The principal leaders of the United States have on various occasions tried to explain what neoliberal globalisation is. For example, the highest ranking U.S. trade representative once said that “Globalisation is the United States.” Concerning Latin America and Canada, former Secretary of State Colin Powell declared at one point: “our objective is to guarantee that the control of U.S. companies extends from the Arctic to Antarctica and that free access reigns for our products, services, technologies and capital, without any kind of obstacle throughout the entire hemisphere.” His successor, Condoleezza Rice, once said while still serving as National Security Advisor that “We want to change the Iraqis’ minds.”

In other words, globalisation is imperialism. The FTAA (Free Trade Area of the Americas) is an annexation of Latin America and the role of the U.S. state in all of this is evident. The idea that the state has lost its reason for existence due to neoliberal...
globalisation and the privatisation of economic public sectors is an idea which is indemonstrable and lacking of any theoretical or realistic content.\footnote{As Ellen Meiksins Wood (2004) states in her article “El imperio capitalista y el Estado nación: ¿Un nuevo imperialismo norteamericano?” Revista Viento Sur. June 12, 2004: “This imperial power depends not only on its own domestic state but on the global system of multiple states. This signifies that every one of those states is an arena of struggle and a potential counter-force. It is not necessary to say that the struggles in the heart of global imperialism are an important target for oppositional forces and for international solidarity. But every state upon which global power depends is an important target for oppositional forces and international solidarity. Protests against the summits of the World Trade Organisation or the G-8 can without doubt change the political climate. But in the end, they do not substitute for politically organised opposition to the power of capital organised in national states.” See: http://www.vientosur.info/articulosweb/textos/index.php?x=246.}

The classical authors on imperialism, such as the anti-Marxist Hobson and Marxists Luxemburg and Lenin, have defined imperialism as the necessary expansion for capitalism during its stage of domination by monopoly capital. Presently, the United States controls much more than half of the major banks and corporations in the world and constitutes the planet’s principal imperialist power. In order to extend and guarantee the control of big capital, “endless” military expansion and wars are necessary. As Thomas Friedman, a politically liberal journalist from the \textit{New York Times} suggested, the invisible hand of the market would never work without the “iron fist” of the U.S. military ensuring that the world remains safe for Silicone Valley technologies (Friedman 2000:464).

By reflecting and promoting the interests of monopoly capital, the U.S. government implements a militarisation of the world that threatens preventive military attacks upon sixty nations under the pretext of “the war against terrorism.” This militarisation serves to ensure and increase control over natural resources, the expansion of big financial and industrial capital, and the best possible conditions for U.S. trade and investments.

For that reason, Washington has established more than 700 military bases in 132 countries, including almost all of Latin America, where it has also suffered various defeats in recent years. In Puerto Rico, the mass rejection on the part of the Puerto Rican people put an end to the use of the Island of Vieques as a military free fire zone for constant live ammunition military exercises. In 2001, more than 15,000 Latin American military personnel were trained by the U.S. government in the re-named facilities formerly known as the “School of Americas,” well-known for its training of military dictatorships during the “dirty wars” that raged throughout the region.