



THE HUMANITARIAN AND INSTITUTIONAL CRISIS OF FORCED MIGRATION SEEN FROM THE NEO-MARXIST PERSPECTIVE

Jorge Morales Cardiel

ORCID: [0000-0002-2627-4435](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2627-4435)

Contacto: moralesc_j@javeriana.edu.co

Doctorado en Estudios del Desarrollo, Universidad Autónoma de Zacatecas (México).

Afiliación: Pontificia Universidad Javeriana de Bogotá, (Colombia).

Fecha de presentación: julio, 2025

Fecha de aceptación: noviembre, 2025

Fecha de publicación: diciembre, 2025

Cita sugerida (APA, séptima edición)

Morales Cardiel, J. (2025). The humanitarian and institutional crisis of forced migration seen from the neo-marxist perspective. *Revista Pensamiento Científico Latinoamericano*, 4(8), 125-141.

SUMMARY

The humanitarian and institutional crisis caused by forced migration as seen from the Marxist perspective would propose to explain this phenomenon as a developmental strategy imposed by the capitalist system in order to expand its hegemony in a macro-regional context, together with public policies implemented by individual States that intervene in these human displacements to gain control over these migrants and convert them into what could be referred to as a reserve army. Therefore, this dialectical perspective seeks to systematize everything that fosters the migration of workers through the processes of economic integration and capital production chains, especially through the destruction of basic means of subsistence and productive activities in communities of origin, constrained by the reconfiguration of internal markets. But this Marxist dialectical method is not without conceptual problems that must be dealt with, especially in regards to the new generation of neo-Marxists, since an important part of science is based on questioning that should be recognized and reflected upon for conducting future research that explores this same Marxist theoretical line.

Keywords: crisis; emancipation; forced migration; marxist perspective.

INTRODUCTION

To explain the problems caused by irregular immigration from a Marxist theoretical



perspective, the methodology should focus on political economy, which refers to the analysis of the social, economic, and political areas of production within capitalism and how they lead to the exploitation and commodification of the migrant labor force for obtaining surplus-value. Specifically, this methodological proposal refers to the mechanisms of assigning a value to this labor force through the expansion of financial capital, territorial dispossession and the loss of social rights of this sector of the population.

Therefore, it requires a theoretical methodological analysis that should focus on the understanding that this type of migration belongs to an industrial reserve of capital that is forcibly displaced in the frantic effort to continue reproducing its labor force, as simple merchandise, beyond national borders. In an attempt to delve deeper into this dialectical perspective, there are certain authors who argue that this liberalization of the migrant labor force occurs as a result of the socioeconomic decomposition of peripheral regions, largely due to the restructuring of internal labor markets and structural policies based on the three tenets of openness, privatization and deregulation (Márquez and Delgado, 2011), which have triggered large waves of forced human displacement.

Given these assertions, it is important to analyze the methodological and epistemological categories as they pertain to irregular immigration; these categories must be viewed as a certain historical-structural moment specifically focused on peripheral regions of capitalist development, as Latin America. For the Marxist method, in general, this is the way capitalist reality is conceived, in other words, the way in which this reality can be approached and appropriated by means of the premises used in any research where the crisis of capitalism has had a profound impact causing a marked underdevelopment (Cámara Izquierdo, 2002).

The first step toward reconstruction of the capitalist reality under this dialectical perspective must fundamentally involve the delimitation of epistemological aspects, so we can understand the difference between the methods of investigation and exposition. The starting point is the theory of value and the general law of accumulation, ideas developed by Karl Marx in the nineteenth century and which have been elaborated on by those who try to continue his work to the present day.

DEVELOPMENT

a) Challenges from the dialectical perspective of Marxist methodology

For the analysis of irregular immigration, it may prove to be an adequate theoretical-



conceptual tool of exposition somewhat than analysis, nor be considered methodology as well, in a certain sense, because of Marx's own conception of reality as a contradictory process subject to constant movement and change. And Marxist dialectics do not in themselves explain capitalism, but rather are an aid in investigating capitalist relations and production processes for societies exposed to this system (Taylor, 1943), which at present encompass practically all of them.

