

EAST AND WEST

www.eastandwestnewspaper.com

No. 12 14 June 2026

US CITIZENS MUST STOP THE MADNESS THEIR EMPIRE IMPOSES ON THEM AND THE WORLD

By Elena Gutiérrez - [Common Dreams](#)

Today, the United States has the opportunity to prove to itself and to the world that the mistakes committed by its government do not reflect the desires of the US people.

Since January 2026, when the intensification of US policies aimed at suffocating the Cuban people began, I have had the opportunity to travel to the island three times. Each time I return with my heart a little more broken, but also with a stronger conviction that we need to defend Cuba.

As a Mexican, I have received, on behalf of my compatriots, thousands of expressions of gratitude and hugs that the Cuban people send to the Mexican people. Every time I am there, I speak about the empathy and understanding we have toward Cuba, about the great efforts ordinary Mexicans make to bring a few kilos of rice to collection centers. And when I listen to Cubans, I learn a little more about the deep history that unites us.

But as a Mexican American and a binational activist, I also carry the weight of understanding the average US citizen. After many years of living in the United States, I continue to be surprised by how deeply the dream of democracy lives within people there, despite the fact that the country has been experiencing a deepening democratic crisis for years.

The deprivation imposed by Washington on the Cuban people for decades is now being reflected within the very core of the empire itself. It is suffered not only by migrants, Native Americans, Black communities, and the historically oppressed. Today, that same yoke has reached a white middle class that is beginning to feel the collapse of freedoms originally created for them.

Fortunately, people in the United States can learn much here from Latin America—and Cuba in particular. They can learn from the region's long history of struggle against Washington's domination—and from the long construction of democratic processes from below that go far beyond just elections.

The resilience and social fabric the Cuban people have built are unique, just as unique as the oppression caused by the blockade the US government has maintained for all these decades. The United States needs public healthcare, free access to university education,

and affordable housing. It needs to stop investing the billions it spends on war and instead invest that money in its own people. Cuba has done that.

The dream of democracy in any country is built beyond the ballot box alone, through projects that people themselves embrace and carry out. Today, the United States has the opportunity to prove to itself and to the world that the mistakes committed by its government do not reflect the desires of the US people. Today, as C. Wright Mills said 60 years ago, "Cuba's voice must be heard in the United States, because the United States is too powerful and its responsibilities to the world and to itself are too great for its people not to hear the voices coming from the hungry world."

The United States is preparing for another electoral cycle while its policies of war and interventionism throughout the Global South get reaffirmed.

At the same time, the island of 10 million inhabitants is preparing to continue resisting in the face of the possibility of an attack. In Cuba's "Family Guide for Protection in Case of Military Aggression," one can read recommendations for what to pack in a backpack: identification, a radio, candles, food, medicine, and toys to help distract children.

A recently published poll by the Center for Economic Policy Research (CEPR), a think tank based in Washington, DC, reveals that more than 60% of US citizens oppose a war with Cuba. At the same time, solidarity networks with Cuba in the United States—which have existed since the beginning of the blockade—are reactivating with renewed strength.

But can US citizens truly stop the madness their own empire imposes on them and on the rest of the world? Let us hope so, because only the people of the United States—and no one else—can carry out the transformations their own country needs. Only then will Cuba, the United States, Mexico, and the rest of the world be free.

Nuclear Abolition Is the Only Civilised Option

Global nuclear weapons spending reached an unprecedented 119 billion USD in 2025, according to the latest analysis by the International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons (ICAN). This represents a 19 per cent increase over the previous year and continues a five-year trend of accelerating investment in nuclear arsenals. In total, nuclear-armed states have spent 471 billion USD on these weapons since 2021. The United States alone accounted for 69.2 billion USD, more than all other nuclear-armed states combined. China (13.5 billion USD) and the United Kingdom (12.6 billion USD) followed as the next largest spenders. All nine nuclear-armed states increased their budgets, many by double-digit percentages.

These investments are not short-term. Current modernisation programmes will keep nuclear weapons operational for decades. Several systems now under development or deployment are expected to remain in service into the 2060s, 2090s, or even beyond 2100. These include the US Sentinel ICBM, the UK's Dreadnought-class submarines, France's next-generation ballistic missile submarines, and China's JL-3 submarine-launched ballistic missile. Nuclearism – the thinking and the weapons – is not fading; it is being entrenched for the next century.

The nuclear weapons industry is a major beneficiary. At least 25 private companies earned 38 billion USD from nuclear weapons-related contracts in 2025 and collectively hold 401 billion USD in outstanding contracts. Lobbying is extensive: 138 million USD in the United States and France, and 226 documented meetings between contractors and senior UK officials. Nuclear weapons are not only political instruments; they are commercial products with powerful institutional defenders. The opportunity costs are staggering.

The 2025 nuclear total equals 32 years of the UN regular budget. It exceeds the cost of ending world hunger for multiple years. One day of nuclear spending could fund 17,000 solar-powered home transitions or plant two billion trees. Nuclear weapons do not merely threaten humanity; they drain resources from the very things that could secure its future.

