

<https://internationalviewpoint.org/spip.php?article6282>



Chile

“The working class is in the process of constituting itself as a political actor”

- IV Online magazine - 2019 - IV538 - November 2019 -

Publication date: Saturday 9 November 2019

Copyright © International Viewpoint - online socialist magazine - All rights reserved

Karina Nohales is part of the 8M Feminist Coordination and Javier Zuñiga is involved in the Movimiento del Agua y los Territorios (MAT – Movement for Water and Territories). Alex G. spoke to them on October 28, 2019

Where are we at in terms of the mobilization in Chile? Yesterday, we learned of the resignation of the cabinet and the end of the state of emergency. What does that mean? How has Piñera, the president of Chile, reacted in the face of the movement?

Javier Zuñiga I think Piñera's bet with his government right now is based on the analysis that the political response through the state of emergency to contain the mobilization did not work. Massive mobilizations have grown steadily until the demonstration on Friday, October 25 which was an eloquent expression of this. This shows that the repressive response did not deactivate the driving elements of the mobilization. Piñera is trying to head off a certain level of discontent that started with the rising price of the metro tickets and has widened to other problems of society. The layers of the people who have mobilized begin to demand profound changes. The change of cabinet is part of the idea of letting go of the ballast little by little, for communication purposes. But that does not make the mobilization run out of steam. There is no consensus on this cabinet change.

Karina Nohales In my opinion, there is a popular uprising in Chile, an uprising against the political system whose content takes the form of a record of 30 years of an agreed democracy. It started with the mobilization of the youth against the rising price of the metro tickets, then extended across Santiago and across the country. But this does not yet translate into concrete demands, because it is a challenge to the entire political system, the political parties that participated in this agreed democracy. Piñera responded to the extent of how the movement presented itself. That started with the price increase on the subway, Piñera suspended it and deployed the military on the streets. The movement challenged economic abuse and social inequality and Piñera announced a package of economic measures. None of these measures worked. Thus, the mobilization took different forms. Explosive at its beginning, diffuse in the territories. After that, there was a decrease in the mobilization on Tuesday, October 22nd. From Wednesday, it took its current form: massive and concentrated in the centres of cities. In the territories, social and political activities are maintained.

What does military repression mean in a historical perspective in Chile? What methods of self-defence and protection exist?

K. N The government only waited eight hours to deploy the military in the streets of Santiago and declare a state of emergency. This is a big decision, because it implies an image of instability for the bourgeoisie, with what that means for the stock market and investment capabilities. This decision breaks with the slogan of the transition from the end of the dictatorship, which had been "Never again". For us, that meant the end of the military presence. For the bourgeoisie, it meant "Never again class struggle". It must be pointed out that the present army and that of the dictatorship are not two different armies. Obviously, the people who compose it have changed. But the army is an institution that has been left intact, which represents a continuity between dictatorship and democracy, as is the transition. The armed forces remained unpunished. Now, there is a change of period in Chile. Something curious happened, people did not feel fear and went out on the street, despite the military presence and the curfew. In terms of self-defence, an unarmed people have two solutions that they have used: their creativity and or the size of their mobilization.

J. Z. A first dimension is what Karina said. Recourse to military force expresses, in the last instance, the means of

the bourgeoisie to resolve a situation of insurrection. To guarantee bourgeois democracy, the army appears. But in our case, that does not solve anything, it even becomes a problem for Piñera's government. What demonstrates this? The curfew ended last Saturday. A context thus opens: what will the government use to try to disable the mobilization? What has the government to offer after that? It is probable that, with the change of cabinet, figures from the transition of the Christian Democracy, completely worn out, will participate. But that makes no sense for the mobilized working masses. What could this context lead to? There is a political crisis, but is it or will it be a crisis of hegemony? That is to say, a crisis of any capacity, for the whole capitalist network, to produce hegemony over the whole of society, to recompose itself with a social base. The capitalists are trying to resolve the crisis with the military at first, and now they will return to their barracks. In this context, we will see the different types of violence and human rights violations that have occurred (and are still practiced with repressive measures). For the capitalists, this means a challenge as to the forms in which the revolts will appear, of how to contain the mobilization in this opening political cycle. It could set in place a context that involves a fundamental questioning.

