

# TOWARDS THE THEORY OF ALTER-GLOBALISM GHOST OF ALTER GLOBALIZATION

*BUZGALIN*

## ÍNDICE

I. ALTER GLOBALIZATION IN RUSSIA.....	2
II. TECHNOLOGICAL, ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL PRECONDITIONS FOR ALTER GLOBALIZATION .....	6
2.1. PRECONDITIONS FOR ALTER GLOBALIZATION : “A NETWORK SOCIETY” (“A SOCIETY OF KNOWLEDGE”).....	6
2.2. GLOBAL HEGEMONY OF THE CAPITAL-THE NEGATIVE PRECONDITION FOR ALTER GLOBALIZATION A.....	7
2.3. ALTER GLOBALIZATION AS ALTERNATIVE TO INTERNATIONAL ALIENATION.....	9
III. PRINCIPLES, CONTRADICTIONS AND THE ROLE OF ALTER GLOBALIZATION MOVEMENTS.....	11
3.1. MAIN PRINCIPLES OF THE MOVEMENT.....	11
3.2. CONTRADICTIONS OF ALTER GLOBALIZATION.....	13
3.3. ALTER GLOBALIZATION AND LEFT-WING PARTIES: A ROLE AND A PLACE IN STRUGGLE FOR SOCIAL LIBERATION; PROBLEMS AND PROSPECTS OF THE MOVEMENT.....	18
IV. THE POSITIVE PROGRAM ALTER GLOBALIZATION .....	20
I. THE METHODOLOGY OF SOCIO-ECONOMIC RESEARCH (INSTEAD OF INTRODUCTION).....	27
II. THE MATERIAL PRECONDITIONS FOR THE BIRTH OF A NEW SOCIETY: NEGATION OF THE WHOLE WORLD OF ALIENATION, NOT ONLY CAPITALISM .....	28
2.1 THE PRECONDITIONS FOR A NEW SOCIETY.....	28
2.2. THE MAIN OBJECTIVE “SUPER-TASKS” OF THE NEW SOCIETY.....	29
III. THE THEORY OF SOCIALISM .....	30
3.1. SOCIALISM AS THE PROCESS OF NON-LINEAR TRANSFORMATION OF THE “REALM OF NECESSITY” INTO THE “REALM OF FREEDOM”.....	30
3.2. SOVIET SYSTEM AS “MUTANT SOCIALISM” .....	31
3.3. STAGES OF THE GENESIS OF SOCIALISM IN THE XX-XXI CENTURY .....	32
3.4. SOCIALISM AND THE MARKET .....	34
IV. THE SOCIAL BASE OF SOCIALIST TRANSFORMATIONS. NEW SOCIAL MOVEMENTS AND THE LEFT .....	34
4.1. THE SOCIAL STRUCTURE OF THE CONTEMPORARY WORLD COMMUNITY.....	34
4.2. SOCIAL CREATIVITY, FREE ASSOCIATION AND MASS DEMOCRATIC MOVEMENTS.....	36
4.3. GRASS-ROOT DEMOCRACY AND POST-PARTY FORMS OF ORGANIZATION OF THE LEFT ...	39

## (INSTEAD OF INTRODUCTION)

1. The ghost wanders on the world. The ghost “anti-globalization”. In its sacred persecution bushes and blairs, liberals and stalinists, fundamentalists and chauvinists unites. But our movement grows and develops not only year from year, but also month from a month.

2. And still, despite of the growing scale of movement, its theoretical foundation remains a not so very popular theme. And it is not unique, but very remarkable example of how growing from below and not predicted by scholars in any explicit way **social creativity of weights outstrips theoretical program constructions**. Nevertheless, we can specify some sources of such theory where we can find (1) objective bases of occurrence of such class of alternatives and (2) probable principles of these movements. Besides that (3), the movement which is named “the anti globalization” and which we shall name alter globalist, has grown not on an empty place. Both practiks, and theorists (C. Agiton, E. Wallerstain, etc.) remark that this movement reminds a wave of the “new left” in 1968 in genesis, principles, and scales. At the same time it is obvious, that without “old” trade unions and Left-wing parties **such** scale of performances would be impossible neither in Seattle, nor in Genoa, and in many other places. And still alter globalization movement is (4) really a new movement.

3. As such it demands **the dialectic research** examining objective preconditions, and genesis (removal of historical bases), and qualitatively new features in their contradictions. Following this method, we first of all shall try to systematize some empirical features of movement (thus the author for an English-speaking variant of article omits the sections devoted to the analysis of the international experience, well-known to the English-speaking reader and only shortly characterizes “the anti globalization” in Russia), then we shall allocate some of its steadily reproduced principles and, at last, we will address to deducing its intrinsic contradictions, having premised to this the brief characteristic of well-known theories of objective preconditions of genesis of alter globalization movements.

## I. ALTER GLOBALIZATION IN RUSSIA

4. In 2002 alter globalization movement of Russia for the first time rigidly counteract with authorities during the meetings dated for arrival of Bush and leaders of the European Community in May in Saint Petersburg and Moscow. In total 47 our comrades have been arrested, many of them hit.