Nuclear weapons remain humanity's most destructive and undemocratic curse. No population has ever been asked whether it wants these weapons in its name. Decisions about devices capable of killing millions of civilians are made without public consent, democratic debate, or moral accountability. No opinion polls show that any nation's majority wants them or would accept their use on their own territory.

The defining feature of nuclear weapons is that they are designed to kill innocent people who are not participants in any conflict. That principle — the deliberate targeting of civilians — is universally condemned in international humanitarian law. It is incompatible with any claim to civilisation, ethics, or responsible statehood. The core definition of terrorism is the threat or use of violence against civilians to achieve political ends. Nuclear weapons embody this principle completely. Their destructive power is aimed not at military targets but at cities, populations, and the fabric of human life itself. The strategic value of nuclear weapons lies precisely in their ability to inflict mass civilian casualties. This is not a side effect; it is the doctrine. Nuclear deterrence depends on making entire societies fear annihilation. If non-state actors used this logic, we would call it terrorism. When states use it, we call it security policy. The moral distinction is nonexistent.

Nuclear weapons are also illegal under international law. The Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons (TPNW), adopted by the UN General Assembly in 2017, prohibits the development, possession, threat of use, and use of nuclear weapons. It entered into force in January 2021 and is now supported by 93 signatory states and 70 states parties. The treaty expresses the will of the global majority: most of humanity lives in countries that reject nuclear weapons outright. Nuclear-armed states stand outside this legal and moral framework, isolated from the norms they claim to defend. Supporters of nuclear weapons often claim that deterrence prevents war because nuclear weapons will never be used. But this argument collapses instantly. If both sides know the weapons will never be used, there is no deterrence. Deterrence only functions if leaders are willing to carry out the threat — that is, to commit mass murder when the strategy fails. The credibility of deterrence rests on the declared readiness to slaughter civilians on a scale that violates every principle of international humanitarian law. A doctrine that requires the willingness to commit a crime against humanity cannot be defended as a peace strategy.

Nukes are also unethical and illogic. There can be no political goal that legitimises their use and the automatic killing of millions of people, huge cities, and causes irreparable environmental damage. No human being or government anywhere can or should have the power to decide about humanity's future. No government would use them on their own territory, they are by definition non-defensive in more than one sense. And who could conquer and use a territory after

it has been nuked — a nuclear desert for what? They are, therefore, military useless. Even if one were to accept this perverse-grotesque logic, deterrence still fails on practical grounds. Too many accidents — that you have probably never heard of. It assumes perfect rationality, perfect information, perfect technology, and perfect political stability — conditions that have never existed in human history. The record of nuclear near-misses exposes the fragility of the system: false alarms at NORAD, malfunctioning early-warning satellites, misinterpreted radar signals, lost bombs, accidental arming events, and human errors that brought the world within minutes of catastrophe.

A security system that depends on luck, secrecy, and the hope that no one ever makes a mistake is not a security system at all. It is a permanent hostage situation in which the lives of billions depend on the flawless functioning of machines and the flawless judgment of leaders. No other policy area would tolerate such risk. No society would accept a transportation system, an energy system, or a medical system that fails even once in a century with civilisation-ending consequences. Yet this is exactly what nuclear deterrence demands. Nuclear weapons are not stabilising. They are not civilised. They are not compatible with democracy, law, human dignity, not to mention military efficiency.

Nukes are the last great superstition of the modern world — a belief that terror can produce safety. The world has abolished slavery, child labour, rape as a means of war, and absolute monarchy. It can abolish nuclear weapons too. There is a convention against genocide. Were nuclear weapons to be used, it would not only lead to a genocide, it would be omni- and eco-cide.

The ICAN report shows that nuclear-armed states are choosing long-term nuclear rearmament over global public goods. The political argument shows that nuclearism is indistinguishable from the logic of terrorism. The historical record shows that deterrence is a myth sustained by luck and delusion. Together, these realities point to a single conclusion: nuclear weapons have no place in a civilised world. Nuclear abolition is not an idealistic dream. It is the only rational, ethical, and human response to a system built on the — unacceptable — threat of mass murder. We need only one critical mass — explosion: Humanity's mobilisation for the most important issue: **NUCLEAR ABOLITION NOW!**

TFF Transnational Foundation

<https://thetransnational.substack.com/p/nuclear-spending-terrorism-and-the>

CAN UKRAINE RETAKE CRIMEA?

Ukraine has intensified drone attacks deep inside Russia and on the Crimean peninsula. It may be early to celebrate

The question may have appeared unlikely, even absurd, just a few months ago. The failed Ukrainian counteroffensive of the summer of 2023 was aimed at breaking the land bridge between Mariupol and the Crimean peninsula in two. At the time, in the weeks that preceded the Ukrainian attack, Ukrainian and Western military analysts claimed that Ukraine had a realistic chance at retaking Crimea. In fact, people said that the prospect of retaking Crimea for Ukraine would be much more realistic than a successful advance in the heavily fortified Donbass. Ukrainian officials argued that they would drink coffee in Yalta the following May. Zelensky himself said that the Russo-Ukrainian war had started in Crimea (referring to Crimea's passage to Russia in 2014) and would be over in Crimea. The disastrous failure of the Ukrainian counteroffensive in 2023 had a sobering effect. At least for a while.