K. N. The official figures show more or less 20 deaths. It is likely that we will discover more cases: the National Institute for Human Rights will investigate cases of people killed in fires, to see the origin of their deaths. There are also cases of sexual violence. Currently, unlike the time of the dictatorship, we are able to recognize this type of violence. Sexual violence under the dictatorship was invisible, but with the work of feminists, it has been recognized that these were not excesses, but a form of women-specific repression, a way of disciplining the body. There is one case these days: police, not soldiers, tortured a young man, raped him and forced him to declare publicly that he was a homosexual. This is a political dimension of discipline on the part of the forces of repression, not an excess on their part. From now on, the violation of human rights is approached in a multidimensional way. On the other hand, in the south, a young man was murdered. His father said that the man who said we were at war and put the military on the street was responsible. This shows that the violence is not the only political responsibility of the military, but of Piñera. That's why we are asking for his resignation.

Piñera announced a legislative package of social and economic measures. What are these measures? What do you think of them?

K. N. This package was announced on Tuesday, October 22nd. Piñera is a businessman. My first impression was that he behaved like an employer during collective bargaining. He responded as if it were a company, not a society, making demagogic offers. Basically, 70% of the measures are about pensions, because Piñera knows that this is a very important point of conflict. Then, there are the themes of health and wages. So, what he has offered is to expand medical coverage by subsidizing drugs in the hands of private companies. To guarantee a minimum income, he proposed to subsidize private companies with public money. In the case where a worker earns less than the minimum income, the state completes it. For pensioners, the increase in the amount for retirees is done without affecting pension fund administrations that are financial institutions. It is therefore a question of deepening the logic of subsidizing private companies of the Pinochet constitution. Everyone is contemptuous of these measures.

J. Z. It seems to me important first of all to point out the influence of social networks in the circulation of political messages, calls to demonstrate, to organize. When Piñera announced these measures, the reaction was immediate on the networks. From one minute to another, the reaction was not to believe it and rejection. For the same reason, last Friday, the event was the largest in Chile's history. The political message is that the announcement of this legislative package is meaningless for the people. It did not have a demobilization effect and it does not allow the co-optation of sectors of the movement. The measures have not been perceived as being able to improve living conditions. It amounts to a media manœuvre. Today I was at a meeting and a woman in her sixties said, concerning Piñera's speech: "this has had no impact, because we have woken up".

What is your assessment of the general strike last week? Are there sectors still on strike?

K. N. There has been only rarely been, and never since the return of democracy, a general strike in Chile. The days of protest from 1983 to 1986 began with calls for a general strike but faced with the impossibility for the working class of mobilizing under dictatorship, it turned into a national protest. As the March 8 Feminist Coordination (CF8M) said, strike was a forbidden word, the content of which was unknown. It is from feminism that the general bedrock was established again as a method for the working class. The CF8M proposed a general strike call for Monday, October 21 to a broader space, called Social Unity, in which it participates. The CUT trade union federation responded that it was unprepared and considered this proposal irresponsible in a curfew context. So, we decided to launch the appeal on Sunday with high school organizations and other human rights organizations. The next day, the trade union corporations of Social Unity had a meeting calling for a general strike for Wednesday. Without the pressure of youth and feminists, we do not know if there would have been this call. On Monday, October 21, the twenty or so ports of Chile were on strike, as well as the workers at the largest private copper mine in the world, the Escondida. It is very significant. However, it was difficult to assess the real impact of the strike because everything was paralyzed in fact. Industrial unions reported that the companies staying open operated at 30% and the majority were closed because there was no transportation. However, the strike has appeared again as a method of action in Chile. Next Wednesday, a new general strike has been called. We can have a better view of whether it works.

J. Z. The working masses had been mobilized since at least Friday, October 18, building a subjectivity involving methods such as barricades, *cacerolazos* and a willingness to occupy the public space. At this moment, calls are constantly circulating spontaneously. The political concern on whether to call a strike requires taking into account the fact that there is already an uprising. People were already on the street before there was a call. It is different to the process of the feminist general strike called for on March 8, 2019: the work of the feminist comrades was to prepare keynote events, in wage labour, and building a base in reproductive labour, with meetings, spaces of prior deliberation and so on. Therefore, the difference with these calls is that they are mounted on events already in progress. What is at stake with the call to strike if people are already mobilized? In my opinion, a dialectic is set up, as Gramsci says, between spontaneity and direction/orientation of the movement. The gamble of the strike is to give a meaning to the mobilization. This process is supported by a large part of the socio-political organizations, although this does not mean "putting ourselves at the front" as some sectors want. The subjectivity established, of rage and mobilization, cannot be decreed, but it is possible to contribute to the marking of an orientation. Thus, calling a strike condenses the influx of ongoing mobilization. The political cycle may be marked by an anti-neoliberal perspective, at least that is what the popular assemblies say. This could open a new context in society. In this sense, the strike becomes again an instrument recognized by the mobilized masses. And if this is successful, the strike comes to be appropriated as a tactic of accumulation of forces. The strike is not then an affirmation of self-indulgence, but a resource incorporated by the working masses. With key elements such as strikes in strategic sectors of the economy, this method tends to mean that the working class stops working and organizes itself according to the strike. It becomes a repertoire of action of the class, and not only of the trade union and organized world.