It is to be assumed that dialectics as a method, but not a methodology of science. Considering science as the art of reasoning correctly using given premises, be these false or true. For this reason, Marxist dialectics can be indifferent at first to the truth of its premises. These premises towards irregular immigration, when analyzed under the umbrella of political economy, must necessarily include empirical aspects of any analysis, at the same level of abstraction as in the theoretical level, something that is not commonly done.

It should be taken into account that Marxist dialectics have a dual nature as a method of study; it is both a method for constructing theories (theories of knowledge) and a conception of social reality contrasted with the criterion of truth. That is, the reproduction of concrete thoughts using the material reality that is intended to be reproduced. Certainly, we remain within the same process of abstraction, as Cámara Izquierdo (2002) rightly points out, as it is an unfinished basic relationship between theory and practice, which Marx highlighted when dealing with the contradictory condition of the relations of capitalist production. This gave rise to the ideology of the working class, as one of its main achievements, because it is not only implicit but also represented under this supposed methodology of analysis, which is equivalent to saying that it possesses a strong political character of intrinsic activism.

As happens within Marxist abstraction in this dialectical method, most of the neo-proto-Marxist dialecticians do not formulate theories with the aim of advancing the traditional scientific method, and this is likely one of their main shortcomings. If they are aware of it, they do not appear to be very interested. Indeed, the motivation of many followers of Marx's intellectual work is manifestly philosophical and/or political, not precisely a scientific and, therefore, methodological motivation with real repercussions on society, since dialectics is understood as a vision of the world, and a vision of the world is not realized, it is made concrete (López, 2010).

This is ironic, because Marx himself warned of this when he stated that our fundamental task (as academic researchers) was to change the world rather than to understand



it (Harvey, 2014). At this point, using the conclusions of Manuel Sacristán, the previously cited López (2010), recognizes that Marx employed a kind of inverted Hegelian method, because Marx himself recognized that dialectics could not be identified with a logic of theoretical construction in idealistic terms, separating himself from Hegel, because Marx was a materialist and Hegel an idealist.

Regardless of this ideological and philosophical debate, what is certain is that the labor force, comprised of thousands of forced migrants, “the industrial reserve army” of Marxism, has never ceased to be an integral part of the accumulation processes of capitalism. Which is why the supposed “economic heroism” seen in places where labor migration is concentrated, has been at the cost of an increase in poverty in the communities of origin and communities of migration in the peripherally underdeveloped nations. In any case, capitalism cannot function without the mobility of the cheap labor provided by the irregular and/or forced migrant, even if this subsequently generates socially unbearable chaos, as Polanyi (1954) argued.

Certainly, it is a complicated reality when it comes to issues of migration to try to find an adequate method and methodology to explain the origin of irregular migration, which will later become forced, if the destination countries reach this recognition. Historically, having a theory that can explain all the details of any (economic) displacement is difficult due to the enormous and growing complexity of the migrants involved, due to their different nationalities, ethnicity, legal status and social class, and because of their geographical trajectories within any migratory system.

And even more so considering that in the modern era, within the dynamics of capitalist development, the social and global dimension of displacement has been exacerbated in terms of the number of migrants trying to cross borders. This global dimension of displacement has become a valid scientific paradigm within the sociology of migration, being one of the studies most prone to be idealized or politicized, an ideologization that is the greatest expression of the Marxist method, even more so for the new Marxist dogmatic wave.

Above all, when forced migration is transferred without much thought to concrete reality and without sufficient methodological, i.e., empirical, rigor. Since neo-Marxist perspective has become a simple imitation of the traditional orthodox method within the research process, of which they are very critical, the perspective of the Marxist historical-material process cannot be understood, because the theoretical interpretation ceases to be appropriate (Marini, 1991).



This has happened because it has taken advantage of the humanitarian and institutional crisis of Latin American forced migrations, being one of the most palpable consequences and contradictions of the modern crisis of the capitalist system, but perhaps the least understood by the policy of the states' rights that intervene in its management, the situation on the U.S.-Mexico border in this sense is more than evident.