A narrowing land corridor

Three years later, however, talks about a possible Ukrainian retake of Crimea are starting to emerge again. In the early months of 2022, Russia's main territorial objective had been to secure a land corridor between the Donbass and Crimea. After eight years of logistical challenges, Crimea could be resupplied via land. Russia had of course built in record time a 19-km long bridge over the strait of Kerch that separates Russia's Krasnodar region from Crimea and the bridge was opened in 2018. But this bridge, especially in the context of a war, proved a fragile liability. Since 2022, it has been severely damaged three times already. Each strike was celebrated in Ukraine and by the most ardent supporters of the Ukrainian cause in the West, in a grotesque exhibition of collective Schadenfreude, something which unfortunately has become the norm in recent years.

Now the land corridor between the Rostov region in Southern Russia, approximately 100 km wide, has increasingly been under Ukrainian drone attacks too. Ukrainians

have not been particularly squeamish about their targets either. Ukrainian drones, many of which now are being supplied by the American company Perennial, headed by former Google CEO Eric Schmidt, are equipped with AI intelligence systems and do not need human operators to select targets. Hence, these "Hornet" drones are deemed very effective.

Zelensky said that the Russo-Ukrainian war had started in Crimea (referring to Crimea's passage to Russia in 2014) and would be over in Crimea

A strategy of maximum damage

The damage these drone attacks produced has been vast — but often indiscriminate too. In recent weeks, quantity seems to have prevailed over quality of the targets. Trucks along the Rostov - Simferopol R280 highway are hit regularly, whatever they may carry. Logistics between the Russian mainland and Crimea is becoming a challenge.

Two million people live in Crimea. The majority are loyal Russian citizens

Beyond the land corridor from the Donbass to Crimea, intensified drone attacks, however, have led to a lot of "collateral damage" too. In the Luhansk region, there was the attack on the vocational school in Starobilsk, in which 21 people died. In the Donetsk region, a passenger bus was hit by a drone, killing 8. Russia is working on improving its defenses in the region, also with the use of anti-drone nets around the transport highways. In the night between

June 7 and June 8 a passenger train in Crimea was hit too.

Wrong incentives

Ukrainians argue that these attacks will enforce a logistic lockdown on Crimea. If the pressure increases, Russia may be forced to give up Crimea, possibly without the necessity of a military offensive. But the logic of the morale among the local population may work in an entirely different manner. After Crimea's passage to Russia in 2014, many in Ukraine already argued that if Ukraine cut electricity and water supplies — Crimea was at the time integrated in the Ukrainian power grid and irrigation system — this would force the inhabitants of the peninsula that had "betrayed" Ukraine to go back to Ukraine on their knees, humiliated and begging for forgiveness. The opposite, however, has been the case. Around two million people live in Crimea. Regardless of the question of the legitimacy of the referendum in March 2014, people who chose to remain in Crimea after 2014 — the vast majority of the population did so — became loyal Russian citizens. According to the highest and most pessimistic estimate, "only" 100,000 people, mostly Ukrainians and Crimean Tatars, left Crimea after 2014. Estimates vary, but according to some, 1 million Russians may have relocated to Crimea.

In March 2019, Russian president Vladimir Putin finally "turned on the lights in Crimea", connecting Crimea to the Russian power grid: it became a symbolic moment. In the 12 years that passed since the Crimea referendum of March 2014, there have been very few episodes of pro-Ukrainian sentiment and anti-Russian malcontent. Local residents have become used to difficulties. Blockades and drone attacks won't change their loyalties. "You will not be sweet (loved) by force", as the Russian saying goes. It is very difficult to imagine that a few drone strikes may force the people of Crimea to go back to Ukraine, with their heads bowed down in repentance, as some in Ukraine and in the West envision.

My UN would have saved Ukraine

According to the 1975 Helsinki Declaration the security of one state cannot be built at the expense of another's security. That principle had been invoked by the West for decades, but only when it suited the Euro-Atlantic powers.

By Pino Arlacchi

There is a question worth asking frankly, now that Ukraine has been reduced to a battlefield and Europe is suffering the consequences of a war it can neither win nor stop: was this catastrophe avoidable?

The answer is yes. And it is still avoidable today, if we have the courage and honesty to reflect on its underlying causes.

The most recent starting point is the failure of the Minsk Agreements. Signed in 2014 and 2015 under the nominal supervision of France and Germany, these agreements were supposed to provide the diplomatic framework for a resolution of the conflict in the Donbass. But they were a poisoned chalice from the outset. In 2022, with a shamelessness that borders on the unbelievable, Hollande and Merkel, the European leaders who had guaranteed them, publicly declared that they had used Minsk merely to buy time, to allow Ukraine to rearm and prepare for war. Not a peace agreement, then, but a trap worthy of the era of secret treaties between the European powers racing towards the world wars of the twentieth century.