The Social Unity space seems to direct or at least influence the movement. What does this sector propose? How does it relate to mobilizations?

J. Z. Social Unity is a referent that is positioned as a legitimized entity. Because, for example, in the assembly where I am coming from, people recognize the need to have an interlocutor at the general level. Social Unity is a complex network of organizations. For me, three tendencies occupy this space. Firstly, a sector composed by the big unions and traditional corporations: the CUT, the No + AFP movement [for a public pension system], a part of the National Confederation of Municipal Health (Confusam), the teachers' union (Colegio profesores), the National Confederation of University Professionals of Health Services (Fenpruss), the National Association of Administrative Employees (Anef). They represent a certain leadership of the space. This sector is characterized by its urgency to be those who lead the movement, to appear as the actor at the head of the movement, and not as an actor who makes themselves available, proposes, brings together demands and so on. The second sector is made up of feminist, environmental, student, *pobladores*[people living in peripheral and popular neighbourhoods] organisations, human rights associations, that do not fit into traditional trade union logics. We are not in harmony with the understanding of the situation that these union corporations have, because we understand that this is a moment of urgency to challenge

the neoliberal regime. We must be up to the task, not around corporate claims. For this, it is necessary to keep the situation open with popular participation through councils (*Cabildos*) and grassroots assemblies. Our goal is not to cede to the negotiations that will surely take place, but to open a process of politicization from the challenging of the regime. It is no longer possible to live as we lived a month ago. We therefore understand the idea of a Constituent Assembly as an element of dynamism to enable the political participation of the people. Finally, there is a third less permanent sector that sees Social Unity as a roof under which to put itself to allow the coordination and direction of the protests. Social Unity therefore appears as a relatively legitimate agent of the people, although differences are noted. It is in a conflictual space that brings together popular organizations.

KN My personal analysis is that, since the last presidential election, a new opposition bloc has appeared (Frente Amplio) and destroyed the Nueva Mayoría as a government bloc after the Concertación [these two coalitions mainly integrate the Socialist Party, Christian Democracy, Communist Party and social-liberal and centrist organizations]. This creates a problem: forming a new opposition bloc. The Communist Party is the keenest to put itself at the head of a new configuration of the opposition. This worked with, for example, the 40-hour work-reduction project, which forced the opposition to come behind the CP. As proof of this role, the CP managed to gradually exclude the Christian Democracy from the opposition bloc. Then, there came the eruption as we know. The CP continues what it has achieved in parliament through the CUT. The federation joined with Social Unity after its formation and directed it quickly. What happens from that is a lot of other organizations are joining this space. While the CF8M, which has been part of Social Unity since the beginning, a space that has been proposed by No + AFP, decided to participate critically. Indeed, this space is perceived as made up of summits of organizations, led by conservative union sectors. For the latter, the class struggle is conceived in its trade union form, ecology and feminism are considered subordinate. We have made this criticism explicit.

In the conjuncture, Social Unity dared to call for a general strike. But, between the CUT and the CF8M, the conception of a general strike is different. For the CUT and the other union organizations, it was necessary to go on strike to demonstrate that we are serious organizations, call for discipline and show leadership. As if the disobedience of the working class was an insignificant thing. In the end, it proposed a big demonstration for October 23, which in the context could appear very much below what the situation demanded. Openly demobilizing actions have also been proposed. The general strike is understood by these sectors as a moment and possibility to place its leaderships in the movement

Feminism understands the general strike as a process, in which the working class, with women and gender and sexual minorities at the head, can organize itself and think about the life it wants and how it wants to organize it. In a strict sense, we feminists consider that no strike is general, because the work of care does not stop. The strike is not only to stop working, but also to think a lot. In short, we are talking about two meanings of the general strike: one is to create, the other is to direct. These conceptions have now been put on the table.

