverse completely his policies in relation to AMLO but more essential was the mobilization of Mexicans in defence of democracy as more than a million supporters of López Obrador participated in the so-called *Marcha de Silencio* which centred at the Zócalo of Ciudad de México⁶¹. This march of multitude has been described as an historical political act as well as the most rational act by the Mexican political left for a long time⁶². Be it as it may, it is evident that the *Marcha de Silencio* did made a major contribution to the broader process of defending democracy against the anti-democratic designs of a government which was supposed to promote the democratization of Mexico *also* after the initial success of dismantling the long succession of PRI governments which ruled under the revolutionary and democratic banners despite the emergence of an increasingly authoritarian governance system since the end of Lázaro Cárdenas government in 1940.

However, the right-wing mobilization against the growing popularity of López Obrador did not

⁵⁹ However, despite the history of PRI-PAN *pactos*, given the political atmosphere which is poisoned in multiple ways, it is no by means necessary that such *pactos* which are not free from internal contradictions can survive the actual political crisis.

⁶⁰ See Araizaga, Jorge; Jáquez, Antonio, "Una rendición tardía, torpe y costosa". *Proceso*, 1 de mayo de 2005, 8-12.

⁶¹ See Gutiérrez, Alejandro, "Entretelones del desinflé". *Proceso*, 1 de mayo de 2005, 14-17. Gutiérrez reports also on the visit to Mexico by the Joint Chief of Staff of the US military forces (Jefe del Estado Mayor Conjunto de las Fuerzas Armadas de Estados Unidos) Richard Myers who took part to a meeting of various key political and civil service officials of the Fox administration just before the *Marcha de Silencio*. Meyers conveyed the message of the Bush administration on its preoccupation about the political instability caused by the *desafuero* process. At the same time the major US newspapers such as *The New York Times*, *The Washington Post* and *The Wall Street Journal* considered the *desafuero* process a serious political mistake. On the other hand, another possible external influence may have been the criticism of Cuba's Fidel Castro on the Fox administration's attempt to inhibit the political rights of a candidate (AMLO) who had most popular support. According to diplomatic sources Mexico's minister of foreign affairs Luis Ernesto Derbez threatened to break diplomatic relations with Cuba. The same sources inform that the Cubans indicated that in such a case they will make public videotapes (by Carlos Ahumada Kurtz) in which two sons of Vicente Fox's wife Marta Sahagún and Ms. Sahagún herself discuss on business affairs with a business person of Argentina origins. This may have been problematic for Vicente Fox due to the fact that Ms. Sahagún's sons (Briebisca brothers) have been accused of illegal business affairs involving political nepotism also in Mexico.

⁶² Monsiváis, Carlos, "La Marcha del silencio". *Proceso*, 1 de mayo de 2005, 36-40.

end with the failed *desafuero* process. The Fox government which had transformed from a pro-reform transition government more into a reincarnation of PRI politics, the function of which is to hinder the maturation and consolidation of the democratization process, in a sense that all political forces could be allowed a success in the popular vote through elections, mobilized in a process which has been called the state elections (Elección del Estado). The purpose of state elections is to mobilize all state and other public institutions at their disposal to promote the PAN candidate in the presidential elections of 2006. Moreover, many private sector social forces and institutions, especially those close to PAN but also many of those traditionally close to PRI, have been involved in this un-democratic project. The process of state elections has included, among other things, open support for the PAN candidate and a sort of discursive dirty war against López Obrador. This war has included direct statements for the part of federal executive and an extensive and expensive media campaign, especially through television advertisements (spots), aiming at undermining the popular support of López Obrador. These spots were often constructed on outright lies and typically twisted the facts with incorrect images in order to give an incorrect and distorted image of the policies and political objectives of the opposition candidate⁶³. As was the case with the previous PRI governments, the PAN government of Fox used various federal and state level financing programs to promote electoral success of PAN⁶⁴ as well as other traditional and newer practices related to electoral fraud, before, during and after the elections proper. Moreover, the state election process involved an election process which was compromised by the partial nature of IFE which was supposed to be independent electoral body and one of the main ins-

titutional guarantees of the democratization process. Consequently, the IFE turned out to be a biased election institution which supported the state election process and there were demands on Ugalde's and other IFE councillor's resignation⁶⁵. Due to the partial nature of IFE, the institutional legitimacy of the election process rested effectively on the TEPJF.

Given the fact that the electoral process was problematic, involving various more or less illegal and fraudulent practices clearly against the existing electoral legislation – as well as changes to Mexico's legislation supporting the practices related to the state election process, e.g. in relation to the spot campaign – and a widespread frustration with the Fox governments society-dividing policies and the accumulated experience on the partiality of the state election politics, another mobilization of multitude (*Megaplantón*) in favour of López Obrador's candidacy arose after the elections. This time the main objective was to show the broad support of Coalitions candidate AMLO as well as to support their legal struggle against the electoral fraud and Coalitions demand on the total recount of the votes. This other mobilization to defend democracy was even larger and broad-based than the earlier *Marcha de Silencio*, about 2.5 million persons gathered together in public space to defend democracy and effective vote. In his speech López Obrador said they are living definitive moments of Mexico: what is in stake is the future of Mexican people and now it will be decided whether a true democracy will be installed or a regime of simulation of democracy is imposed. He also asked the multitude about his proposition to create 47 permanent installations that would be in place until all votes are recounted and they have an elected president. The multitude accepted his proposal⁶⁶. Soon after the permanent camps were installed, also

⁶³ If it was possible to write that in the elections of 2000 the Mexican elections had been "Americanized", in a sense that negative campaigning had become a norm in Mexico, (see, Minkkinen, Petri, "Kansalaisjärjestöt Meksikon vaalien tarkkailijoina". *Kosmopolis*, XXXI-4 (2001), 49-67) it may well be possible that negative dirty campaign of the organizers of the state elections in the elections of 2006 surpasses even the levels of negative campaigning in the United States.

⁶⁴ However, this problem seems to be rooted into Mexico's political culture, due to the fact that all main parties, not only previous and actual government parties PRI and PAN but also the main opposition party PRD (though less often) had used public funding to promote their electoral support in the political areas under their control. However, it is possible to say that despite the more general nature of this problem, the complicity of PAN as the governing party during the Fox administration can be pointed out because the conditioned misuse of public funds forms a part of broader state election process.

⁶⁵ See Gil Olmos, José, "Cambios en el IFE". *Proceso*, 16 de agosto de 2006.