Had there been a United Nations organisation reformed in accordance with my proposal – with a General Assembly endowed with sovereign prerogatives and effective mechanisms to ensure the implementation of peace negotiations – such a deception would have been impossible. An independent monitoring body, mandated by the entire international community, would have overseen the implementation of the Minsk commitments, documented violations, admonished the parties and rendered politically untenable the sabotage that took place undisturbed for seven years in broad daylight, with the complicity of the guarantors. The UN I propose would have made that betrayal impossible. But there is more. In the autumn and winter of 2021–2022, as the crisis spiralled towards the point of no return, a General Assembly endowed with effective powers would have been able to intervene on both fronts of the emerging conflict. Not as a powerless observer, but as a judge-arbitrator equipped with adequate means of intervention. Up to and including the use of its own armed peacekeeping force. The first step would have been the formal recognition of a reality that the Western alliance had stubbornly refused to acknowledge: over the course of thirty years,

Russia had been subjected to an undeclared process of strategic encirclement by NATO. This was neither imperial paranoia nor excessive sensitivity on the part of the Kremlin regarding its sphere of influence. These were documented, indisputable facts. In breach of commitments made immediately after the fall of the Berlin Wall and the dissolution of the Warsaw Pact, NATO had admitted fourteen new members between 1999 and 2020, pushing its front line right up to the borders of the Russian Federation. Missile bases had been installed in Romania and Poland, described as defensive shields but rapidly convertible into offensive platforms. The 1997 NATO–Russia Founding Act, which had promised not to deploy permanent military forces in the new member states, had been progressively stripped of its substance. And in 2008, at the Bucharest summit, the promise – which proved to be a spark – was made that one day Ukraine and Georgia too would join the Alliance.

It was a deliberate strategy, orchestrated by Washington and passively accepted by a Europe that had abdicated its strategic autonomy and had masked NATO's expansion with a parallel, innocent policy of the European Union's eastward enlargement.

A silent, slow-motion aggression: not with tanks, but with treaties, bases, memoranda, and maps turning blue towards the east. Russia had protested for decades – with Putin having explicitly denounced the encirclement as far back as his 2007 Munich speech – and no one had responded.

A sovereign General Assembly would have broken that silence. It could have adopted a resolution recognising the legitimacy of the Russian Federation's security concerns. It would have called on NATO forces to formulate a response consistent with the principle of the indivisibility of the national security of every member state. A principle enshrined in the United Nations Charter and the 1975 Helsinki Declaration, according to which the security of one state cannot be built at the expense of another's security. That principle had been invoked by the West for decades, but only when it suited the Euro-Atlantic powers. A reformed General Assembly would have applied it without exception, even when NATO was the accused party.

But acknowledging Russia's concerns would have been only one side of the equation. The

other would have been a warning to Moscow: your security concerns may justify a proportionate response, but not an invasion. International law provides for appropriate courses of action in such cases. A military operation confined to the Donbas regions, based on the right to self-defence and the protection of Russian-speaking populations who have been subjected since 2014 to repeated bombardments documented by the OSCE, would have fallen into a legally contentious area but one not without solid justifications. A large-scale invasion of Ukrainian territory, the overthrow of the government in Kiev, the military occupation of hundreds of thousands of square kilometres – no. That would have been, and was, something different: a full-scale war, incompatible with a defensive interpretation of international law.

This distinction – expressed not by Washington nor by Moscow, but by the authoritative and impartial voice of the General Assembly – would have carried a weight that no unilateral declaration could have possessed. It would have offered Putin a perfectly viable way out: your concerns are acknowledged, your enemies have been suitably warned, the world agrees with you on NATO, but it does not give you *carte blanche* for all-out war. And it would have sent a clear message to Ukraine and its Western backers: NATO's eastward expansion, the use of Minsk as a ruse, Ukraine's accelerated rearmament, and the systematic dismissal of Russian anxieties and protests have made you ultimately responsible for this crisis.

None of this happened. Because it could not happen. The Security Council remained paralysed: the West blocked the Assembly's resolutions acknowledging the validity of Russia's concerns. And so the world watched helplessly as the crisis unfolded.

My proposal to reform the UN is not utopian. It comes from someone who has seen from the inside how the highest expression of the multilateral system works (and how it does not work). My UN abolishes the right of veto, which places certain countries above international law. It grants the General Assembly the power to reflect the will of the international community as a whole, putting an end to the effects of the division of the world that took place at Yalta in 1945. It opens the door to a more equitable and democratic multipolar world.