5. These street actions became the brightest events which above all have been covered by mass media. However, actually alter globalization or, speaking traditionally, “the anti globalization” activity in Russia developed, perhaps, since November, 9, 2001 (in this case if to speak about “**the anti globalization” in the narrow sense of the word**, the movement which associated itself with this name). Then there was a series of public hearings in the House of journalists, in other places of city of Moscow, in many cities of Russia, meetings and actions, including the meeting on Mayakovskiu square. After that series of actions which directly associated themselves with “the anti globalization” subjects

have taken place in Russia. First of all, it is necessary to note, that these actions were especially internationalist, actually they were always coordinated with international the anti globalization actions. By the way, it was not occasional that the events on November, 9 in Moscow too were carried out on the day of the world actions against the World trading organization: the joint to it for Russia can turn back huge amount of negative social and economic consequences. Perhaps, from number of the most appreciable the anti globalization events of winter of 2001-2002 it is necessary to name participation of some the Russian colleagues in the World Social Forum in Port-Allegro after which, they had organized the so-called Moscow Social Forum- for the present modest action with several dozens of persons in Moscow, and there have been held in parallel seminars, meetings, round tables and press conferences more than in 15 cities of Russia. In youth clubs in Moscow, in the Moscow State University, a number of scientific academic structures there have been held some interesting discussions, including the seminars in the Institute of economic and the international relations, in the Institute of Latin America, the Institute of philosophy of the Russian Academy of Science, in a number of the Moscow and peripheral high schools.

6. Perhaps, the second large event in this problematic was the actions dated for visit to Russia of the president the USA Bush and the leaders of the European Community. During these events in St. Petersburg and Moscow the arrests for the first time have been carried out, some our comrades were hit, have spent some days in militia departments. However, as it has already been told, our activity basically is not so much street actions, as constructive opposition. Here again for us the most important field of work is explanation of the fact that, there really exists alternative to today's neo-liberal world politics, economy, ideology. And this alternative is not only nationalist and traditionalist slogans inverted in the past, but also proposal of the other type, other integration of different Russia in different world.

7. These actually the anti globalization actions while remain rather limited both on number of participants and on the scale. In most cases the number of participants was limited by from several dozens up to several hundreds. Their organizers became the left political groups, such as “Socialist resistance “, left trade union “Defense”, and also the group “Keepers of the rainbow “. As to the movement of “Alternative” it from the very beginning have participated actively in this activity, actively participating in many street actions. But the main thing for us remain substantial-scientific, educational, directed on support of self-organizing of workers and citizens of the actions, in particular, the International conference of “Alternative of globalization “(Moscow-June, 2002, more than 500 participants from 16 countries), the Forum “Siberia-not for sale” (Barnaul, February, 2002), etc.

8. This is “the anti globalization” in the narrow sense of the word. It is young, but has already received big enough popularity due to interest on the part of mass media (this phenomenon should be noted as well). But **in the broad sense of the word the movement of opponents of capitalist globalization** in Russia, naturally, has much longer history as it is connected to search of real alternatives in economic, social and political areas.

9. First, it concerns activity of various social and social movements, mainly, born “from below”, and resisting the models of development of liberal market capitalist economy which are imposed to Russia today including under powerful pressure on the part

of the International Monetary Fund, World Trade Organization and other forces of capitalist globalization. Among these movements I would allocate, first of all, protest actions of labor collectives, the brightest of which were occupational strikes on Yasnogorsk machine-building factory, at the Vyborg pulp-and-paper combine, and later on series of such actions in many cities of Russia and Ukraine during which labor collectives have shown, that they are capable, to create other world “from below”.

10. These actions appeared real the anti globalization movement, it is not so much because such slogans were exposed by participants of these events (they, as a rule, did not make stresses on it), but because in these actions creation “from below” of the other world, other economy, other social and human relations have been really shown. Here we were continuers of that affair, which began in many countries of the world (both in developing, and in advanced) by supporters of the anti globalization movements. In Russia we struggled for *de privatization*, struggled against switching-off of an electricity, against nonpayment of wages; and in the countries of Latin America or Africa people struggled for the right of access to clean water and for preservation of the workplaces. Nevertheless, the sense of this struggle was approximately uniform, and the circle of opponents of our struggle was approximately uniform. It is the same policy of the global liberal capitalist nomenclature. The labour collectives in Russia and landless peasants in Brazil, the unemployed in the Western Europe and founders of cooperative societies in our domestic remote places struggled all together. Therefore these actions should be counted the brightest display pf real alter globalization .

11. It is necessary to emphasize, that besides the occupational strikes on the account of such movements born “from below” were blocking of railways, and, unfortunately, mass hunger-strikes, (it is especially workers of budgetary sphere), and many other forms of the social protest. But the main thing in them were positive work on creation of new relations, attitudes to the workers control, the self-management, new relations of the management, new human relations among those who created these forms. In detail it is possible to read about all in books which we published as the movement of “Alternative” from the very beginning actively participated as colleagues and as advisers and as comrades on struggle in many of these actions.

12. Second, alter globalization movement in Russia is connected to the other tradition of political opposition to the present capitalist system, its foreign sponsors and ideological inspirers. The left communist and socialist opposition in Russia exists actually from the moment of disintegration of the Soviet Union, it is necessary to speak about it directly. Although, in most cases, there is not so much search of other model of integration, other model of internationalism, as much criticism of modern global system of world imperialism (as supporters of this ideology prefer to speak) from patriarchal positions, from positions of nostalgia on the Soviet system, probably, even from positions of the Russian chauvinism and nationalism (if to speak about radical wings of this movement).