⁶⁶ See e.g. *La Jornada*, 31 de julio de 2006. According to the Ministry of Public Security (Secretaría de Seguridad Pública) of Distrito Federal more than 2 million men and woman protested while the organizers estimated 3 million participants.

from the main square Zócalo all the way the main avenue of Ciudad de México Paseo de la Reforma, as parts of this *Megaplantón*, Fox government's interior minister Carlos Abascal asked the Mayor of Ciudad de México Alejandro Encinas to "guarantee order and the rights of all citizens"⁶⁷. Some social forces such as the employer's organization Coparmex (which was according to Encinas promoting, financing and developing the dirty hate campaign against López Obrador) were even demanding repressive action against the peaceful civil resistance. However, Encinas declined to use force against the demonstrators and defended the *plantón* because the question was not only about the certainty on the electoral result but also about the governability and viability of Mexico in the future⁶⁸. However, López Obrador himself announced that at this point there will be no new actions of civil resistance because they were waiting for the decision of the TEPJF. To his political opponents he said that they will not engage in negotiations and that a condition for an agreement is a total recount of the votes⁶⁹.

As it had become evident through the election observation information of local and foreign election observers as well as the analyzes and observations of various political and civil society forces in Mexico, it was evident that the only correct and legitimate decision the TEPJF could do was to decide in favour of complete recount of the votes, of all ballot boxes and in all electoral districts of Mexico. This demand had been presented and supported also by various foreign newspapers such as *New York Times* and *Financial Times*⁷⁰ and also many Mexicans whom otherwise are critical of López Obrador agree that his demands were reasonable due to the fact that the official vote counting resulted as a very close contest: for example Carlos Tello Díaz wrote that those who (such as he) are convinced the elections were clean and Mexico's

electoral institutions are reliable should support the recount of the votes⁷¹. However, despite the clear evidence of election fraud and a broad support for total recount of the votes the TEPJF made a decision according to which only 9.07 percent of the votes will be recounted⁷². This ruling casts doubts on TEPJF's willingness to protect democratic popular will expressed on the polls by the Mexicans and opened up a question whether even this institution was prepared to promote the consolidation of democracy in Mexico. On the other hand, by deciding to recount at least a part of the votes, TEPJF effectively admitted that the election process was filled with irregularities and fraud. Moreover, the partial recount produced evidence (results on 81 percent of the *casillas* examined were incorrect) on irregularities and fraud which is enough for TEPJF to decide for a total recount⁷³. Therefore, given the evidence of fraud in the partial recount, which suggests that in the case of total recount AMLO would emerge as a real winner, the TEPJF should have decided for a total recount, a decision which is legally at its disposal.

Because this kind of partial ruling did not resolve the problem of election fraud it is understandable that López Obrador announced that they will continue civil resistance in order to defend democracy against the imposition of the PAN-candidate Calderón, restore and deepen the process of democratization and the consolidation of democracy⁷⁴. As the peaceful resistance was extended to Mexican Congress in the form of an attempt to install a *plantón* camp close to the House of Representatives, the Federal Preventive Police (La Policía Federal Preventiva, PFP) and the infamous *granaderos* removed violently the protesters and also the legislators representing PRD were targets of beating, a repressive act that was widely condemned⁷⁵. Despite the repression the peaceful protests continued and they were related, among other

⁶⁷ *La Jornada*, 2 de agosto de 2006.

⁶⁸ *La Jornada*, 2 de agosto de 2006.

⁶⁹ *La Jornada*, 3 de agosto de 2006.

⁷⁰ *La Jornada*, 4 de agosto de 2006.

⁷¹ Tello Díaz, Carlos, "El recuento de los votos". *Proceso*, 29 de julio de 2006.

⁷² See *La Jornada*, 6 de agosto de 2006.

⁷³ *La Jornada*, 14 de agosto de 2006.

⁷⁴ *La Jornada*, 6 de agosto de 2006.

⁷⁵ *La Jornada*, 15 de agosto de 2006; *La Jornada*, 17 de agosto de 2006.

things, to the 1st September last State of the Union speech (Informe de Gobierno) of president Fox who was characterized as a traitor of democracy and to peaceful protest in the context of Mexico's Independence Day in 15th September. Moreover, AMLO announced that they will organize a National Democratic Convention (Convención Nacional Democrática) in the main square Zócalo, which is also known as Plaza de la Constitución⁷⁶. Even if division general Luis Garfias Magaña was of the opinion that if the protests harm the traditional military parade of Independence Day it will insult the military forces, the Mayor of Ciudad de México Alejandro Encinas assured they have logistical experience to allow Independence Day traditions and peaceful protests to take place simultaneously. Moreover, AMLO said he profoundly respects the military forces as a defender of national sovereignty and was of the opinion that the army should be used neither to supplement incapable civilian governments nor to repress the people⁷⁷. Political scientist Octavio Rodríguez Araujo suggested that what is taking place in Mexico represents a *coup d'état ex ante* which resembles that of 1988 elections and was of the opinion that the demand of recounting all votes remained viable⁷⁸. On the other hand, a large group (16.802 signatures) of lawyers, academics, intellectuals and citizens delivered a petition to Mexico's Supreme Corte that it should use its mandate to investigate the legality of the electoral process and order a suspension of TEPJF's qualification of the presidential elections until the Supreme Court makes its decision⁷⁹.

Yet another step in defence of democracy was taken when the Chief Judge (magistrado presidente) Leonel Castillo accepted to analyze a citizen complaint against IFE's Ugalde and other counse-

llors on "acts and omissions" which affected the equity of the presidential elections⁸⁰. Moreover, the Coalition obtained new evidence on the (failed) coordinated effort (complot) by prominent *panistas* including President Fox and also ex-president Carlos Salinas de Gortari to inhibit the candidacy of AMLO, which it was presented as new evidence to TEPJF⁸¹. Based on solid evidence, the case for Coalitions demand of total recount was strong, due to the fact, as indicated by Claudia Sheinbaum Pardo, that "now, after the [partial] recount, the Tribunal has not only casual evidence (incidios) but certainty, plain proof the there was fraudulent alteration at the ballot boxes". Therefore, she continued, "Is it too much to ask a Tribunal of Federal Juridical Power [TEPJF] to comply with the law?"⁸² However, despite the evidence presented by the Coalition and the fact that the decision to accept to analyze a citizen complaint on the performance of the counsellors IFE and that the TEPJF had *de facto* admitted the irregularities and fraudulence of the presidential elections by ordering (the partial and insufficient) recount, the TEPJF considered unfounded a great majority of complaints related to the presidential elections. In relation to total recount, judge Alfonsina Bertha Navarro expressed a view that there was no demand for the total recount by explaining that nobody solicited the opening of all of the ballots of all 300 voting districts, which would have required a specific demand in every single voting district⁸³. On the other hand, Horacio Duarte, representing the Coalition in IFE, defended their complains – which were, according the TEPJF, badly argued – and said that in this case they should have turned down earlier. Moreover, he denounced the validity of this argument, because it opened two incidents, the other being the opening of all ballot boxes,

⁷⁶ See *La Jornada*, 14 de agosto de 2006.