What relationship does Social Unity have with the institutional left? What is the latter doing and proposing, especially in parliament?

KN My personal opinion, shared by other comrades in the last assembly of the CF8M, is that if there is no ungovernability for the executive power it is because the parliamentary opposition has maintained parliamentary activity. Social Unity launched the idea of a legislative strike, but it did not happen. For example, the plan to reduce working hours to 40 hours a week was adopted during the state of emergency, with soldiers on the streets. In the Frente Amplio (FA), which emerged during the last presidential election, there was no agreement between its different sectors. On the part of those who want to maintain parliamentary activity, the idea is that if they do not do so, the framework of democracy could be closed again. But in the end, the opposition eventually legislated, even the set of measures proposed by Piñera. It meant giving a hand to the government. At one point, the government proposed a meeting with the opposition parties. The Christian Democrats (DC), the Radical Party and the Party for Democracy attended. The Socialist Party, the PC and the FA didn't. Revolución Democrática, the main sector of the

FA, wanted to go at first. It's serious. The CP is now raising a constitutional accusation against Piñera and the FA agrees with that.

J. Z. The role of the CP in this has been very important. Immediately, it announced that it was not going to attend the meeting convened by Piñera. The significant political experience of the CP is recognised, so it has an influence on the entire arc of opposition parties, standing out from the DC, and putting pressure on the Socialists and the FA. In a statement that discusses the situation, the CP recognizes Social Unity as a legitimate actor, and moved the centre of dialogue to civil society. The CP has therefore played an important role in this shift in legitimacy. In any case, the movement was not going to accept a meeting of the opposition parties with Piñera and rejected them in the same way. This has been skilfully understood by the CP. At the same time the journey of recognition begins in terms of legitimacy and roles as interlocutor of Social Unity. Part of the opposition is exerting constitutional pressure, in continuity. Secondly, Social Unity includes activists from FA, CP and Socialist Party elements, but it cannot be said that this front is party-led. The movement and internal dynamics of Social Unity do not allow these groups to put themselves at the head, at least for the moment. And this for a fundamental reason: because the mobilization in which Social Unity is involved has emerged uncoordinated but driven by the working class as an actor that challenges the whole of society. It changes the way of doing politics. However, that the working class emerges does not mean that it organizes itself and necessarily becomes aware "for itself" of its experience as working people. Although there are strong embryos of organization and struggle that go in this direction. The power of Social Unity, in a context where the class arises as an actor, is that it can contribute to the political re-composition of the working class, if it does not think only of dialogues with the government or of restricted demands which are corporate and conciliatory.

Yellow vests appeared during these days of revolt. José Antonio Kast, a figure of the Chilean extreme right, called them to protest last Sunday. Is there the possibility of a reactionary social base in this situation?

K. N. The initial media discourse was that the first days were looting by criminals, creating a sense of insecurity. Groups appeared in the neighbourhoods that used yellow vests, with sticks or other forms of domestic weapons to prevent theft and defend their homes. This expressed a somewhat fascist trend. Quickly, the far right called for these yellow vests to participate in a demonstration for October 27, with the slogan of the right to live in peace, that is to say using the song of Victor Jara ("El derecho de vivir en paz") which became a popular anthem during the curfew. This caused confusion. But, the far right made the decision to cancel this demonstration on Friday, October 25, after the big demonstration that took place the same day. We can imagine, and this is a question, that the demonstration on Friday, October 25 would not have been so successful if there had been no military in the streets and if the government had continued its discourse on the movement as if they were thieves ransacking small businesses. But when the military comes onto the streets, there is a feeling against the army because of our history. This mobilized many people. The military presence in the streets opened a traumatic memory. This may be optimistic, but it leads me to say that the people of Chile are not right-wing. There could have been more yellow vests without the military on the streets. The extreme right is clever, but it was surpassed. The discourse of theft and insecurity lasted between two and three days. When the government promoted the idea that "We are at war", the media went from the discourse of theft to the discourse of terror, when the terrible videos of repression come out, with soldiers firing at people and entering the houses. The idea was, "If you go out on the street, they'll kill you". From this story, which did not work, the media turned to the discourse, following the big demonstration, that the people are peaceful and can hope for a better future, because those who have power are listening. For example, Piñera said it was nice to see families protest, when in fact people were asking for him to resign.