13. With such patriarchal-oppositional moods the Russian Communist Working Party and a number of the left radical groups, including the national-bolsheviks headed by Edward Limonov (Savenko) perform, in particular. A little different is the position of the Communist party of the Russian Federation-the largest political oppositional organization which in the slogans remains, perhaps, the organization reminding the left social democracy except that in geopolitics, in the attitude to global capitalist system the Communist Party of

the Russian Federation, as a rule, expose not so much the ideas of new internationalism as idea of the Russian patriarchal character, greatness of Russia and self-preservation of its specificity. Besides it is necessary to note, that in Russia there is also a number of right opposition to the globalization on the part of monarchic and other nationalist organizations, resisting global expansion (first of all, from their point of view, American) fighting for necessity of the closed development of our country, its revival as special independent power. But it is completely different opposition of globalization, rather than alter globalization , movement for other integration about which we will speak now.

14. In this connection in Russia there is complex enough situation when *for supporters of other model of integration there is a necessity of struggle on two fronts*. The first and the basic, naturally, is struggle against conductors of neo-liberal model of economic, social and political development of our country. The second, unfortunately, in many cases not less important, is the propaganda activities directed on explanation dead lock and, in many respects, harm of patriarchal-conservative criticism of globalization from the past, ideas of national isolation, and especially ideas of great-power Russian chauvinism. Nevertheless, we should take into account, that for the latter tendency in Russia there are objective preconditions. Among these preconditions the valid responsibility not only Russian, but also the western circles of the nomenclature of the global capital for those catastrophic, crisis consequences of privatization, liberalization, geopolitic and ideological transformations which have taken place in our country; destruction of Soviet Union which has hurt struck on social, patriotic pride and prestige of citizens of our country; westernization of cultures, destruction of the uniform welfare space existing in territory of Soviet Union and many other reasons, repeatedly analyzed by the author of this text.

15. It is more important to us today to connect movement for other globalization as ideological and political current to real, going “from below”, social struggle for creation of another world. Besides already mentioned movements of labour collectives it is necessary to take into account, that in our country there are a lot of progressive public organizations which really carry out a role of the structures raising “from below” for new public relations in sphere of wildlife management, new initiatives in the field of education, spiritual development, protection of disabled and many others traditional and original for Russia fields of public work. This direction, it seems to me, is especially important development of alter globalization . Among concrete, practical actions which today can integrate these public organizations, alter globalization movement and, I do not exclude, many traditional left political organizations; I shall note continuation of the struggle developed 2 years ago against governmental variant of Labor Code (now it has passed to a new phase: the labor code is already accepted, however there is a problem of development of strategy of counteraction to those negative consequences which causes its actions); struggle against the housing-and-municipal reform which are were outlined vaucherization and commercialization of education.

16. Realization of the similar uniform social actions directed on counteraction against liberal-capitalist (and intensified by globalization) models of development of barbarous capitalism in Russia is also real prospects for alter globalization in our country. But, I want to emphasize, actually “anti globalization “movement as such, only arises in the

Russian Federation though develops roughly, intensively and in dialogue with international “anti globalization” movement.

17. And this text is focused first of all not on the description of the alter globalization movements, but on research of its nature. That is why we would like now to address to research of those objective preconditions, which created our movement.

## II. TECHNOLOGICAL, ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL PRECONDITIONS FOR ALTER GLOBALIZATION .

### 2.1. PRECONDITIONS FOR ALTER GLOBALIZATION : “A NETWORK SOCIETY” (“A SOCIETY OF KNOWLEDGE”).

18. One of the well-known and frequently repeated by critics of our movement paradoxes is that “anti globalization” movement has grown due to one of the most known phenomena of globalization-to the Internet. It is real paradox specifying the real contradiction: caused by life progress of productive forces, globalization on the boundary of centuries information (network) technologies became one of the major, practically working bases of struggle against globalization. How and why?

19. First of all **there is globalization and globalization: objective process of internationalization of technologies and cultures-on one pole; the global capital as special, historically concrete perfect form of this process – on the other.** Such division goes back to K.Marx's classical heritage, and below I shall address to it specially, now I underline, that alter globalization has grown in many respects due to the Internet. This is an empirical phenomenon: Zapatista in Mexico, landless peasants in Brazil and high brow intellectuals from “Le Monde Diplomatique”, who initiated ATTAK, work and operate due to the Internet; the World social forums have been organized mainly through the Internet; success of important for us actions in Seattle is due to the Internet and mobile phones.

20. However the essence is not that computers, the Internet and “mobiles phone” are convenient for the organization of mass actions. The Connection here is much deeper. The major fundamental features of information, network technologies about which wrote M.Castels etc., are those, that they make possible and necessary and moreover, optimal, those forms and principles of the social organization which are embodied in practice by new social movements and first of all–alter globalization.

21. Neo Marxist interpretation of the basic features of “the network society » has been depicted by the author earlier, therefore here I can take advantage of results of this research and offer some conclusions.