⁷⁷ See *La Jornada*, 15 de agosto de 2006; *La Jornada*, 16 de agosto de 2006; *La Jornada*, 18 de agosto de 2006.

⁷⁸ Or as he puts it, el golpe de estado ex ante, an inverse counterpart of which is coup d'état ex post (el golpe de estado ex post), using similar vocabulary that Gunnar Myrdal used in the field of economics (Rodríguez Araujo, Octavio, "Golpe de Estado ex ante". *La Jornada*, 17 de agosto de 2006).

⁷⁹ *La Jornada*, 18 de agosto de 2006.

⁸⁰ *La Jornada*, 20 de agosto de 2006.

⁸¹ Other prominent *panistas* were Diego Fernández de Cavallos and ex-interior minister Santiago Creel and the evidence was a video containing confession by the already mentioned entrepreneur Carlos Ahumada Kurtz (See, *La Jornada*, 19 de agosto de 2006).

⁸² *La Jornada*, 25 de agosto de 2006.

⁸³ *La Jornada*, 29 de agosto de 2006.

which implied not just vote by vote recount but also recount in 300 voting districts. It can also be said that because the TEPJF denied the evidence of irregularities of the majority of ballot boxes revealed by the partial recount, which underlines the similar pattern on all ballot boxes, and by not considering these errors or irregularities [fraud] as systematic errors, the TEPJF made a juridical error⁸⁴. However, although the Coalition announced that the decision of the TEPJF opened the way for the imposition of PAN's candidate Calderón, the TEPJF postponed the revision of the complaints about the validity of the elections until the qualification of the elections⁸⁵.

On the other hand, Magdalena Gómez was of the opinion that if the TEPJF complies with the respect of the principle of certainty, impartiality and objectivity it should consider seriously the grounds (la causal) for “abstract nullity”, because its time-limits do not, according to her, allow for a total recount, a demand the TEPJF underestimated from the beginning⁸⁶. Moreover, AMLO accused the TEPJF of assuming the attitude of complicity (cómplice), validating the fraud and supporting delinquents who stole the elections. According to him this signifies a real *coup d'état* and a submission to the extremists of political right and that the decision is against the constitutional order. Moreover, according to him the judges made a political decision instead of a juridical one. At the same time AMLO said that the fraud not only closed the electoral way of the aspiring politicians but also *de facto* annulled the constitutional rights of the citizens to elect in free and democratic way who governs the country. He also presented a program to be discussed in the National Democratic Convention of 16th September 2006. It included, among other things, not to accept usurpa-

tion and not to recognize Calderón as president as well as how to decide whether the legitimate president or the coordinator of peaceful resistance and an organ of government will be installed and take possession in 20th November or 1st of December⁸⁷. During his visit to Tabasco, he also pointed at the tendency of those whom stole [or, are in the process to steal] the presidential elections to promote racism in order to disqualify the movement of civil resistance and said that he is proud to represent humble people, the poor people of Mexico⁸⁸.

With its resolution of September 5, 2006, the TEPJF qualified the results of the presidential elections and declared PAN-candidate Felipe Calderón Hinojosa as the elected president of Mexico for the period of 2006-2012, and thus effectively validated fraud based elections⁸⁹. On the other hand, Coalitions candidate Andrés Manuel López Obrador rejected the decision of the TEPJF and declined to recognize those who pretend to display themselves as Federal Executive “without having legitimate and democratic representation”. Moreover, he ratified his proposal that in the National Democratic Convention “we will constitute a government which counts on necessary legitimacy to re-found the Republic and re-establish the constitutional order”⁹⁰. Consequently, along with the resolution of the TEPJF, Mexico had an outgoing president whose legacy was to undo representative democracy which rests on the vote of the people as expressed on legitimate and trustworthy elections, an elected president whose “mandate” rests on electoral fraud for which international recognition is sought and an candidate who in reality won the presidential elections and is in the process of re-found the Republic and to promote emancipative transformative politics in the context of National Democratic Convention⁹¹. This Conven-

⁸⁴ See *La Jornada*, 30 de agosto de 2006,

⁸⁵ *La Jornada Online*, 28 de agosto de 2006. Available from Internet at: <http://www.jornada.unam.mx:8080/el-tepjf-abrio-la-puerta-consumar-imposicion-de-calderon-duarte/sendto_form>; *La Jornada Online*, 28 de agosto de 2006. Available from Internet at: <http://www.jornada.unam.mx:8080/posterga-el-tepjf-revision-de-alegatos-contra-la-validez-de-la-eleccion-presidencial/sendto_form>.

⁸⁶ *La Jornada*, 29 de agosto de 2006.

⁸⁷ *La Jornada*, 29 de agosto de 2006.

⁸⁸ *La Jornada*, 30 de agosto de 2006.

⁸⁹ See *La Jornada On Line*, 5 de septiembre de 2006. Available from Internet at: <http://www.jornada.unam.mx:8080/tepjf-declara-a-calderon-presidente-electo/sendto_form>.

⁹⁰ *La Jornada On Line*, 5 de septiembre de 2006. Available from Internet at: <http://www.jornada.unam.mx:8080/ratifica-amlo-su-llamado-a-contruir-un-gobierno-legitimo/sendto_form>.

⁹¹ On the attempt to acquire international recognition, see “Ratifica AMLO su llamado...” above.

tion, has the possibility create and promote a broad coalition of Mexicans and their forms of organization which defends and develops further democracy and social justice inside and outside Mexico.