The problem here is that these governments do not have the genuine support of public policy makers, which should fall to the scholars that research these matters. Instead, through their actions, politicians continue to promote the adjustment mechanisms of the internal and external markets of the most voracious capitalism. However, there is still a pressing need for a theoretical approach to critical migration and development studies.

This is the basis of presenting the structural root causes that have led to the current massive transnational migration of hundreds of thousands of workers from Latin America, which in turn, has led to a sudden upsurge of intellectuals who decided that a theoretical approach that claims to be based on a Marxist critique of dominant perspectives, should be considered the only adequate theoretical option for studies centered on migratory workers (Delgado, 2009).

Based on this perspective, not so critical as generalizing and dogmatizing, the neo-Marxist approach proposes that the humanitarian crisis caused by irregular and forced immigration is part of the multidimensional crisis of contemporary capitalism because it turns these migrants into what can be called a "reserve labor of the industrial army" by the processes of commodification of labor. The social reproduction of capitalism, by deteriorating human relations, converts the massive exodus of migrants into a "subaltern" displacement, reproducing through their labor force the same conditions of subordination, domination and exploitation of capitalism (Delgado, 2009).

This totalizing and catalyzing sector of social science proposes that this type of crisis is recurrent and essential for the reproduction of the conditions of capitalism in the U.S, as a mechanism of purification and reallocation of surpluses since its imbalances and contradictions are confronted and reorganized to generate a new balance in its dynamic core. They make use of the observations of Harvey (2014), who, citing Marx, affirms that the crises of capitalism have always been the real concentration and forced adjustment of all the contradictions of the private economy of capitalism.

This is a feature of globalization due to the increase and expansion of unequal



development among the nations involved in this type of displacement. Therefore, the theoretical proposal about the causes of the humanitarian and institutional crisis of irregular immigration from a neo-Marxist perspective, can be described as part of the movement of a displaced labor force through the structural imbalances between the first world and the third world, or as has been more recently pointed out, of the "Global North and Global South".

Because of their historical relationship of dependency, brought about by the circulation of production and value through the labor force of these migrations, and which under these assumptions have even come to be called "nomadic proletariat", they are constantly in danger of being disregarded by the regional dynamics of labor exploitation, as if they were the "new international division of labor". In concrete terms, the theoretical neo-Marxist vision within the study of irregular and/or forced migration caused by contemporary capitalism, continues to be part of a historical-structural perspective that considers these forced migrations to be the result of a new capitalist world order.

This new order involves industrialized countries and peripheral countries, in a co-developmental relationship, for the benefit of the latter, by having a subordinate internal structure of underdevelopment, which deepens to the extent that more forced displacement of labor is directed towards the centers of development, squandering their labor force, which is the only thing they can sell, regardless of whether it is a condition of servitude or semi-slavery, since in a world of unequal relations, it is better to be exploited than not to be exploited.

b) The political economy of forced migration: the emancipatory impasse

The political economy as seen from the Marxist perspective seeks to address the phenomenon of forced migration at its highest level of abstraction, as mentioned by Márquez and Delgado (2011). This means that this perspective is directly related to the general dynamics of capital on the basis of two analytical categories: original accumulation and overpopulation, consequently, the political economy could serve as a critique of capitalism as the main mechanism that triggers the migration of workers, especially at the conceptual level.

Therefore, the objective of the political economy aimed at the study of irregular and forced migrations should be to understand the general principles within the dynamics of capitalist production, a daunting task. Additionally, it should refer to the analysis of the historical-structural causes of migrations within the mechanisms of capitalist production, for a population that under this umbrella would be considered as "redundant" or "relative", who



frantically try to escape from the segmented and precarious internal labor markets from which they were previously “liberated”, because all their possibilities of basic subsistence have been diminished.

In a certain way, it would be something of an obligation for this dialectical method to try to give meaning to the structural conditions of the labor force in movement, that is to say, of labor migrations, which at present are almost all irregular migrations. Thus, there are a number of Neo-proto-Marxist authors who fully rely on political economy, among them Altvater (2011), who risks claiming that one can maintain as much as one wants of this critical perspective of political economy, since, unlike classical or rationalist economics. For Altvater, as well as forms of socialization within the more abstract processes of the market consequently, “Karl Marx’s critique of political economy is unique among the contributions of economic theory” (Altvater. 2011: 46), which is to say it is unique not “the only one”, at least it seems so.