**22. First**, the phenomenon of knowledge specifies occurrence of a resource which by its contents is **unlimited**. If for a while we abstract from the market form and a private property on knowledge (and alter globalization exposes this “abstraction” as the practical requirement) they appear “product” which increases more, the more it is “consumed”. Really, de substituting of knowledge, phenomena of culture conducts to growth of this knowledge, progress of culture: “consuming” knowledge, the scientist increases it (Einstein, “consuming” knowledge, “made by “Newton, did not destroy achievements of the predecessor, but “has removed” them, having increased knowledge; the same occurs at use of mathematics or even... Language); the same occurs in art and education.

**23. Second**, the network, as against hierarchy, by its contents is **flexible, mobile, open and popular education** (as the sea or air space, it is open for everything while they are not supervised by militarists or pirates). The market, commercialization and private property is the social forms so badly compatible with network technologies and the world of knowledge, as the serfdom and the feudal-monarchic social organization have been badly compatible with the industry (the substantiation of this conclusion has been given by us earlier).

**24. Thirdly**, knowledge and the network organization are democratic by the nature: in this world there is place for all and everyone, and this world is necessary for all. Thus it is necessary and useful to all **differently**, it is the world of **general availability of unique and individualized “products”** (any knowledge is unique, any work of art is individualized). It can be entered and is in practice entered, as it has already been marked, by the unemployed and professionals, peasants and intellectuals, thus, I shall repeat, everyone is included in this world differently though frequently they solve the common problems. Only one example: At plenary session of the World Social Forum on problems of easy approach to knowledge the dialogue was held by programmers from the USA struggling for system “Free soft-ware” (free-of-charge distribution of the software), and peasants from Latin America, struggling against exclusively high prices for high-quality seeds and breeds of cattle, which most part of cost-indemnification of “the intellectual rent” (both emphasized, that this rent is received not by intellectuals, but corporations that had bought their intelligence).

**25. Fourthly**, new principles of the organization of activity and communications are distributed to social sphere even there where new technologies are absent. So, industrial activity of landless peasants in Latin America based on traditional industrial-agrarian technologies, social and economically aspires to construction in the form of a network.

26. Summing up, we can assume, that “a society of knowledge” (“the network society”) by the nature assumes (at abstraction from the market and a private property) realization of new principles of the social organization, such, as:

27. -limitlessness and simultaneously uniqueness of resources;

28. -general availability, an openness, flexibility of networks and their social forms;

29. -democratic character inter-structural (whether it be professional, regional, social structures) character of the organizations.

30. As such they are in the fundamental contradiction with principles of modern social and economic and political-ideological system which the author, following K.Marx, V.Lenin and A.Gramshi's traditions, has named global hegemony of the corporate capital.

## **2.2. GLOBAL HEGEMONY OF THE CAPITAL-THE NEGATIVE PRECONDITION FOR ALTER GLOBALIZATION A.**

31. For liberals it seems obvious, that globalization is an objective process, a synonym of progress in new conditions and consequently any alternatives to development of authority TNC and IMF, the NATO and WTO is not present and cannot be, and everyone who with it disagrees is the opponent of progress.

32. Alter globalizers agree, that on a boundary of centuries the world develops in conditions of growing integration of technologies, economy and cultures; this process,

really, is objective. But we categorically disagree that the unique economic, political and spiritual form of this process of integration is the present absolute power of “global players “. We confirm (and this conclusion is proved in hundreds materials of many outstanding scientists of a planet, such as E.Wallerstain, S.Amin, etc.), that nowadays the world has faced not simply a new stage of internationalization of the economic and public life menacing to the sovereignty of the nations, the states, but a characteristic for “late” capitalism, (E.Mandel) social form of this process. ***The world has faced not simply globalization, but global hegemony of the corporate capital.*** It is hegemony – complete, total authority of the capital as uniform economic, social, political and spiritual force; it is authority of the capital, personated first of all by narrow circle of global players (THC, “not sacred Trinity “, etc.), connected with establishment of “the big seven “, and it is the authority of the capital covering all world.

33. So, the global authority of the capital assumes the , total, penetrating every aspect of human life, market. And it is not the market of freely competing atomized enterprises, but *the total market as space of struggle of huge networks* which centers are TNC. All of us are workers, consumers, inhabitants – we become almost slaves of these spiders struggling among themselves and their webs, turning in clients “McDonalds”, “Pepsi generation” and as a whole – in petty bourgeoisies-consumers.

34. Second, hegemony of the capital nowadays is mainly *authority of the virtual fictitious financial capital* “living” in computer networks. In the world “the black box “, consisting of huge (in hundred billions and billions dollars) financial bubbles inflated for the account as gamble in the 1-st world, and duties, “asphalting”, etc. forms of financial suppression of the countries of the 2-nd and 3-rd worlds.

35. Thirdly, global hegemony of the capital nowadays assumes not simply operation of hired workers through purchase-sale of a labor, but also *complete submission of the personality of the worker.* The creative potential, talent, education,-all human life of the professional is appropriated by modern corporation in the 1-st world; semi feudal methods of the operation that lock workers in ghetto of backwardness, are more and more distributed not only in the 3-rd, but also in the 2-nd world.