4. CONSTRUCTING NORTH AMERICA AND OUR BACKYARD: ACTING DESPERATELY AGAINST THE TIDE

The US expansive policies in the Americas have varied between forceful military conquest and peaceful conquest. Occasionally there have been periods during which the US governments have opted for a policy based more on peaceful co-existence as was the case in the 1930's and during the Second Eurocentric Civil War during the presidency of Franklin D. Roosevelt. At that time the US renounced unilateral expansive and coercive militarism in its relations with Latin America. The problems the US had faced with Mexico and its insistence on the principle of non-intervention as well as on the economic rights of nations (both of which were visible in the Mexico's 1917 Constitution and in Venustiano Carranza's foreign policy doctrine) had matured into reformist policies inside the US in the form of New Deal social transformation and into a Good Neighbour policy towards Latin America. However, this policy did not last and in the context of the Third Eurocentric Civil War during 1950's, 1960's and 1970's the US renewed its more aggressive policies and began a permanent stage of war against Cuba and began to undermine Latin American governments and impose military dictatorships in order to promote and secure particular economic and geopolitical interests. During the early 1970's the US had a dual approach: in the case of Chile a military coup was organized and in the case of Mexico local capitalists were encouraged to rebel against Echeverría government in order to promote the policies of peaceful conquest. In neither case these policies led to direct military occupation⁹². Instead two varying approaches were applied in order to promote eco-

nomical imperialism, the purpose of which was the total social transformation in order to promote particular economic interests and prevent a more socially oriented and emancipative transformative politics. After the Sandinista revolution in Nicaragua and with the ascendancy of Reagan administration, the US opted for a mixture of semi-direct military intervention through proxies and a policy to promote economic reforms that would pave way for peaceful conquest. Ronald Reagan coined a term Evil Empire in order to give religious tone to his description of the Soviet Union as a vicious threat to "American way of life and liberty". His administration also applied the domino theory originally devised to describe the supposed communist expansion in Asia to underline the threat an expansion of the Nicaraguan revolution might pose to other Central American countries and also Mexico, which consequently would threaten these cherished US values. Effectively, by supporting the authoritarian and totalitarian governments in Central America and a broad genocide against indigenous people in Guatemala, his description of the Soviet Union applied the principle of the pot calling the kettle black.

During the Reagan administration's mixture of policies, its trade initiatives component of 1980's constructed a base for peaceful conquest which was the general policy line towards Mexico, the Caribbean, Central America and Latin America during the 1990's. Among other trade policy initiatives, the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) and its extension to the whole Americas (except Cuba), the Free Trade Area of the Americas (FTAA), were the main macro-regional international treaties which promoted peaceful conquest supported by contractual frameworks. Inside Mexico and between Mexico and Central American countries the trade, infrastructure and development treaties and initiatives served the dual purpose of fomenting integration in North and Central America as well as the process towards the FTAA.

⁹² However, in both cases the governments used repressive policies against their populations. In the case of Chile this required a change of government from a reformist democratic government into a totalitarian military dictatorship. In the case of Mexico, the PRI-government of Echeverría promoted reformist policies both at global level as well as inside Mexico and applied repressive policies against more radical opposition in Mexico. There is also a possible connection between Echeverría government and the coup in Chile. Mexico sent two generals involved in 1968 repression against the student movement to Chile and at least one of them was close to the Chilean army involved in plot against the Allende government (see, *La Jornada*, 2 de octubre de 2003). Moreover, in his private discussions with President Nixon, President Echeverría had said (with clear reference to Chile) that we do not need another Cuba in the continent (see the transliterated discussion of the Presidents on June 15, 1972. Available from Internet at: <<http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB95/mex27.pdf>>).

They also paved the way for the Puebla-Panama Plan (PPP) of the Fox administration which, among its infrastructure and development components, aimed at controlling and diminishing the migratory flows from Central America and Southern Mexico towards the United States⁹³. The PPP can also be seen as a logical continuation for the US historical objectives to control the natural resources of this area (including oil) as well as the geopolitical and geo-economic objectives to promote the Isthmus of Tehuantepec as an alternative land corridor for the Panama Canal. Whereas Mexico as a part of geographical North America has already become an integral part of North American political economy as well as the emerging political community, it is possible to consider Central American and Caribbean (Mare Nostrum), not only geographically separate from South America proper, but also as areas belonging not only to traditional sphere of influence and domination of the United States but also as possible parts of an extended North American political community, which would possess transformative qualities with other parts of this area-community.

As I have already indicated in this article, in the context of new imperialist policies and hard form integral fascism the US of George W. Bush administrations has moved from peaceful conquest towards aggressive and military forms of expansion. Even if the peaceful conquest element of US policies is visible also in the policy palette of this administration, it has clearly been a subordinated element in relation to this general aggressive new imperialist posture. Moreover, these policies which were partially applied in order to curb down alternatives to neo-liberal peaceful conquest, had, contrary to the hopes of the new imperialists, strengthened the resistance and the implementation of alternatives around the world and in this case especially in Latin America. This is clearly visible, not only in the durability of Fidel Castro in Cuba and Hugo Chávez in Venezuela, but also in the rise of Luiz Ignacio Lula da Silva in Brazil, Nestor Kirchner in Argentina, Evo Morales in Bolivia, René Préval in Haiti, Michelle Bachelet in Chile

and Alan García in Peru. Moreover, the *de facto* electoral victory of Andrés Manuel López Obrador, despite the attempted fraud based imposition of the PAN candidate, is about to promote social transformation through the defence of democracy and the National Democratic Convention with its political program also in Mexico, the political resistance of which during the 1990's played an important role for the emergence of the global alternatives movement and also for the present position of the democratic left in Latin America⁹⁴. Despite the fact that left-leaning politicians represent different kinds of alternative policies, as a whole they form an impressive political front which has challenged the neo-liberal peaceful conquest and the new imperialist militarism. Besides transformations at the political level which have clearly weakened the US leverage in Latin America and the Americas as a whole, this transformation is visible also at the economic and trade policy level. This was evident in recent round of negotiations on the FTAA and the failure to accomplish an agreement that would have allowed the realization of this free trade area from the beginning of 2006 as was planned. It is probable that the FTAA will not be concluded and that the Latin America based integration schemes such as MERCOSUR and ALBA (la Alternativa Bolivariana para América Latina y el Caribe) will evolve into South American economic community which does not serve the purpose of peaceful conquest.

These developments at the political and economic level suggest that the United States is losing its traditional hold in Latin America, which is, contrary to the objectives of the new imperialists of Bush administrations, not paving the way towards a new American century, but instead, contributing to the overall global decline of the United States. The new imperialist Bush administration had not only opted for external repression and military expansion, but also adopted the policies of internal repression in the context of hard form integral fascism, familiar from the national security regimes promoted in Latin America in the recent past as well as its own history of repression of internal others⁹⁵. The echoes of this policy line have been

⁹³ On Puebla-Panama Plan as “reserve space” for the expansion of global capital, see Torres Torres, Felipe; Gasca Zamora, José (coords.), *Los espacios de reserva en la expansión global del capital. El sur-sureste mexicano de cara al Plan Puebla-Panamá*. México D.F., UNAM/Plaza y Valdéz, 2006.