This Week in History: June 12–June 26

- 12 June 1898 – The **Philippines** declared independence from Spain after more than three centuries of colonial rule.
- 13 June 1886 – **King Ludwig II of Bavaria** was found dead in Lake Starnberg under mysterious circumstances.
- 16 June 1903 – The first **Ford Motor Company automobile** was produced, helping launch the age of mass motorization.
- 17 June 1953 – **Workers' protests erupted across East Germany** against the communist government.
- 18 June 1815 – The **Battle of Waterloo** ended the military career of Napoleon Bonaparte and reshaped the political order of Europe.
- 19 June 1865 – **Enslaved people in Texas** learned of their freedom more than two years after the Emancipation Proclamation.
- 20 June 1789 – Representatives of the French Third Estate gathered in the **Tennis Court Oath**, pledging a constitution.
- 21 June 1948 – The **Berlin Blockade** began shortly after the introduction of a new currency in Western occupation zones.
- 22 June 1941 – Nazi Germany launched **Operation Barbarossa**, invading the Soviet Union in the largest military operation in history.
- 24 June 1812 – **Napoleon's Grand Army** crossed the **Neman River** and invaded the Russian Empire.
- 25 June 1950 – The **Korean War** began when North Korean forces crossed the 38th parallel into South Korea.
- 26 June 1945 – The **United Nations Charter** was signed in San Francisco by representatives of fifty countries.

Trump's Iran War Slowing Global Economic Growth to Lowest Level Since Pandemic: World Bank

“For light at the end of the tunnel, you'd have to look to the 2030s,” says the World Bank's chief economist.

By Brett Wilkins - [Common Dreams](#)

The World Bank on Thursday lowered its global growth forecast for the remainder of 2026 as the illegal US-Israeli war of choice on Iran drives up energy prices, inflation, and the cost of debt.

“The global economy is facing another major shock,” the World Bank's latest biannual Global Economic Prospects report states. “The conflict in the Middle East has triggered sharp increases in energy prices, renewed inflationary pressures, and fueled expectations of tighter monetary policy.”

“Global growth is projected to slow to 2.5% in 2026, from 2.9% in 2025—the lowest rate since the Covid-19 pandemic—amid weaker prospects for economies dependent on energy imports and those directly affected by hostilities,” the report continues. “Activity is expected to firm in 2027-28 as energy supplies recover, monetary easing resumes, and trade strengthens.”

The Iran War has resulted in the closure of the Strait of Hormuz, through which around 30% of the world's fertilizer and 20% of its oil previously passed. In addition to increasing the risk of a global food crisis, the strait's closure has sent fuel and fertilizer prices soaring, with US farm diesel costing nearly 50% more than it did on the war's eve in February and various fertilizer products

spiking by between one-quarter and one-half.

The war has affected the economies of countries far removed from Iran, as the World Bank reports forecasts that “growth in emerging market and developing economies (EMDEs) is expected to slow to 3.6% this year.. “The level of per capita income across EMDEs excluding China and India, relative to advanced economies, is not expected to return to the pre-pandemic level until after 2028, implying nearly a decade of lost income convergence,” the international financial institution predicted.

World Bank Group president Ajay Banga said in a statement Thursday that “developing countries have faced a series of challenges over the last decade”. “The impact differs by country, but the basic test is the same: Protect people and preserve stability today, without giving up on growth and jobs tomorrow,” Banga added. “In response to the current shock, we are providing liquidity where it is needed now—and we are ready with additional financing, guarantees, and private-sector solutions if pressures deepen. Our job is to help countries steady the ship, keep reforms moving, and emerge stronger on the other side.”

The bank said in April that up to \$100 billion would be made available over the next 15

months for nations suffering the most acute economic shocks caused by the war. As US President Donald Trump and Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu allegedly undermine efforts to end the war, the World Bank cautions that the global economic outlook “remains skewed to the downside.”

“A renewed escalation of hostilities or more prolonged disruptions to commodity flows could further raise commodity prices, intensify inflationary pressures and food insecurity, trigger financial stress, and lower growth,” the bank's report warns.

In his foreword to the new Global Economic Prospects report, World Bank Group chief economist Indermit Gill warned that “barring a miracle, the 2020s will prove to be what their ominous opening foreshadowed: a lost decade—not just for a couple of outliers, but for dozens of developing economies.”

“Amid one of the densest clusters of global shocks since the 1970s, nearly 1 out of every 2 developing economies has failed since 2019 to advance on the most rudimentary promise of development: narrowing the income gap with the world's most prosperous economies,” Gill added. “For light at the end of the tunnel, you'd have to look to the 2030s.”

The People, Democracy And Some Misconceptions

By Andrea Zhok

The issue raised by democracy is that of the existence and functioning of a people (demos). To assert that 'sovereignty belongs to the people' is an essential but insufficient step.

The progressive and liberal left has created a fiction, devoid of any historical or practical foundation, whereby democracies can exist without peoples. In fact, these 'democracies without peoples' are simply the reduction of democracy to a total (global) non-place of voluntary exchanges. This is the 'democracy' in which 'a dollar is a vote' and where the will of the people is expressed through acts of purchase on the market. Obviously, there is no collective identity here and therefore no political horizon, which requires the possibility of a horizontal discussion amongst all decision-makers. This is the 'global village' of the 'citizens of the world'. Politics is replaced by the economy, democracy by the market. Whether they are aware of it or not, this is precisely the direction in which all the various 'no border' movements and all those who think that citizenship is a useless trappings or a politically correct honour are heading.