Regardless, political economy in relation to the phenomenon of forced and irregular migrations, can be considered an early intrinsic phase of capitalist development. The conquering and colonization of entire continents caused migrations to be the relative and surplus population of additional labor, as the basis of the expansion of wage labor and the value it possesses. Thus, arising from the expropriation of this labor power, Marx would coin for these terms the concept of “absolute surplus population” (Marx, 1967), having in mind the Irish migration that had gone to the industrial north of England in the middle of the same 19th century.

At this point, one of the first premises of political economy towards irregular and forced migration, is to consider such precarious labor conditions in the places of origin of the labor force that is below the minimum subsistence levels, but that, without being a coincidence, turn out to be quite convenient for the capitalist producer, especially the oligarchic, once the market is able to expand. We also see this in the observation made by Marx, that within the classical political economy, what characterized productive or living labor was the creation of surplus value, because it exceeded the value needed by the worker to survive (Marx, 1967).

This leads to the recognition of another fundamental premise within Marxist analysis, in a second, less abstract plane; international migrations have responded to the unequal spatial distribution of capital and wage labor, assuming as their origin the disparities in the levels of



production reflected in wages, and between the countries involved in these displacements.

Arghiri Emmanuel, who, starting with the recognition of the alteration of prices and wages as a product of imperfect competition, argued that the mobility of the labor factor should be only enough to ensure that there is an international equalization of the benefits of production and that wages remain valid (Emmanuel, 1972).

Which in a larger sense models us to the understanding of why there are such marked border restrictions between countries with different levels of capitalist development, Mexico and the United States being the clearest. A relevant aspect comes to light at this point if we want to continue to maintain the later treatment of international migration as part of the “floating reserve army of capital”, or as “the nomadic proletariat”, to what Marx referred to as flows and counterflows; by the generation of such surplus value that determined the constant elimination of workers in countries where a thriving industry with profit rates. And by extension, better wages, has not been developed, which encouraged greater displacements of the labor force to places where this kind of industry has been able to develop (Marx, 1967).

For Marx, this labor mobility was the immigration and emigration seen as a constant phenomenon in the emergence and development of the capitalist system. Previously Marx had considered this labor force as a simple commodity for use and sale, deducing that the exploitation of its labor force and its migratory movement would become inseparable aspects to fundamentally counteract the downward trend of profit rates created by capital (Marx, 1967).

It was evident that for Marx there was a process of circulation of value through the labor of this working class, which for him meant another subaltern aggregate of the *lumpenproletariat*, which formed a part of his dialectic. In the words of Harvey (1982), the body of the worker becomes variable capital, turning that worker into a mere appendix of the circulation of capital as part of a constant process of circulation of value.

Although the ideas described up to this point would seem to be quite clear and straightforward, where does all this dialectic lead us to? Certainly to a dead end as seen from the neo-Marxist perspective. This leads us to the concept of Emancipation: although it also questions neoliberal institutions and the structural dynamics of accumulation of capitalism to the detriment of the freedom and rights of the working class, aspiring to be understood by this same class. Emancipation for forced or irregular migrations cannot be in the near future a process of social construction that clues to the formation of class-consciousness.



The idea of emancipation when used in the concrete sense of forced migrations, does not align with class struggle, because even though migration is a part of the “nomadic proletariat”, it does not aim to be the end of such nomadism because it is very difficult to define the places of transit and destination. Emancipation, in this sense, should refer, as Vladimir Lenin did, to the fact that it does not necessarily imply the end of capitalism, but more likely will lead to an internal restructuring of colonial power; towards an “exterior” type of capitalism within a new power of reorganization. For Lenin, emancipation was something to be achieved through the revolutionary transformation of land ownership allowing for a separation from the forces of production within bourgeois society (Lenin, 1973).