⁹⁴ On the latter, see Minkkinen, Petri, *Meksikon 1900-luku...*, op. cit.

⁹⁵ See and compare id., “El fascismo integral...”, op. cit.

visible in the repressive policies the Fox administration has opted for in Mexico, which were in similar ways as in the US case, derived partially from the repressive history of PRI administrations in of Mexico. In similar vain, the Fox administration promoted the US objectives in the recent FTAA negotiations, for which he was amply criticised in Mexico and Latin America. This also produced a diplomatic crisis between Mexico and especially Venezuela, which was also translated into yet another weapon against AMLO for the purpose of state election process in Mexico and which, like other similar attempts, backfired and turned against the operators of state election process themselves. Moreover, even if the policies of increased border control and wall construction have been promoted both by the Clinton administration in favour of peaceful conquest and the Bush administrations favouring new imperialism and hard form of integral fascism, it is evident that the representatives of these policy lines have not been able to realize that both forms of conquest can only aggravate the problems leading to emigration in the sending end of the line and that wall construction cannot end the immigration. Therefore, it is evident that the Mexican and Latino immigration will continue to transform the political, social and other landscapes in the US⁹⁶. Together with the political transformations and the defence of democracy in Mexico which are changing the situation in Mexico, immigration, among other things will contribute also the transformations inside the emerging political community in North America⁹⁷.

Besides the problems in political and trade policy sphere, it is not probable the US would be in a position to launch large scale military interventions in the Americas. The main actual target areas of the new imperialists are in Eurasia and it is unlikely the US would open up a second front in Latin America, for example in Cuba or Venezuela, despite the fact that Cuba has been an “enemy” and a target for military intervention much longer than Iran, the main target in Eurasia. However, as the attempt to organize a coup against the Chávez government Venezuela in 2002 suggest, in the context of new imperialism and hard form of integral fascism it is not possible to rule out smaller scale operations to undermine either democratic or revolutionary governments (Cuba) in that area. For example, the President Evo Morales informed in the end of May 2006 that the US had organized groups to assassinate him without success⁹⁸.

In May 2002 George W. Bush announced an Initiative for a New Cuba, which was “the beginning of an ongoing, flexible, and responsive campaign designed to generate a rapid and peaceful change within Cuba”⁹⁹. Later in June 2006 in Cuba was launched, which included 80 million dollar budget for the dissident activities in Cuba and to exercise a more comprehensive control over the sanctions on Cuba¹⁰⁰. At the same time, in the context of illness of Fidel Castro and a temporary transfer of power to his brother Raúl Castro, Cuba announced to be prepared to confront the military aggression and annexation

⁹⁶ See e.g. Winders, Jamie, “Changing politics of race and religion: Latino migration to the US South”. *Progress in Human Geography*, XXIX-6 (2005), 683-699, who reports a tremendous increase of Latino and especially Mexican migration also outside the traditional destinations such as Texas and California (due to for example growing intra-ethnic labour competition) in other parts of the United States and in her study, especially South-East United States. For example, using figures of E. Grieco, she points at Tennessee where the the foreign-born Mexican population increased by 2166 percent in 1990-2000.

⁹⁷ On the previous, see Minkkinen, Petri, “Toward a Political...”, op. cit.

⁹⁸ *La Jornada*, 31 de mayo de 2006. Such plans in Bolivia have not however succeeded. One should however remember that in the case of Cuba, such attempts have been carried out by all kinds of US government which are in power in the context of a political system based on the predominance of two parties, as the failed Playa Girón (Pay of Pigs) invasion in 1961 during the Kennedy administration suggested. Even after that in March 1962 the US Joint Chief of Staff prepared a memorandum in which various pretexts were planned in advance in order to justify US military intervention in Cuba. The plan was considered viable only if the intervention would not directly involve Soviet Union and the idea was to create an atmosphere in which the US would be forced to intervene due to Cuba’s “threat” to peace in Latin America. According to this scheme, after this initial step various secondary pretexts could be added (see The Joint Chiefs of Staff, *Memorandum for the Secretary of Defence. Subject: Justification for US Military Intervention in Cuba (TS), 13 March 1962* [document on line] Available from Internet at: <<http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/news/20010430/northwoods.pdf>>).

⁹⁹ The White House, Office of the Press Secretary. “President Bush Announces Initiative for a New Cuba” [document on line] Available from Internet at: <<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/05/print/20020520-2.html>>.

¹⁰⁰ *La Jornada*, 11 de julio de 2006. This article also reports that President Castro has been a target 637 assassination attempts or aborted attempts, such as that in Panama 2000 when the CIA asset Luis Posadas Carriles aimed at assassinating Castro.

plans of the US¹⁰¹. However, even if the US is prepared to utilize every situation to harm Cuba, a military invasion to Cuba is unlikely, as confirmed by ex-foreign minister and UNAM professor Gustavo Iruegas¹⁰². Recently the US appointed a special director of intelligence for Cuba and Venezuela, as was done in relation to countries described as parts of “axis of evil”¹⁰³. This confirms partially the October 2002 statement of Henry Hyde, the Chairman of the US House of Congress Committee on Foreign Relations, just before Brazil’s presidential elections, that Cuba, Brazil and Venezuela form an emergent “axis of evil”¹⁰⁴. However, it seems to be the case that in the eyes of the new imperialists Brazil has enhanced its position.

However, due to the fact that the new imperialist Bush governments rule under a questionable mandate which is based on electoral fraud in the key states, their credibility as promoters of democracy and transition either in Eurasia or in the Americas is non-existent. Moreover, the announcement of George W. Bush that the new imperialist occupation forces will not leave from Iraq during his presidency underlines the non-probability of a military intervention in the Americas¹⁰⁵. However, this duality of his administrations –anti-democratic and militaristic posture– also underlines the new imperialist and hard form integral fascist objectives of their North American policies. While we can point at Bush administrations vacillating line in relation to Latino and Mexican immigration –differing and overlapping pro-capitalist pro-immigration tendency and conservative anti-immi-

gration policies favouring militarization of border and wall construction, in the overall context of the inability to face the reality of continuity of immigration caused by uprooting tendencies of both pacific conquest and military conquest– it is possible to analyze the politics of exclusion and repression built into new imperialist and hard line integral fascist line of constructing North America. It is possible to detect at least three tendencies with this respect: strengthening of the military component of emerging North American community, the wall construction within this community and its extension areas and fomenting internal control inside and outside of the United States¹⁰⁶.