36. Fourthly, the system of methods *of monopolization by the 1-st world of key resources of development* –know how, a high-quality labor etc. is well-known, while absorption of an overwhelming part of natural resources and export of dirty technologies, social “dirty” in the 3-rd and 2-nd world.

37. Fifthly, this *global political and ideological manipulation, information and cultural pressure.*

38. Such system of the world hegemony in economy (new quality of the market, money, the capital), a policy and ideologies causes (by virtue of its internal contradictions) expansion of the certain set *of forms and methods of counteraction of global authority of the corporate capital, tendencies of counter-globalization and counter-hegemony.*

39. *Totality, allsideness of the power of the capital in modern society creates the negative precondition (a basis for negation, dialectic denying) for so complex, all-round removal of this authority.*

40. Simplifying the theoretical model, it is possible to say: penetrating in aspects of human life the all-round authority of the global market and the capital, subordinating us as workers and consumers, citizens and persons must have created also an all-round, mass and



resolute alternative. If we return to the theory, this alternative *of global authority of the capital*, its denying and removal: (the dialectic logic operates here) **theoretically is seen as** (NB! in this case we speak only about a theoretical hypothesis which should be checked, comparing with practice):

41. -all-round, comprehensive, but *anti-total*, based not on totalitarian unification (that is typical of the global capital), but on uniqueness, originality, independence of agents;

42. -*anti—hegemonic*, removing authority of the capital and suppression (economic, political, spiritual)) of the person in not-alienated forms of equal dialogue;

43. -*alter-global*, perhaps, post-global, i.e. developing process of internationalization due to removal of its modern corporative – capitalist restrictions;

44. -*post-corporate*, i.e. developing achievements of corporate structures by removal of their bureaucratic, hierarchical restrictions on ways of development of open associations.

45. It is those, I shall repeat, the theoretical hypothesis constructed on the basis of application of a dialectic method to research of process of removal of global authority of the corporate capital.

46. Thus we leave without substantiation the answer to the major question for the left: whether such alternative can not touch the bases of manufacture, first of all – the capital, whether it can not be first of all anti-(or even post) capitalist? Below the author will show objective contradictions of alter globalization, causing dialectically complex answer to this question. The solution by the author basically is not original: in framework of [late] capitalism there is space for its partial social reforming on the global scale; thus such reforming, if take place, must be held (1) only under powerful pressure of opposition, including (and it is possible – and first of all) alter globalizators and (2) never will provide transition to qualitatively new, not capitalist type of integration, that is unique in its capability to resolve deep contradictions of global hegemony of the capital. However we have distracted.

47. Before we shall start comparison of these characteristics with empirically obvious features of movement, the author considers important to remind the reader that the phenomenon of complete submission of the person to external forces already for a long time is well familiar to critical Marxist philosophy which has developed after Hegel and Marx a category of “alienation”.

### **2.3. ALTER GLOBALIZATION AS ALTERNATIVE TO INTERNATIONAL ALIENATION.**

48. The phenomenon of alienation became most obvious empirically and simultaneously investigated theoretically in second half of the 60th of XX century, not casually having coincided with movement “new left” (the author mentioned them as “primogenitors” alter globalization). Then for left it became empirically and theoretically obvious, that the problem of oppression of the person in the world of “late capitalism” is not reduced to operations of its labour, to assignment of a surplus value by the capital. Research of alienation and revolt of the “new left” against alienation became a prologue to

the present beginning of mainly positive movement against the alienation known under the name of “globalization” and named by me as global hegemony of the capital.

**49. Alienation** is essentially important concept for the subsequent research; therefore we shall stop on its consideration more in detail, basing on widely known positions of Hegelian-Marxist tradition.

50. This tradition results in understanding of alienation as world in which intrinsic forces of the person as the patrimonial essence which is carrying out transformation of the nature and society according to understood laws of their development, became alien for the overwhelming majority of members of a society. They are as though “appropriated” by prevailing social system and the transformed forms laying on its surface having visibility of a thing, institute (a typical example – money as a thing, subordinating a person to itself).

51. Qualities and abilities of a Person—creator of history (the purpose and means, process and fruits of his activity, his feeling and relation to other people) turn to the world external, alien, not subject to the person and incognizable social forces. These social forces—division of labor and relations of exploitation, the state and tradition, fetishism of money and religion—are *as if they appropriate* human qualities and by that transform the Person-creator into function and the slave of given not personated forces.

52. Relations of alienation are characteristic for all a level of a social life—material-technological (a division of labor and transformation of the person into the partial worker subordinated in the activity to this or that technological system), social and economic (the person as function of the capital, the market), political and ideological.

53. The result (and the precondition of a new coil of reproduction of alienation) becomes *self-alienation* of a person: life in which the individual perceives itself as function of an external world.

54. The given world—the world of alienation—*as though* transfers human qualities to external social forces (for example, to a slice of a paper with watermarks). As though—just because actually this world of curve social mirrors is created by people due mainly to the objective reasons. But by virtue of the same reasons only ugly figures of worlds behind the looking-glass and their featuring (making of money, career, etc. as *end in itself*) are perceived by us as if it is the unique real and natural world (recollect, the reader, a marvelously exact image of a fairy tale on naked king). Moreover, in the world of alienation we, as a rule, cannot live and develop outside of these alienated social mechanisms – divisions of labour and operation, the market and the state ...