Marx, in “On the Jewish Question” writes about the fundamental conceptions of the rights of man, who, according to him, possesses two degrees of emancipation: one political and the other human. Political emancipation is that of a citizen and a moral person and is the reduction of person to their role as a member of bourgeois society, as an independent and selfish individual. Human emancipation is reaching out only when a person recognizes the social forces needed to organize himself, with a view to the self-government of the working people (Djordjevich, 1961). The situation for forced migrants, but especially for irregular migrants who are in the shadows, is unfortunately far from being achieved. But, not so for the new neo-Marxist colleagues, for whom this scenario could be very different, which we will return to later.

Marx and Engels, through the Communist Manifesto in 1848, believed that workers around the world would unite to fight and thus try to contain the destructive forces of capital, building an alternative approach. The migrant proletarian class, on the other hand, having no homeland, do not possess anything that can be taken away from them, thus making it easier to conquer political power and rise and constitute themselves as a multinational class in contrast to the bourgeois, as the first conditions for their emancipation, which is also far from having been achieved. The following is an outline of how this came to be.

Without a homeland – which would amount to citizenship rights for stateless migrants or political asylum for economic migrants – state boundaries are currently too rigid for migrant workers. Nation-states settle the struggle to maintain control of their borders, even if these boundaries are often merely representative, but which in theory would offer opportunities for political organization and action, a situation that is not foreseen in the near future, and for which there are clear examples.



One of them, quite frighteningly, is that emancipation does not even require a “socialist state” today. Djordjevich (1961), saw from the workers’ struggle in the former Yugoslavia in the middle of the last century, a socialist State that did not urge society to emancipate itself from the old institutions and social causes of oppression. An obvious case of this that has emerged within the rise of the new leftist government in Mexico, under the so-called “Fourth Transformation” (Cuarta transformacion or 4T), is dedicated, as its main immigration policy, is to persecuting immigrants as if they were criminals. Especially in the main North Mexican border cities, where these migrants are trapped at the “gates of the empire”, as the Neo-Marxists of the Mexican State might call it.

Therefore, it is currently far from realistic to entertain the possibility of understanding irregular or forced migration in emancipatory terms, as a dialectical concept, as it relates to the power that this sector of the population could have to direct their own destiny. Assuming a leading role in their conditions and political and social reproduction, and in their situation of class exploitation, to build an alternative means of development by opening new channels towards free transnational labor mobility.

Certainly, irregular migrants, with their “stubborn determination” to cross borders while facing all possible adversities to do so, as José Rocha (2010) says, are apparently not indeed victims of a capitalist system that exploits, marginalizes and discards them whenever it deems necessary. However, rather they seem to be the pioneers of new forms of a type of civil disobedience, one that manages to transgress to varying degrees all the barriers imposed by developed nations that build walls to continue dividing the world into classes.

Nevertheless, the most contradictory side of the emancipatory objective, even within the Marxist dialectic itself, is notorious in this very sense. Beginning with the recognition that in the current world system governed by the neoliberal economy, there is no possibility of being sovereign if we cannot rid ourselves of this domination and this logic applied to the market (Rauber, 2013).

Emancipation, which the organization and class struggle of migrants would supposedly lead to, is quickly refuted by another current example of irregular migration: the 2018 caravans of Central American migrants through Mexico, who laid bare the true intention of this collective to reach the United States at any cost, despite all the risks they encountered along the way, including losing their lives.

They were dedicated to the idea of selling their labor power as simple merchandise



and consequently to continue the cycle of the same conditions of subordination and labor exploitation that exist within the tremendous U.S. private capital, instead of the supposed emancipation or liberation of the objective of class struggles of the “nomadic proletariat”. Not even the civil organizations who supported them during this journey had in mind the dialectical horizon of emancipation.

What this example of the Central American caravans showed us, was rather a sort of “right to be exploited”, because definitely for the Central American, Caribbean, African, Asian migrant, from any place of the so-called Global South, it is better to be exploited than not to be exploited. This exposes the need for a variant of the Marxist dialectical method and the neo-Marxists who whole-heartedly embrace it, and who are unable to detach themselves from the Marxist orthodoxy that indicates that the proletariat will or will not be a revolutionary force.