As I have pointed out elsewhere, after the S-11-2001 in the context of First Real World War and the war on terror and non-white others, there emerged plans to create continental military force in North America and integrate Mexico into North American Aerospace Defence Command (NO-RAD) into which Canada already belongs¹⁰⁷. In March 2005 the heads of state of Mexico, the United States and Canada announced they have signed the Security and Prosperity Partnership for North America (Alianza para la Seguridad y la Prosperidad de América del Norte, ASPAN). The security component of ASPAN included the protection of North America against external threats, prevention of threats within North America and responding to them and facilitating secure, efficient and low risk legitimate movement (tráfico legítimo) in their common borders¹⁰⁸. The working group structure of ASPAN reflects the tendency

¹⁰¹ *La Jornada*, 5 de agosto de 2006.

¹⁰² *La Jornada*, 2 de agosto de 2006.

¹⁰³ *La Jornada*, 20 de agosto de 2006.

¹⁰⁴ Waller, Michael J.; 29 October 2002. “US Rep. Brands Cuba/Brazil/Venezuela ‘New Axis of Evil. Hyde Urges Bush to Help Oust Venezuelan President’”. *Insight* [journal on line] Available from Internet at: <<http://www.insight.com/news/308706.html>>; Minkkinen, Petri, *KAKTUS...*, op. cit., 225.

¹⁰⁵ See e.g. *La Jornada*, 22 de agosto de 2006. In this article Bush the youngsters also refers terrorists groups for example in Gaza which are- according to him- trying to slow down the advance of democracy. Given that he refers to Hamas, his argumentation is highly contradictory, given that Hamas rose to power in democratic elections whereas he himself does not have similar democratic record.

¹⁰⁶ While the attempt to promote hard line integral fascism is of global scale, these policies have their specialities on “home ground”, within the emerging North American community and its extension.

¹⁰⁷ See Minkkinen, Petri, *KAKTUS...*, op. cit., 289, referring also to Carlos Fazio’s article in *La Jornada*, 2 de febrero de 2002; On the antecedents of ASPAN, see Trejo García, Elma del Carmen et al.; 2006. *Alianza para la Seguridad y la Prosperidad de América del Norte (ASPAN)* [libro en línea] Disponible desde Internet en: <<http://www3.diputados.gob.mx/camara/content/download/21501/112616/file/SPE-ISS-02-06.pdf>>; on the security community as a part of North American political community, see Minkkinen, Petri, “Toward a Political...”, op. cit., 22.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, 2; La Casa Blanca, Oficina del secretario de Prensa; 2005. “Prosperidad de América del Norte depende de seguridad común. Estados Unidos, Canadá, México describen nuevo pacto” [documento en línea] Disponible desde Internet en: <<http://usinfo.state.gov/esp/Archive/2005/Mar/25-764441.html>>.

combine the elements of military expansion and control and the elements of peaceful conquest and control. Under the heads of state there is a group of coordination (in Mexico *Presidencia de la República/OPP*, in the US *White House/National Security Council* and in Canada *Privy Council Office/Foreign Policy Adviser*), facilitating groups on security and economic affairs (Prosperity and quality of life) and action plan groups (trilateral groups for security and economic prosperity and quality of life)¹⁰⁹. The priority is given to security which reflects a movement from underlining peaceful conquest towards military and repressive expansion and control and a general “alternative” anti-democratic tendency in relation to a political community built on democratic regionalism within which the construction of a pluralist security community would be an integral but a subordinated part in relation to democratic advance and economic development and equality and within which the new imperialist expansive militarism would be restrained¹¹⁰. If the ASPAN reflects the tendency to underline security/militarism/control and economic dominance and control, the other part of constructing “alternative” extended North American community the Puebla-Panama Plan represents an attempt to promote infrastructure and development in the service of transnational and especially North American capital, the US geopolitical interests and an extended barrier against the migratory movements from Central America¹¹¹. Given failure of the FTAA plans for the Americas and the relative disintegration of Mexico from its previous South American trade alliances¹¹², the NAFTA-ASPAN-PPP triad represents an attempt preserve through macro-regionalization the US-North American (and

their ruling classes) position in geographical North America, Caribbean and Central America¹¹³.

It has been considered central for the revolutionary movement leading to US independence to keep African people enslaved and that the reason for many Founding Fathers not to like slavery was their willingness to have an all-White republic. Moreover, “in the short term, the demand for independence offered this upper-class patriot bloc [a section of the colonial elite] a means to channel popular anger away from itself and onto the British government”¹¹⁴. Many Texans have had also a tradition to promote illegitimate territorial expansion and slavery; the annexation of Texas and the territorial expansion through the US-Mexican war of 1846-1848 were seen as means to preserve slavery in the US and expand its coverage southwards¹¹⁵. In the context of new imperialism and hard form integral fascism there has been an effort to blame the internal and external others for the internal problems of the United States and those of the broad historical context of Eurocentric globalization of capitalism. Moreover, in the context of North American community and its extension an attempt is been made to promote contemporary forms of slavery in the context of security-economic bloc and to construct border walls to exclude Latino and Mexican immigration with the pretext of the war on terror and non-white others. However, for various years there has been a surge of successful opposition to these policies globally and inside the United States. In North America the pro-immigration protests of the United States in 2006 showed the strength of Latino-Mexican community of the United States. For many years the

¹⁰⁹ See Trejo García et al., *Alianza para la...*, 15.

¹¹⁰ On the latter, see Minkkinen, Petri, “New Imperialism...”, op. cit.; id., “Toward a Political...”, op. cit.

¹¹¹ On PPP and its relation to natural resources and geopolitical interests, see Torres Torres, Felipe; Gasca Zamora, José (cords.), *Los espacios de...*, op. cit.; Saxe-Fernández, John, *La compra-venta de México*. México D.F., Plaza & Janés, 2002; Minkkinen, Petri, *Meksikon 1900-luku...*, op. cit.

¹¹² On the latter, see *El Financiero*, 19 de junio de 2006, in which it is reported that the Free Trade Agreement of G-3 (*Tratado de Libre Comercio del Grupo de los Tres (G-3)*) will be officially dissolved by November 19, 2006 on the initiative of Venezuela’s President Hugo Chávez.

¹¹³ Given that the policies of aggressive globalized nationalism, new imperialism and also the hard form integral fascism have produced a continuous line of failures in “democratization” as well as other objectives and the deepening of conflict and confrontation around the world, this triad represents an attempt to foment exclusive and repressive policies in extended North America. However, given the inbuilt weaknesses of these policies and opposition against them these attempts are about to be reversed also within this area.

¹¹⁴ See Berlet, Chip; Lyons, Matthew N., *Right-Wing Populism...*, op. cit., 27.