J. Z. Right-wing sectors, police and the military tried to take people who were afraid as a social base. This feeling of paranoia and hysteria that has existed, the extreme right is trying to capitalize on it. The latter wants to give a turning point to a corporate exit, targeting that part of the working people who want peace and tranquillity now, against the part of the class that is betting on protest because it understands that this is the time to make demands. However, the biggest protest in history last Friday has disrupted the supposed harmony between the far right and some of the

people. It should be noted that the yellow vests were not necessarily favourable to an even more militarized outcome, or in favour of Jose Antonio Kast, the far-right figure who obtained 8% of the votes in the last presidential elections and looks like Bolsonaro under certain aspects. Many wanted to be quiet. For example, in my neighbourhood, which is in Puente Alto, a suburban town, the yellow vests celebrated the highlight of Friday, they made a "barbecue", listening to popular music and identified as from the left. This event brought us back together as a class, after the media tried to exaggerate the most reactionary aspects of the convulsion we are experiencing. In any case, Kast has a discourse that has been able to win support among poor people, but his economic program preserves neoliberalism, which is the source of the malaise we are experiencing. This is a radical limit of his project. He cannot therefore offer a programmatic exit from the mobilization, which says that the neoliberal way of life and the malaise it provokes are unbearable. It should be noted that the appearance of yellow vests reveals a real problem: there are organized gangs in outlying neighbourhoods that commit crimes affecting working class neighbourhoods, around drug trafficking. This is the sector which the yellow vests confront as an effective threat, which in no way implies support for the government, Kast or repressive measures.

The forms of struggle and the slogans which seem to have the most force are the general strike, which we have already discussed, the territorial assemblies and the Constituent Assembly. What is the reality of territorial assemblies right now? Which self-organization processes are developing? How have these slogans been forged: spontaneously, resulting from the struggles of recent years?

JZ There is a mix of self-convened territorial assemblies and the fact that people have gathered at subway stations and other public places, where people sing, deliberate and perform cultural activities, and so on. This phenomenon appears spontaneously. Also, sectors quickly seize this moment and give it a conscious direction, calling for the creation of territorial assemblies. Tactically? Why are these assemblies important? First, they are getting together, they are organizing in several territories and that is a fact. I have seen similar self-activity processes, but never with this much magnitude in the contents that are debated as in the magnitude of the phenomenon. People's assemblies must push for a constituent assembly, which must be seen as a legitimate mechanism for changing the Constitution, an objective that is obviously not sufficient in itself. Sectors are talking about a new constitution, with a new parliament, and that's not what we're talking about. It's something else. We add the adjective "popular" to assert the sovereignty of the process. The Constituent Assembly can push and change the political scene. The challenge to the regime allows a participatory democracy in which the working class presents itself as a significant and leading actor. The second tactical importance is that the territorial assemblies are forming a base, a social fabric that will not disappear, although the intensity of mobilizations may decrease at some time. It is a common class experience, a learning of historical organization, which can allow the maintenance of a counter-power in the parliament, the institutions of the capitalist state, developing other values in the neighbourhoods and other modes of self-organization. However, the emphasis I have has to do with the possibility that the Constituent Assembly has the ability to move the political context in an anti-neoliberal way. There is an unusual force that generally challenges the educational model, management of natural resources, pensions, financial debts and so on. It is necessary to combine the Constituent Assembly with a program that challenges, in a radical synthesis. This is at least what is happening in the territories. But this is not taken up by some sectors that claim to be leading the movement.

K. N. These are strategic questions. The reality of the assemblies is that they are sectoral and started at subway stations, which correspond to neighbourhoods, with people living in the same area. They arose because activists participated from the first day and because they were needed. People got to know each other in the revolt, we got to know each other, to talk and to ask questions. The current challenge is so general that concrete claims do not arise. People have met in the struggle, trying to detect what we were challenging, why and how we imagined what we wanted. It sounds very simple, but for me it's already a constituent moment, not in the sense of changing the Constitution. The class is building itself in this process. It is difficult to have a general picture of the country, in terms of assemblies, demonstrations and repression because the situation is convulsive, and no organization has the capacity to grasp the totality. It is an explosion on the margins of traditional organizations.