Even for the non-governmental organizations that offer support to migrants in Mexico, most of which have established migrants’ shelters, the work continues to be based on the defense and respect of the Mexican State of the fundamental human rights of migrants, to counteract the violence they have suffered during transit. In other words, the emancipatory struggle for the labor and social rights of citizens has not yet been put on the table for these organizations. In any case it opens the way to emancipatory practice from the inverse logic that the proletariat has no specific interests, thus making it revolutionary, as expressed by Espinosa (2018).

This migrant working class, which should appear to be a revolutionary expression through an emancipatory practice, with the introduction of the Marxist approach to the existing struggle between social classes, would ostensibly be trying to attack the very heart of capitalism. But this is an orthodox vision that comes from certain Neo-Marxist authors and that constitutes a real problem for scientific thought within the social sciences, because by proclaiming truths as infallible in certain aspects of social and political life, it is anti-scientific and dogmatic and consequently contrary to socialism. Even Marx himself condemned the alleged official reasoning that does not succeed in instructing through science and the spirit of research, but wants to instruct science (Djordjevich, 1961).

This is due to the fact that many times the revolutionary mind of the anti-organic intellectual is apt to change everything, ignoring what really needs to be changed, because sometimes it only seeks in dialectics an object of faith, a subject for speculation. Whereas true



reforms can be boring, revolution in the proto-Marxist mind is exciting, being easier to practice within the Marxist eschatology attributing to the proletariat (or the migrant) the role of savior (Aron, 1965).

This brings us to the Judeo-Christian origin of Karl Marx, in which a revolutionary demand of the proletariat gives rise to the myth of the suffering of the chosen class and of a Messiah that will rescue humanity. Certainly, migrants like those from Central America, the Caribbean or Africa do suffer and believe they are heading toward the kingdom of freedom and redemption. But so far, the ruptures that might have entered this ideological field of self-consciousness, as we believe was exemplified by the migrant caravans of 2018 in México, do not lead to the construction of that myth more than in the thought of Marxist dialectics, which paradoxically separates it from its particularities.

c) *Marxism as academic vampirism*

But the main drawback of the Marxist perspective in the study of international migrations does not lie in the current impossibility of realizing the emancipatory objective, it lies in the "academic vampirism" of the Neo-Marxists trapped in the productivity university bureaucracy. This academic vampirism, together with the academic arrogance that often accompanies it, as corroborated by Lopes de Souza (2019), is disguised as solidarity at all levels of scale, especially when it comes to class struggles in a world plagued by inequalities.

This same author offers us an eloquent explanation of this controversial term: "exploitation of other people for the benefit of one's own academic career, structurally it is the self-reproduction of a mercantilized and bureaucratized academy" (Lopes de Souza, 2019: 11). This author goes on to assert that this kind of academic arrogance is particularly damaging and hypocritical, as most academics, many of them "radical and critical" based in the so-called "Global South" are willing to accept; and they would even be honored to sit on an international advisory board or editorial board of an international journal based in Western Europe or the United States. Publishing their refried-papers mostly in English, without feeling any conscious risk of being co-opted in the course of their increasing "cultural integration" or "cultural adjustment" (Lopes de Souza, 2019).

They are easy to identify because they often play a powerful and influential role at the national level, as "privileged intermediaries" between U.S./Western European academic centers and their own national academic centers. They are academics who are outspoken about being conservative, and participate in this despite belonging to the "left" and, therefore,



are supposed to be radical, internationalist and committed to socio-spatial change and anti-colonialism (Lopes de Souza, 2019), which is surely a problem for their Marxist inclinations.

We are talking about a "productivism" academy (and academics), driven by the opportunistic system of "publish or perish". A kind of growing "structural hypocrisy" according to Lopes de Souza (2019), including the remaining self-declared radical provinces of the social sciences, that is proto-Marxist without actually being so, because of the systemic tendency towards the commodification of scientific knowledge and the bureaucratization of academia.

More than proto-Marxism, within the vampirist academic groups, what prevails is rather a vulgar Marxism that magically, through an ideological structure from an excessively general point of view, does not allow us to see any phenomenon in its concrete particularity. As Carlos Castaneda points out in the afterword of Octavio Paz's book *Las Enseñanzas de Don Juan*, Marxism is not a science, but rather a theory of science and history, since for Marxism there is only one history. And, for proto-Marxists there is only one theory for any objective that is put in front of them, as a centralized universalism that does not allow the plurality of concerns or openness to other theoretical perspectives.