¹¹⁵ See Gill, Mario, *Nuestros Buenos...*, op. cit. 17-21.

cooperation of North American civil societies has continued to strengthen, and in relation to immigration and border control, this development continued in the context of the Frontier Social Forum (Foro Social Fronterizo) in Ciudad Juárez in October 2006. In Mexico, the pro-democracy movement from the 1980's, the civil society movement including the Zapatista movement in the 1990's and as most recent the movement in defence of democracy and AMLO's presidency and promoting National Democratic Convention have emerged as a challenge to the pacific and military conquest as well as the anti-democratic policies.

In the United States, the Bush government has faced various serious setbacks ever since the relatively rapid loosening of the post-S-11-2001 curtain of fear and repression and the re-emergence of internal opposition towards the new imperialism and hard form integral fascism among other civil society opposition pre-dating S-11-2001. Also the formal political parties and juridical organs of the US have been successful in dismantling the Bush administrations illegal and otherwise unviable policies, despite the occasional alarmist events which are supposed to strengthen the support of new imperialism and hard form integral fascism. An important step towards dismantling the concentration camp system in which prisoners are tortured to death¹¹⁶ created by the Bush administration was the Guantánamo ruling of the US Supreme Court, according to which the Bush administration exceeded its legal authority in ordering special tribunals for the detainees of Guantánamo and that the Article 3 of the Geneva Conventions applies to these detainees¹¹⁷. Bush himself had before the decision said that he would like to close the detention centre but added that "the Supreme Court first had to decide whether the detainees there should be brought before civilian courts or military commis-

sions"¹¹⁸. Given the Supreme Court decision and his earlier promise, this concentration camp should be closed immediately. Moreover, given that Bush had said the Guantánamo prison is been used as an excuse to attack the US¹¹⁹, by closing the concentration camp as demanded by the US and international law, he would remove this kind of excuse. Following this line of action the Bush government should also close other secret prisons in foreign countries, as demanded by the UN committee against torture¹²⁰.

Besides strong and crowing popular opposition to the new imperialist war of conquest in Iraq and earlier criticism also from within the government, now not only the new imperialist war in Iraq but also the war on terror and non-white others in general is being increasingly criticised by the US military leaders, ex-high government and civil service officials and national politicians¹²¹. Also the hard form integral fascist control policies of the Bush administration are facing increasing problems. One example of this is the ruling by a federal judge Anna Diggs Taylor of the United States District Court in Detroit that National Security Agency (NSA) "program to wiretap the international communications of some Americans without a court warrant violated the Constitution". At the same time this ruling "rejected almost every administration argument" in favour of the secret program revealed by the *New York Times* in December 2005¹²². In the context of the border control and wall construction project reaching from North America and European Union to Israel there has been growing criticism, for example, on the war crimes committed by Israel, which, according to Amnesty International, has engaged in "deliberate policy of destruction" of the civilian infrastructure in its war against Lebanon¹²³. Moreover, it has been suggested that in the context of this war Israel also

¹¹⁶ See, *La Jornada*, 12 de junio de 2006, in which various reasons which support the idea that the deaths of three detainees in Guantánamo were not suicides as claimed.

¹¹⁷ *La Jornada*, 30 de junio de 2006; *The New York Times*, 29 June 2006.

¹¹⁸ *La Jornada*, 22 de junio de 2006; *Human Rights Watch*; 9 May 2006. "U.S.: Bush should Close Guantanamo Now" [document on line] Available from Internet at: <<http://hrw.org/english/docs/2006/05/09/usdom13332.htm>>.

¹¹⁹ *La Jornada*, 15 de junio de 2006.

¹²⁰ *La Jornada*, 20 de mayo de 2006.

¹²¹ See e.g. *La Jornada*, 18 de agosto de 2006.

¹²² *New York Times*, 18 August 2006.

¹²³ *La Jornada*, 23 de agosto de 2006.

bombed El Khiam prison, in order to destroy evidence of the past crimes during its long occupation of Southern Lebanon. This “mini-Guantánamo” was “run for fifteen years by Israel’s Lebanese proxies, the South Lebanon Army” in which Lebanese detainees were documented to be tortured until Israel was forced by Hezbollah to retreat from Lebanon in May 2000¹²⁴. In the context of constructing the NAFTA-ASPAN-PPP triad, the transition government of Fox, which was supposed not only to consolidate democracy but also improve the human rights situation of Mexico, continued with the repressive human rights abuses against the opposition and dissident groups for example against the globalization critical movement in Guadalajara, *campesinos* defending the lands in San Salvador Atenco (when, among other repression, tens of foreign and Mexican female activists were violated sexually and which was described by Subcomandante Marcos as “a part of the war against the underdogs, including us”) and against teachers movement in Oaxaca¹²⁵. These repressive actions such as that of Atenco were criticised widely around the world and also by human rights organizations such as Human Rights Watch and Comisión Nacional de Derechos Humanos (CNDH)¹²⁶.

5. BEYOND EXCLUSION AND REPRESSION: UNDOING NEW IMPERIALISM AND INTEGRAL FASCISM

Given the problems of electoral process it is possible to give credit to AMLO’s view that their struggle is meant to transform Mexico¹²⁷. This transformation process should include, besides the apparent need to reform the political system, broader social transformation that would undo the accumulated social injustices derived not only from the era of neo-liberal political program, imposed on Mexico tentatively from the 1970’s and in more

comprehensive manner from 1980’s, but also those created during the post-Cárdenas era which was marked by the institutionalization and at least partial reversal of the progressive objectives of Mexico’s revolution of 1910¹²⁸. Moreover, given the increasing fusion of the countries of geographical North America, transformation process should take place also within the North American political community in the context of democratic regionalism¹²⁹. The importance of this process of reformist and radical reformist emancipative transformative politics is underlined also by the attempt to construct the NAFTA-ASPAN-PPP triad. It is possible to propose that there is a ongoing struggle between the dystopic radical reformist policies represented by the new imperialist, hard line integral fascist and conservative attempt to construct a repressive security-economic bloc of extended North America and the reformist and radical reformist transformative politics promoting democratic and emancipative North American political community and its extension.

Given the fact that the ruling classes of the US as represented by the Bush administration not only initiated new imperialist policies promoting the First Real World War, including wars of conquest, the war on terror and non-white others and a global network of internal civil war but also attempted to globalize the hard form integral fascist project, in the context of which human rights and civil liberties are undermined globally and replaced by concentration camps, border control and wall construction projects, fomented internal and external control systems and institutions as well as general policy line supporting repression, exclusion, terror and torture, the main actual objective of the emancipative transformative politics is to undo these political practices on the spot, in the United States and in the context of North American political community. This necessity is underlined by the fact that even the US citizens think that the US predominance is a threat to world peace¹³⁰. Since

¹²⁴ Riley Thomson, Peggy, “The Roots of Hezbollah”. *CounterPunch*, 13-14 August 2006, 4-5.