The CF8M and the Movement for Water and Territories have spurred the existence of these assemblies. They were created to provide food faced with the closure of shops, to ensure security in the face of repression and looting, and to support the mobilization. The demands are that the military go away, that Piñera and the Minister of the Interior resign and there is the perspective of a Constituent Assembly. None of this is totally spontaneous, but it is impossible to be sure what previous experiences of organization, propaganda and mobilization have been significant. What is certain is that for 30 years, sectors of the people were organized, struggling, sometimes in total solitude. The No + AFP movement is easy to detect, because it was massive and very recent. March 8th, too. Constituent Assemblies seek to create a new constitution, and any constitution addresses the problem of how to base political power. This is important in Chile because the Pinochet constitution is explicit about its purpose. What it has established is not to return to the institutional framework that existed before, because to return to the previous situation is to reopen the institutional path of the workers' parties, which became Popular Unity. But, more than the 1980 Constitution, the constituent moment of present-day Chile is the 1973 coup. Opening the constituent theme is therefore not an easy option for the bourgeoisie, because it opens up the dangers of political participation of its antagonists. It opens an irreversible moment when it is no longer possible to ignore and omit the political problems of the working class. These days, fear has passed to their side.

At the institutional level, a new constitution is a central problem and there is no doubt that it needs to be changed, but it is important not to put the need for a new constitution as the major fundamental problem, as many sectors do, otherwise the anti-capitalist perspective is evaded. What is expressed in Chile is the class struggle, which also existed before the Pinochet constitution. The problems posed do not begin or end in a constitution. We must pay attention to the way in which the Constituent Assembly is concerned. On the one hand, it can close a political moment and guarantee rights, but I will not present it as the basis that has determined the current situation.

J. Z. I agree with that. Before 1973, there was not a better country than today. This debate is inconvenient also. In Social Unity, the theme of the Constituent Assembly appears, but does not challenge us, it does not appear as a debate that organizes politics. By the urgency of the moment, the most important question is how we are going to mobilize. Before this, in our socio-environmental organizations, for example, the Constituent Assembly was not our theme, but rather how to preserve our socio-environmental rights in the face of corporate plunder. The existing conflict directed us, according to the class struggle, to contribute to the working class organizing to preserve itself from this situation. The Constituent Assembly, in this sense, implies the risk of understanding politics in a very formal way: "we change the Constitution and thus we change the country". A singular possibility of this conjuncture is that from now on we have the chance for the working class to assume the direction of a constituent process, so that it is a political success. But at the same time, the social classes are organizing themselves in an antagonistic way. To approach the Constituent Assembly as if it were not class struggle seems to me to be a mistake. We want to at least warn, in this context, the anti-capitalist, feminist and eco-socialist sectors that it is about the class struggle and not about formal and abstract debates on the best forms of constitutional change.

K. N. There are sectors of the former Concertacion and the right that have been open to the need for a new Constitution, but not the Constituent Assembly. This becomes a broader, cross-cutting theme.

What are the challenges for the anti-capitalist, feminist and eco-socialist left?

KN What the working class is facing right now, what it has opened up by its action in a context where it has no parties and its organic strength is weak, will bring it, I think, to a bottom-up political activity, which in fact has been more or less true since 2005. It will be more difficult if we do not prepare organizationally, with an orientation that cannot continue to be sectoral: to strengthen the feminist trade union, pensions and socio-environmental movements is no longer enough. This perspective is general because a situation of protest has opened. There must be a proper narrative of what is happening, and it must be put together by left-wing political organizations, which must also strengthen. Otherwise, it will be difficult to build an alternative.

J. Z. This historic moment allows already existing organizations to launch into the water to seize the new historical dynamics that organize politics. This is not, for example, a question of ill-will, but smaller organizations are not able to respond and deploy meaningfully in this situation. In the Frente Amplio, an organization of several currents, there has until now prevailed a disposition to electoral and intra-institutional politics, and it was not able to be located in an efficient way in this context. My question is: how can the organizations themselves be transformed to anchor themselves in these new political springs that are beginning to open up? What we can at least do is reformulate our organizations, build new networks to fit in, and become part of the popular politicization processes that emerge. I am betting on the unification of the organizations of left and those which will arise from this moment. We must pay attention to these dynamics and contribute to develop anti-capitalist, feminist and eco-socialist perspectives within them, by adding the recomposition of political organizations, and seizing the new forms of politicization. We are very busy, and we have little time, but we cannot lose sight of thinking about new forms of organization in this context.

PS:

If you like this article or have found it useful, please consider donating towards the work of International Viewpoint. Simply follow this link: [Donate](#) then enter an amount of your choice. One-off donations are very welcome. But regular donations by standing order are also vital to our continuing functioning. See the last paragraph of [this article](#) for our bank account details and take out a standing order. Thanks.