55. I shall repeat: we create by our life this visibility of creation of social structure and history not by people, but by external forces, but we could not live and develop in a different way during the epoch of pre history. Thus alienation is always resisted by social creativity – actual ability of a Person to create history directly (more in detail about it below). By virtue of it for pre history a certain *measure of alienation* is always characteristic. The authority of this world never was absolute.

56. The characteristic of the movement named “the anti globalization” as *positive alternative to alienation* looks paradoxical, but as I have noted above, this movement though looks as first of all denying existing forms of globalization in the most appreciable and rough ways (mass actions in places of meetings of agents of globalization), but, in effect, is also positive creation of new forms of social organization, and it is what establishes alter globalization in the substantial actions (with peak in the World Social

Forums) and daily work of new social movements. It also is the contents of alter globalization . Thus the variety of forms and directions of activity of the participating organizations and movements is ***the multi-alternative extending as widely, as widely distributed and diverse forms and mechanisms of alienation in the modern world.***

57. That is why ***alter globalization I could name the movement for overcoming of alienation*** [in all variety of their global types] that differs from traditional left movement as struggle first of all against exploitation of hired workers.

58. Generalizing some features of the alter globalization movements and those challenges and preconditions which are formed in the today's world owing to development of network technologies, global hegemony of capital and all-round alienation, we can allocate some steadily reproduced characteristics of our movement.

### **III. PRINCIPLES, CONTRADICTIONS AND THE ROLE OF ALTER GLOBALIZATION MOVEMENTS.**

59. Previously to offering to the reader the first generalizations, I shall notice, that alter globalization movement still only arises; it in all ways is connected to both traditional forms of opposition, and prevailing forces of alienation. Below the author will aspire to allocation of especial features of this new social reality, abstracting from mentioned above “impurity” with which it connected and which sometimes suppresses or, at least, deforms its actually new quality. Thus we shall follow to logic of the comparative analysis of objective preconditions of genesis of movement and its empirically observable fig.

#### **3.1. MAIN PRINCIPLES OF THE MOVEMENT.**

60. As we have already noticed above, alter globalization movement has arisen during the epoch of development of network principles of the organization. And as such it, ***first, became model of the network social organization*** even there where actually technological processes remain older (industrial en masse). *In alter globalization* in many cases *the social form “has escaped forward “*, becoming oppositional, stand-alone, but a real social challenge for development both economic, and technological structures. Among *the basic features of the network organization as one of principles of alter globalization* we shall allocate such as:

61. - Not-hierarchy, decentralization, mainly horizontal and-or functional cooperation of participants;

62. - Flexibility, mobility, variability of forms and configurations; ease and speed of creation and disintegration of structures;

63. - Openness of a network for “input(entrance)” and “output(exit)””; general availability of resources (first of all-information) networks;

64. - Equality of participants of a network irrespective of their role, scale, resources; not only noncommercial, but also antimarket character of activity;

65. - Secondariness of forms and structures in relation to the contents of activity;

66. - Uniqueness of networks.

67. All features named above, I shall repeat, are abstracted from reality where they are in “mix” with traditional features partly bureaucratic, partly commercial, partly closed

organization. However this valid abstraction occurring in practice is constant. Practically everyone protest action was organized as the special unique network open for any participant which comes there with the resources (but with support of “stronger” or “rich”), Everyone could use freely all common resources of a network, its “brand” cooperates and carry on dialogue with any other participant. The configuration of these networks constantly changed and after the action this network as such broke up, giving rise to new ones. At each of the actions there was the organizing committee, but every time it was open for everyone and in it there was no neither chairman, nor “secretary general”.

**68. Second**, alter globalization has grown as an alternative of capitalist globalization. *As positive, dialectic denying* of global hegemony of the capital, total system of submission of the person our movement in practice has found the following features, becoming unwritten, but observed on practice, **principles**:

69. - *internationalism* of movement; it from the very beginning arises as first of all international and on a circle of participants, and on the purposes of activity, and on character of actions (the international actions against global establishment; the international social forums, etc.); movement *began and proceeds as interstate* and by it be especially valuable, for represents not nationalist – State (and in this sense gravitating to the past), and world, a post – globalization alternative focused on the future;

70. - *inter class and inter ideology character* of the movement opposing to all forms of alienation and hegemonies, and not just exploitation of hired workers (that, besides, and on a circle of participants, and on the purposes-there were protest actions, and World Social Forum);

71. - *anti-hegemony* (and in the most advanced forms-anti-capitalist) character of movement which slogan not casually became words “*the world-not for sale* “; even the moderate part of movement supports, that the ground, water and the basic natural resources, on the one hand; knowledge, education, cultural values and systems of maintenance of basic requirements of a person (food, dwelling, public health services) – have been removed from under control of the market and the capital; radical alter globalizators (including the author) consider necessary to continue this line down to change of the world of alienation prevailing nowadays as a whole, movements to “an empire of freedom “.