Democracies came into being when territorially defined political systems emerged, where laws, decided by those who permanently belong to the territory, apply to what happens within that territory. (This is why there are those exceptions – extraterritoriality – such as embassies or ships, where, on a wholly exceptional basis, a law defined by a people applies to a distant and different territory.) Otherwise, there are empires, monarchies, or plutocratic oligarchies.

But if the left is confused and inconclusive in its conception of the people and popular sovereignty, the right is no less so. There is a section of the right – currently a minority – that has never recognised the very idea of popular sovereignty and, with it, the very idea of democracy. Then there is a substantial section of the right that effectively embraces the liberal-democratic conception, whereby a dollar is a vote, and

whereby, ultimately, people's decisions must be 'weighed' rather than counted: whoever is richer simply carries more weight, and that is only right. This perspective formally accepts democracy, understanding it as a form of plutocracy. To the limited extent that it reflects on this, this right-wing faction justifies itself on the basis of some form of 'social Darwinism'.

Finally, there is a section of the right that remains at a level of pure cultural chaos, imagining that merely chattering about 'traditions', 'Judeo-Christian roots' or 'nationality' is enough to have a coherent idea in mind. This is the most insidious section, because mental confusion allows for the indiscriminate mixing of very different things, right and wrong, paradoxically gaining credibility precisely because of this confusion in which everyone can recognise a little something of their own.

The concept of 'tradition' is enormously important, since it is essentially equivalent to 'cultural transmission', and no people (nor any democratic policy) exists except in the light of a strong sense of shared 'cultural transmission'. But the 'tradition' bandied about by the right is usually stuff like food festivals—things that are perfectly worthy, of course, but essentially brands to be sold to tourists as 'local specialities'. At the very moment it is full of talk about these "traditions", the right (just like the left) dismantles school curricula, demolishes theatres, welcomes the Americanisation of universities with open arms, and so on.

As for niceties such as "Judeo-Christian roots", this is the reification of a chimera, a figment of the imagination, given 1) that the history of Christianity is proverbially riven from within, 2) Judaism in Europe counted for nothing as a religion — largely confined to the ghettos — and 3) given that the broader and more unified common roots of European culture are the Greco-Roman ones, in relation to which the various forms of Christianity have taken root in highly divergent ways (consider the link between

Orthodox Christianity and the Greek roots of the Eastern Roman Empire).

This reification is not, however, an innocent error. It actually serves to destroy European roots, bringing them back into the sphere of influence of the American-led West. The 'Judeo-Christian roots' are an invention whose true purpose is not to reconnect with one's own (European) cultural tradition, but to assimilate into the US-Israel dyad, which has dominated the Western political scene since 1945.

It is on this basis that the right-wing's anti-Islamism arises, deliberately conflating the (real) problem of uncontrolled migration flows with the (fictitious) problem of the Islamisation of the West. As if the riots in the banlieues or the ISIS attacks were part of an 'Islamisation process'.

This, however, does not mean that Europe cannot at some point become 'Islamised'. Given that there are countless varieties of Islam and that therefore any talk of 'Islamisation', without further clarification, lumps together things that are literally incomparable, it is nevertheless by no means impossible that Europe might at some point become 'Islamised'. If this were to happen, it would not be through a coup d'état or the imposition of Sharia by force, but through the voluntary conversion of Europeans: the attainment of hegemony through internal means.

Islam is today a growing religion because it offers a spiritual perspective in a world—such as that of neoliberal Europe—which has systematically eradicated any spiritual dimension. It matters little that Europe can legitimately draw upon a rich spiritual tradition. If this remains merely a banner to be waved at some public ceremony, with nothing behind it, its fate is sealed. Nature, including human nature, abhors a vacuum. And spiritual emptiness (as the vicissitudes of the Roman Empire's decline clearly show) is never tolerated for long.

Andrea Zhok is a Professor of Ethics at the University of Milan

East and West Newspaper

Itinerant independent newspaper
Online since 2016

www.eastandwestnewspaper.com

Contact: info@eastandwestnewspaper.com

Follow East And West on X <https://x.com/eastandwest2016>

Facebook: <https://www.facebook.com/eastandwestnewspaper/>

Substack: <https://substack.com/@eastandwestnewspaper>

SUPPORT EAST AND WEST

GoFundMe:

<https://www.gofundme.com/f/east-and-west-newspaper>

Patreon:

<https://www.patreon.com/posts/east-and-west-151550389>

Can a 21st-Century Civilization Survive With Tribal Emotions?

By Mauricio Herrera Kahn - [Pressenza](#)

“Modern civilization has managed to connect continents, accelerate intelligence, and master matter. Yet it still cannot fully master fear, the tribe, and the ancestral impulse to destroy the other before understanding them.”

The question seems philosophical, but it is brutally practical. Humanity has built satellites, artificial intelligence, hypersonic missiles, instantaneous financial markets, and digital networks capable of connecting the planet in seconds. But beneath that brilliant architecture, an ancient creature still beats: territorial, fearful, vengeful, and tribal. The tool has changed, but the impulse has not always changed.