Gramsci spoke of the "organic intellectual", who's primary duty should be to develop a society autonomous from the State in countries where it is truly important, such as those where the international proletariat is displaced in a situation of humanitarian risk. But Antonio Gramsci was tenacious in this regard, because for him for the "statists" of the proto-Marxists to continue generating resources for their intellectual work, it is civil society that appears defined as the intellectual and moral foundation (Portelli, 2011).

This critique belongs to the category of Gramscian historical blocs, something that is undoubtedly important to point out, since in order to reach the overcoming of the State towards the ends of society, the intellectual class uses the ideological bloc that is detached from society to use the State that in turn controls the subaltern auxiliary groups. Thus, for Gramsci, the collective awareness of the subaltern classes due to war did not automatically become revolutionary consciousness (Portelli, 2011). A reflection that in our historical block could be transferred, insisting that the awareness of the intellectual classes themselves due to the humanitarian crisis of forced migrations does not automatically become revolutionary consciousness, although their publications lead them to believe so.

Due to the long-term consequences of ethnocentrism and sociocentrism within neo-



Marxist studies, it is complicated to analyze the potential of this perspective in the study of international migration. As the author Lopes Souza (2019), who coined the eloquent term “academic vampirism”, has stated that nothing could be more incongruent with the pretension of being radical, critical and anti-capitalist as the principal scientific foundations and, at the same time, being indebted to the immanent patterns of capital and the state apparatus.

In order to avoid incoherence, it is not necessary to “idealize” those to whom we show our solidarity and offer our support, if we wish to truly support them. The true dialogue presupposes horizontality, it presupposes the right to disagree but at the same time the obligation to do so without arrogance, otherwise, we will be hostages of cognitive dissonance. In a nutshell, this conflict is the result of an unfortunate but very common “know-it-all” attitude.

CONCLUSION

The Political Economy of Latin American forced migration, within the Marxist dialectic, highlights how behind these migrations of workers there is an economic scenario within the most marked processes of capitalism. One that creates a dynamic of developmental inequality inherent to the very logic and functioning of accumulation of the capitalist system between countries of the same region, as United States, Mexico and Latin American countries.

The truth is that, at present, labor migrations considered as “irregular” are compelled not only to continue moving surreptitiously through the illegality established by the legal mechanisms of the governments of the most developed nations. The migrants themselves are desperately trying to find work and improve their living conditions, and certainly these are human rights that correspond to any person around the world, but which are denied to these migrants because they lack papers, and, in some cases, they are even more forcefully denied and punished.

Nevertheless, as viewed by the academic trenches of the sociology of migration, it is insufficient to attempt to provide an immediate explanation of the humanitarian crisis of forced and irregular migration, even from the Marxist dialectical method with its imperious attempt to provide explanations of the very roots of the problem. However, the governments of the countries of transit and destination of migrations forced by capital, such as Mexico and the United States, will continue to respond politically to the reconfiguration of local labor markets from the interest of private capital.



Therefore, the neo-Marxists must endeavor to modernize their method by affirming that the humanitarian crisis of migration is an economic crisis, because it is a political and social crisis as well, which is putting at risk the lives and human rights of hundreds of millions of people who have been violently displaced from their places of origin. Thus, the Marxist theoretical-conceptual framework is not a new proposal for the study of migration, rather it has been dusted off by certain groups of proto-Marxist academics from public universities in the "Global South".

All proposals with a Marxist perspective have been part of migration studies in order to continue to find the most tangible links of capitalist accumulation and integration through the exploitation of the labor force by developed nations. In this sense, the Marxist dialectic is risky as a proposed theoretical framework for any study of international migration; although it allows us to identify certain structural causes that generate this exodus of workers and that are behind the superficial facet of the humanitarian crisis of migrants, the only buffer it counts on is the critical standard belonging to the field of dialectics.

Therefore, this perspective runs the risk of depending on this ideological structure too generally and does not allow us to see any phenomenon in its concrete particularity. Moreover, the idea that the U.S capitalist mode of production is the only one that causes massive migrations from Latin America is not something completely obvious, it could be argued in contrast that it is not an exclusive characteristic of this mode of production, but of a series of political and institutional failures by the governments of certain countries.