**72. Thirdly**, *our movement* as I have already noted, by the nature (and it is the nature, the contents of *practical actions*) *is constructed as alternative to alienation* in all variety of its forms and kinds (World Social Forums have expressed this philosophical theme in much more simple and bright formula: “Other world is possible “). In this connection the following empirically observable and steadily reproduced principles alter globalization movement are not surprising:

73. - *solidarity, cooperation and the responsibility* as alternatives to alienation (from here there comes practically constantly repeating accents on “economy of solidarity “, “social – responsible organizations “, “democracies of participation “, etc. forms of co-operation in economy, a policy, social life);

74. - the organization of movement on principles (I about them wrote earlier), rather similar to for a long time known theoretical model of alter alienation-*free, voluntary, working association*; practice of movement has shown, that it is under construction (at abstraction from “impurity” of the world of alienation) as open for everything, extremely voluntary and informal (movement has no charter or the program-only some “frame”

parameters stated in Charter of World Social Forums ) the union, a basis of membership in which are not money or authority (a formal belonging to structure with the certain powers-to the state, parties), and practical participation in activity (a principle of working association-in the theory; principles of mobilization and participation-in practice);

75. - *self-organizing and self-management* as mechanisms of ability to live of the movement in *forms of network democracy, consensus democracies, democracies of participation*, etc. (in a combination to the principle of working association these mechanisms provide an opportunity of practical participation in decision-making for everyone: you simply leave association with which position essentially disagree and participate in work of where your voice is heard, where dialogue, desperate dispute conducts to the consent or create a new network; the most mass and active becomes the structure most open, dialogic, adequate to interests of citizens).

76. Summarizing, we can draw a conclusion, that *differentia specifica of this movement consist in genesis of qualitatively new, mass, international and concerning steady (as far as we can judge now) public phenomenon which is beyond the basic vital principles not only of late capitalism and capitalist globalization, but also all world of alienation.*

77. I shall repeat: movement in practice becomes an alternative to not only essence of globalization and capitalism, but also “an empire of necessity” as a whole.

78. However, it lives and develops within the framework of this world, inheriting its many features and is the successor of previous forces oppositional to the capital. As such, it possesses powerful contradictions.

### 3.2. CONTRADICTIONS OF ALTER GLOBALIZATION.

79. Alter globalization movement is especially inconsistent, that is visible to the naked eye. There are internal, dialectic contradictions describing its essence, and **the external contradictions** reflecting its “differentia” in the modern world. The latter are most obvious, therefore we shall begin our research with them.

80. The contrast of the world of alienation and our movement fixed above should be reflected in the nature of the latter. *Alter globalization movement from the moment of its birth develops in the transitive forms* connecting its own new qualities and qualities of modern global capitalism without its existence alter globalization in present system is impossible. Moreover, this coexistence is contradicto in ajecto, being, meanwhile, the real *contradiction between the alter globalization nature of movement and its interference (as through collisions, arrests, struggle, and, in some cases, cooperation) in global capitalism.*

81. As such movement should be characterized by contradictions directly following from the latter.

**82. The first-between immanent principles for movement of voluntary working association-on the one hand, both necessity to use financial and politics-legal mechanisms, professional work in our own work – on the other.**

83. As a rule this contradiction is solved so, that functions of professional work, financial maintenance, political representation incur the working nongovernmental and political organizations sympathizing alter globalization and representing a significant part of its participants, whereas movement in the actions (from demonstrations up to scientific conferences) is relative irrespective of rigid restrictions and presumes to be open, network,

flexible and constructed on the basis of cooperation of persons, activities and associations, instead of money, capitals and corporate structures.

84. In practice it occurs as if, for example, during II World Social Forum . As I have noted above, the municipality of the city and the government of the state (dominated by the the Party of workers of Brazil, which is itself semi-party – semi-movement) have undertaken maintenance of the material side (at payment under the minimal quotations of all services by participants and huge volumes of voluntary free-of-charge work and the free-of-charge habitation, provided with city dwellers). Large international movements and NGOs have undertaken material support of some delegates from less developed countries, but the overwhelming majority of participants arrived at their own expense.

85. The solution of this contradiction does not mean its disappearance. It is more than actual and sometimes painful (a material inequality of structures of the first and third worlds, “rich” и “poor” NGOs, NGOs depending on the global capital-all these creates many big problems); It is resolved and reproduced, and it is one their fundamental features describing the life of alter globalization in conditions of “empire of necessity” at the stage of global hegemony.

**86. *The second*** contradiction is as obvious, in which the opposition of the world of alienation and alter globalization movements reflects-*contrast of a social and economic inequality of participants* (from millions the poorest landless peasants of Brazil up to elite of the West-European members of parliament) *and their equal rights in dialogue and solidarity* are reflected *within the framework of movement*. This contradiction not only creates a pressure inside movement, but also underlies actual tearing away from many alter globalization actions of the most part of potentially the most active part of movement-of workers, peasants, “ordinary” intelligency of the third world and our countries actively and structurally struggling against hegemony of the global capital. They cannot practically participate neither in Internet-conferences, nor in foreign forums, basing only on their own resources. Here again it became a rule support by the part of participants from the countries of the first world and voluntary allocation of fair means for development of movement, solidarity with participants from the poor countries, the help in the organization of information systems, trips, etc.-all this began one of means of removal of this contradiction.