¹²⁵ See e.g. *La Jornada*, 7 de mayo de 2006.

¹²⁶ See e.g. *La Jornada*, 15 de mayo de 2006; *La Jornada*, 23 de mayo de 2006.

¹²⁷ *La Jornada*, 8 de agosto de 2006.

¹²⁸ See e.g. Minkinen, Petri, *Meksikon 1900-luku...*, op. cit.

¹²⁹ On the outline for a North American political community, see Minkinen, Petri, “Toward a Political...”, op. cit.

¹³⁰ See *Kansan Uutiset*, 5. syyskuuta 2003, referred at in Minkinen, Petri, *KAKTUS...*, op. cit., 264, which reported that in June 2003 67 percent of the US citizens expressed this view.

then the supposed or actual predominance of the US has declined and the continuous instability, repression and the cycle of revenge caused by these policies has been vindicated both analytically and in practice. Moreover, since these policies have been promoted under various kinds of pretexts which supposedly demand the repressive practices of new imperialism and hard form integral fascism, the uncovering of the actuality behind these pretexts has continued to undermine the position of the Bush administrations. However, despite centrality of the North America and at the moment Mexico – and of course transformative activity of the Mexican, the US and the Canadian citizens themselves – in the transformative politics promoting change in relation to these policies and practices, continuous global action against these policies and their negative consequences around the world and the promotion of real alternatives in relation to the dystopic “alternatives” represented by these policies is essential¹³¹. It is thus important that intellectual and practical action is carried on at all levels local, national, regional and global by individuals, groups and movements in academic community, civil society organizations, formal political, administrative, juridical, international and economic institutions and organizations. It is also important that the movements promoting real alternatives to neo-liberal peaceful conquest and new imperialist conquest and capitalism as well as hard form integral fascism work in cooperative manner.

In the previous intensive phase of liberal economic and imperialist globalization from 19th century to early 20th century the Mexican Revolution of 1910 was the first major 20th century revolution against the cumulative effects of external military expansion and pacific conquest as well as internal authoritarian (or dictatorial, depending on the point of view) government of Porfirio Díaz cooperating with the external forces promoting pacific conquest¹³². The Mexican revolution produced the progressive 1917 constitution and together with

the foreign policy doctrine of Venustiano Carranza they successfully promoted anti-imperialism through the doctrine of non-intervention and the economic rights of the poorer target countries of military expansion and pacific conquest and gave an impetus for the Latin American policies promoting national economic development. In Mexico these policies culminated, in a sense, in the nationalization of the Mexican assets of foreign oil companies and the creation of national oil company PEMEX. Even though the oil companies of especially the US and the Great Britain, among other expansionist economic and political forces, had tried to undermine the progressive Constitution and national economic development policies including the nationalization of oil companies, the problems faced with Mexico had convinced Woodrow Wilson about the importance of non-intervention, national self-determination and peaceful resolution of international disputes. Especially during the Lázaro Cárdenas administration of Mexico and Franklin D. Roosevelt administration of the United States in 1930's, this change which was also promoted by conjectural (or systemic, if you prefer) crises, had been translated into the practical transformative New Deal and Good Neighbour policies, which allowed curtailing excessive capitalism in the US, supported the transformative policies of Lázaro Cárdenas and ended the imperialist phase of US expansion in Central America¹³³.

The present struggle in defence of democracy and social transformation of Mexico takes place in the context of defending the democratic will of Mexico's citizens. Given the context of electoral fraud, the central locus was at the juridical organ TEPJF and in the pro-democracy movement defending the respect of voting Mexican through total recount of the votes and the right of the citizens of democratic societies to change their political leaders. Given the decision of the TEPJF formally legitimating the electoral fraud, the emphasis is at the moment in the defence of democracy and

¹³¹ For a detailed ways to confront and undo new imperialism and globalizing integral fascism, see id., “New Imperialism...”, op. cit.; id., *KAKTUS...*, op. cit.; id., *Meksikon 1900-luku...*, op. cit.; in relation to North American community, see id., “Toward a Political...”, op. cit.; and in relation to creation of UN Rapid Deployment Forces and their decision-making system, see id., “The Decision-Making System...”, op. cit.

¹³² In overall terms against the interests of the majority of Mexicans, despite the fact that Díaz government did also promote and defend national economic interest to a certain degree.

¹³³ On this discussion see Minkinen, Petri, *Meksikon 1900-luku...*, op. cit., and especially on Mexico's impact in transforming the global policies of the US through Wilson's change of mind which affected the policies of FDR as well, see Tannenbaum, Frank, *Mexico. The Struggle for Peace and Bread*. New York, Alfred A. Knopf, 1950.

the promotion of social transformation in the context of National Democratic Convention and its policy program. The origins of this movement can be traced back to the strike-movement of 1950's, the student movement of 1960's and 1970's, the pro-democracy, anti-neo-liberal structural adjustment and broad civil society movement of the 1980's, the promotion of democratic transformation, the Zapatista and "free trade" critical movements and ever broader and transnationalising civil society of 1990's as well as to the defeat of PRI on the elections of 2000. Given the PRI-style corruption, repression and anti-democratic policies of the supposed transition government of Vicente Fox, the contemporary pro-democracy movement denouncing electoral fraud and defending effective vote and AMLO's position as the legitimate president as well as the National Democratic Convention can be seen as a logical continuation to these movements. Moreover, it takes place in the context of recent intensive phase globalizing neo-liberal

peaceful conquest and new imperialism as well as hard form integral fascism. As was the case in the previous intensive phase of liberal economic globalization, imperialism and fascism, emancipative and transformative politics will surpass the phase of neo-liberal pacific conquest, new imperialism and hard form integral fascism. In Mexican terms, the neo-porfiriato will be surpassed through a second Mexican revolution, which in this case is taking place through the defence of effective vote which opens up a democratic path to social transformation: given the electoral fraud formally legitimized by the exiting political and juridical institutions, a democratic path to social transformation requires emancipative transformative politics that will recreate democratic politics and community in Mexico. In the contemporary world this in combination with the transnational cooperation of various social forces will promote social transformation also in the context of North American community and its extension as well as globally¹³⁴.

¹³⁴ On this discussion see and compare Minkkinen, Petri, *Meksikon 1900-luku...*, op. cit.; id., "Toward a Political...", op. cit.