For example, there are other countries equally governed by "neoliberals" that do not experience massive emigrations; likewise, there are contemporary "anti-neoliberal" governments ruled by socialist parties, such as the Venezuelan, Nicaragua or Cuban governments, which have provoked the forced displacement of hundreds of thousands, maybe millions of their citizens, heading to the very dangerous Mexican transit to try to reach the United States.

Nevertheless, the Marxist perspective continues to be the research method of a number of public university professors. I have seen this in practice at Mexican universities where professors are conservative in their actions, but very liberal in their ideas, embracing classic dialectical concepts such as orthodox Marxism, which was most likely imposed on their research perhaps since the middle of the last century when one could still speak of the revolutionary heritage in Mexico, but which in turn, these professors now impose on their



own students, imparting the same method with a kind of outdated revolutionary vision.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC REFERENCES

- Aron, R. (1955). *El opio de los intelectuales*. España: Página Indómita.
- Cámara Izquierdo, S. (2022). “¿Hay un método de Marx de la economía política?”. *Laberinto*.
- Delgado, R. y Márquez, H. (2006). “The Mexico-United States migratory system: dilemmas of regional integration, development and integration”. *Migración y Desarrollo*, vol. 7, 38-64.
- Delgado, R. (2009). “Forced migration and US imperialism: the dialectic of migration and development”. *Critical sociology*, 35, 6.
- Djordjević, J. (1961). *Yugoslavia, democracia socialista*. México: FCE.
- Emmanuel, A. (1972). *Unequal Exchange: a study of the imperialism of trade*. New York and London: Modern Reader.
- Espinoza, S. (2018). Marx, a dos siglos. *Observatorio del desarrollo*, vol, 7, num, 21, 93-95.
- Harvey, D. (1982). *The limits to Capital*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Harvey, D. (2014). “Diecisiete contradicciones y el fin del capitalismo”. Ecuador: IAEN.
- Lenin, I. V. (1973). *Obras, Tomo I, 1894-1901*. Moscú: Progreso.
- López, A. y Salvador (2010). “La dialéctica no es método ni metodología”. *Rebelión*. <http://www.rebelion.org/noticias/2010/5/105875>.
- Lopes de Souza, M. (2019). Decolonising postcolonial thinking: Ethnocentrism and sociocentrism as transideological and multiscalar phenomena. *International Journal for Critical Geographies*. ACME. 2019, 18(1): 1-24.
- Marini, Ruy, M. (1991). *Dialéctica de la dependencia*. México: Ediciones Era. Recuperado de <http://www.amauta.lahaine.org>.
- Marini Ruy, M. y Millán, M. (1994). *La teoría social latinoamericana: los orígenes*. Tomo I. México: UNAM.
- Márquez, H. y Delgado, R. (2011). “Una perspectiva del sur sobre el capital global, migración forzada y desarrollo alternativo”. *Migración y desarrollo*, Primer semestre. Vol. 9, 3-42.
- Marx, K. (1967). *Capital, Unabridged. Vol. 1, A critical analysis of capitalist production*. Edited by Frederick Engels. New York: International Publishers.
- ____ (2007). *Elementos fundamentales para la crítica de la economía política*. México: Siglo



____ (2018). *El Capital*. México: Editores Mexicanos Unidos.

Polanyi, K. (1954). *La gran transformación. Los orígenes políticos y económicos de nuestro tiempo*. México: FCE.

Portelli, H. (2011). *Gramsci y el bloque histórico*. México: Siglo XXI.

Rauber, I. (2013). “Movimientos sociales, desarrollo y emancipación para el “buen vivir” en el “bien común”. *Revista CEPA*, 8.

Rocha, J. (2010). “Migrantes: ¿víctimas sumisas o en desobediencia civil?” *Revista Envío*, 342. Recuperado de <http://www.envio.org.ni/articulo/4234>.

Taylor, A. E. (1943). *Aristotle*. Thomas Nelson and Sons LTD. Edinburgh, Discussion books, No. 77.