For centuries, religion promised to domesticate violence. Then came politics, then diplomacy, later human rights, and finally the great universal declarations. All necessary, all insufficient. History has not been a straight march toward goodness, but a permanent negotiation between cooperation and extermination. The temple preached peace while empires marched. Modernity spoke of progress while manufacturing concentration camps, atomic bombs, and surgical drones.

The Argentinian philosopher Silo understood something essential when he placed nonviolence at the center of human transformation. But nonviolence cannot be a spiritual postcard or a gentle slogan for well-lit gatherings. It must be a humanitarian doctrine of survival in the face of armed power. If it does not confront real structures of domination (hunger, fear, oil, minerals, debt, armies, and corporate interests) it is reduced to moral decoration.

Darwin did not teach that the cruelest survive, but that those who adapt best endure. That distinction is decisive. The human species survived because it learned to cooperate, not only because it learned to kill. The primitive did not prevail solely through the spear, but through the tribe, memory, shared fire, the capacity to care for children, and to recognize danger before night fell. The gene of survival was not only aggression. It was also connection. It was also care. It was also collective calculation.

Today, however, the old primitive has been given new tools. It no longer holds stone in its hand. It holds nuclear codes, financial sanctions, military algorithms, air bases, aircraft carriers, satellites, and supply chains. Its ancestral fear has been amplified by imperial technology. That is why the central question of our time is not whether humanity can invent more machines. It can. It has proven that endlessly. The question is whether it can produce a consciousness proportional to the destructive power it has accumulated.

The current geopolitical stage seems written by a Darwinian playwright with a dark

sense of humor. Trump travels to China seeking to speak with Xi Jinping while Iran, Israel, Taiwan, global supply chains, critical minerals, and world trade surround the table like invited shadows. The American president arrives before the Chinese leader not only as the head of a superpower, but as the representative of an empire fatigued by its own fires. He wants to negotiate, contain, reorder, sell, pressure, and exit the labyrinth without appearing lost.

There emerges the deeper paradox. The Western primitive approaches the Eastern primitive to prevent both from destroying the global cave. One carries the rhetoric of command. The other, the patience of the long game. One needs visible results. The other manages historical time. But both know something they do not always say in public. Neither can afford a total rupture. The United States and China compete, monitor each other, accuse each other, and depend on each other. The lions have not become vegetarian. They have only discovered that the jungle can burn with them inside it.

Iran and Israel add the moral gunpowder of the century. There intersect religion, security, oil, historical memory, nuclear power, regional hegemony, and imperial calculation. Each actor speaks of defense. Each accuses the other of existential threat. Each has its dead to show and its reasons to shout. But when everyone declares themselves the absolute victim, politics disappears and only the management of damage remains. Nonviolence, in that scenario, cannot be naive. It must be method, diplomatic pressure, military limits, escalation control, and a radical defense of civilian life.

Religion has not resolved this contradiction either. It has offered comfort, identity, and community, but it has also been used as a banner of conquest, exclusion, and punishment. No god should need artillery, yet human history is filled with armies marching under sacred symbols. There, the irony becomes unbearable. The human being invokes the eternal to justify the most primitive. In the name of heaven, it has too often turned the earth into a cemetery.

Real nonviolence does not deny conflict. It confronts it. It does not claim that power does not exist. It asserts that it must be contained before it becomes extermination. It does not deny that peoples have the right to defend themselves. It affirms that the defense of life cannot become a permanent industry of death. It does not claim that politics is pure goodness. It states that, without ethical, strategic, and material discipline, politics ends up obeying the oldest instinct. That is why this civilization faces an evolutionary test. It has

21st-century technology, but tribal emotions. It has artificial intelligence, but Paleolithic fear. It has global markets, but clan reflexes. It has humanist discourse, but massive military budgets. It has temples, universities, summits, treaties, and peace prizes. It also has hunger, occupation, forced migration, children under bombs, and the elderly waiting for medicines that never arrive. Technical progress has not eliminated barbarism. It has only made it more efficient.

Darwin returns here as a warning, not an excuse. If a species does not adapt its behavior to its new power, it becomes dangerous to itself. A tiger cannot destroy the entire jungle. The human being can. That is the difference. Our intelligence brought us out of the cave, but our tribal emotion can bring us back to it—with electricity, screens, and guided missiles. Modern barbarism does not wear skins. It wears suits, graphs, official statements, and legal language.

Hope, however, is not dead. It is hidden in the same place where human survival began: in the capacity to cooperate when fear threatens to devour everything. In the ancient gene that allowed the first humans to protect the common fire, care for the tribe, share food, and understand that no one survives alone through a long night. That gene was not weakness. It was evolutionary intelligence. It was the first form of politics. It was the first practical nonviolence.

To recover that gene means understanding that humanity will not survive by having more weapons, but by learning when not to use them. It will not survive by humiliating the adversary, but by preventing the adversary from becoming an absolute enemy. It will not survive by turning every border into a trench, but by recognizing that the planet no longer allows clean victories in global defeats. Darwin never promised paradise. The species that survive are not the most violent nor the most arrogant, but those capable of adapting when the environment changes and the old instinct stops working. The problem of contemporary civilization is that it reached the 21st century with tools capable of altering the entire planet, while part of its emotional structure still reacts like a tribe surrounded by invisible predators. Humanity has built artificial intelligence, satellites, global markets, and weapons capable of erasing cities in minutes. Yet it still stumbles over the same ancestral impulses of fear, domination, humiliation, and extermination. Nonviolence, then, ceases to be a decorative utopia. It becomes the final rational adaptation of a species that already possesses enough power to destroy itself.

In the Shadow of War, a Call for Peace: UN Launches 100-Day Global Campaign

By G M Forhadul Mozumdar - [Pressenza](#)



At a time when the world is facing successive conflicts, geopolitical tensions, an arms race, and severe humanitarian crises, a unique and hopeful message has emerged from the United Nations. Marking the 100-day countdown to the International Day of Peace (September 21), the UN Secretary-General has not merely made an official announcement; rather, he has shaken the global conscience with a fundamental question: Is the responsibility for peace solely on state leaders, or does it belong to ordinary people as well?

In a special message scheduled for official release on June 13, the UN Secretary-General noted that the world is passing through a critical juncture where war, violence, and division have become daily realities. For many today, 'peace' seems like a distant dream. Yet, even amidst this darkness, thousands of volunteers, social workers, teachers, human rights activists, and youth leaders across the globe are quietly sowing the seeds of non-violence and empathy. These ordinary individuals are the true architects and driving forces of a peaceful future.

A World at an Unprecedented Crossroads

According to international relations experts, the current global order faces its most multifaceted and complex challenges since the post-World War II era. Raging conflicts in various regions are displacing millions of people from their homes. Simultaneously, food and energy security are under severe threat, and climate change is continuously triggering new humanitarian crises.

In this grim context, the 100-day countdown to the International Day of Peace is not just a formal schedule; it is essentially a global awareness and social movement. Its

primary goal is to foster a deep realization among people that building peace is not the exclusive domain of a single state or international institution; it is a collective human and social responsibility.

Peace Belongs in the Human Heart, Not Just in Diplomacy

This new message from the UN shatters conventional, institutional concepts of peace. In his message, the Secretary-General emphasized that peace does not emerge solely from conference halls, diplomatic meetings, or international treaty tables. True peace begins at the grassroots level, in educational institutions, through teaching tolerance in every school and classroom; within families: inside the core of family values and through healthy relationships with neighbors; at the Social Level: By showing respect for differing opinions and diversity at every layer of society.

True and sustainable peace is rooted when individuals learn to stand against discrimination and practice empathy in their daily lives.

"Wars can be won with weapons, but peace cannot. Achieving peace requires justice, equality, humanity, and mutual respect."

Modern Conflicts and the 'Crisis of Trust'

The relevance of this message is paramount in today's era. Modern conflicts are no longer confined to traditional battlefields. Through political polarization, hate speech, social division, and online violence, conflict has permeated social media, politics, economics, and cultural spheres.

According to experts, the greatest challenge of the coming decade will be the 'Crisis of Trust'. Unless the deficit of trust among states, global institutions, and ordinary

citizens is bridged, achieving any form of lasting and positive peace will remain impossible.

Bangladesh's Moral Leadership in Global Peace

This global campaign presents a new opportunity for Bangladesh to demonstrate diplomatic and moral leadership. For decades, Bangladesh has played a unique role on the world stage as one of the top contributors of military and police personnel to UN peacekeeping missions. From Africa to the Middle East, Bangladeshi peacekeepers routinely risk their lives in war-torn regions to rebuild peace and provide humanitarian assistance.

Simultaneously, in recent years, Bangladesh has taken a strong stance on the global stage to promote peace, tolerance, and interfaith harmony. This 100-day countdown journey will pave the way for Bangladesh to further solidify its philosophy of peace and the 'Culture of Peace' globally.

Youth: The New Language of Peace

The youth generation is viewed as the greatest catalyst and beacon of hope in this peace campaign. A vast segment of the world's population is young, holding the keys to tomorrow's world. The youth can drive peace through two primary avenues:

- **Innovation & Technology:** Utilizing technology positively to counter hate speech on social media and spread messages of peace.
- **Social Initiatives:** Fostering tolerance, respect for diversity, and humanitarian values at the grassroots level to preempt future conflicts.

While the International Day of Peace is celebrated annually on September 21, the UN is spreading a new message 100 days in advance- 'Peace is not a one-day event; it is a daily practice.'

According to diplomatic sources, extensive global programs are being planned over the next 100 days to directly involve civil society, educational institutions, youth organizations, and humanitarian agencies in this peace process.

The War Within the Human Conscience

Ultimately, the world's greatest battle is no longer fought along geographical borders; it is being waged within the human conscience. The UN's 100-day countdown is not a mere paper declaration or a formal statement. It is a powerful, humane appeal to a war-torn, divided, and uncertain world- 'Let peace begin with me, with you, and with all of us.'