**87. *The third*** contradiction showing antagonism of our movement and the world of alienation-*between an openness and a network principle of the organization of movement, on the one hand, and necessity of interaction with power structures, participating in political processes,-on the other.*

88. From the most obvious displays of this contradiction we shall allocate, (1) empirically observable and already mentioned *dependence of many participants of movement (especially large “old” NGOs of the first world, oriented to the aid to the less developed countries, poor, but not only) from subjects of hegemony* (the state, global interstate structures and even TNC) through different sorts of funds and grants, political decisions of parliaments, dependence on parties in power, etc. In result they become, on the one hand, participants of creation of the alter globalization networks, and on the other-conductors of global hegemony of the capital (here it is partly pertinent prompted to author C.-î. Michael analogy to missionaries of an epoch of colonialism).

89. Not less obvious (2) *contradiction (and dialectic unity) of the left political parties, on the one hand, and movements as such-on the other.* The last is shown as in

empirically obvious form of struggle for inclusion of parties in number of organizers of social forums (till now them could be only NGO and social movements), and as less obvious contrast between mass character, an openness, softness of network structures of alter globalization and relative rigidity, fixity of membership, hierarchy structures of political parties.

90. Besides there is a challenge of necessity of practical struggle for inclusion in real political system with the purpose of real struggle for real redistribution of power for the benefit of networks of citizens. Here alter globalizers *meet contradiction between preservation by our movement the specificity as open network* (that underlies success and mass character) *and, on the other hand, findings of forms traditional – institutional for participation in the life of a civil society and political struggle.*

91. It is still an open question how far the alter globalizers can possibly find forms of removal of all these external contradictions. One of the ways for this purpose is not the adaptation of alter globalization networks to rules of the world of alienation, *but change of the world of alienation, imposing to it of the rules and forms of life, methods of activity and interaction.* In such way, in particular, are organized protest actions of alter globalizers, directed on change of this world by means of the actions laying outside of its “rules” (civil disobedience, etc.).

**92. Internal contradictions of alter globalization** are the essence of this movement. Here again the mentioned above principles of movement appear to display its deep contradictions. The author is not ready yet systematically and substantially open this methodological installation, but I am ready to assert, that one of such deep contradictions having many empirically obvious displays, *is discrepancy of the associated social creativity as “patrimonial essence” of alter globalization.*

93. First of all *the contradiction between social creativity as dialogue of special, unique subjects* (persons, communities) *and uniform process of the joint coordinated activity.* And the basis of joint activity is not similarity, and uniqueness (at unity of strategy) of the subjects. For alter globalization this contradiction is more than obviously shown in each aspect of our movement, in its each practical step, where and when it is necessary to coordinate not simply constantly, but to connect in uniform process of actions [every time special] unique combinations of the organizations, movements and individuals.

94. Each participant of movement can easily develop this theme, therefore I shall be limited only to the indication on one of the consequences of this contradiction: so diverse, as diverse forms of alienation and interests of the person, the mobile, flexible, open *network organization* (a combination of subjects of the associated creation of the new world-if to speak in philosophical language) *there is strength and weakness of the alter globalization.* Strength-for these principles make the movement mass, attractive to the most different layers, groups, individuals, reactive (capable to react quickly to the diversified problems) and difficult to destroy [different to precise structure] from the outside. Weakness-for movement appears unstable, amorphous, easily washed away and dying away, actively reacting on various “viruses” [disagreements, provocations, etc.]-the list is easy for continuing.

95. *The unity and contrast* are one of the empirically observable internal contradictions of alter globalization as one of types of social creativity *destructive* [first of

all, in relation to institutes of global hegemony of the capital] *and creative* [“ Other world is possible”!] *the sides of our activity*.

96. First of them is most known. And it is not occasional.

97. Firstly, it is more simple and is accessible both to inclusion in it , and for reception of the first impression about movement: to the citizens (and all of us to some extent are slaves to hegemony of the capital, passive conformists), oppressed by the capital (it is especial to people excluded from “the society of two thirds “) destructive forms of the protest are much closer and understandable, than the complex associated social creation.

98. Secondly, this destruction in the modern world must accept the irrational, perverted forms that are quite often used for discredit of movement (a typical image of “anti globalization”, purposefully broadcasted by mass-media to citizens-the hooligans beating show-windows of McDonalds).

99. However dialectic denying should be a part of our activity. It is different case, that it can and should be directed on constructive replacement of old attitudes and institutes (structures, rules and stereotypes) of alienations by new attitudes of making a person free.

100. And still *the main thing in our movement is not protest actions* (though they for many reasons, are mostly seen), *but positive everyday creation of another world* (other relations, other values, motives) *in many thousands of organizations and movements* (I shall remind, that only in the II World Social Forum 4900 structures have been participated). In this unity of denying and creation is the essences of alter globalization.

101. The contradiction of alter globalization as struggle against the world of alienation (“ the empire of necessity “) *as a whole*-on the one hand, and modern forms of power *of the capital* (as special kind of alienation)-on the other is important as well. And though hegemony of the capital is “only” a kind of alienation existing nowadays, here, in the contradiction between the general and especial, many problems are latent.

102. This contradiction generates two empirically very easily distinct tendencies. *The first* is submitted by numerous social movements and organizations accenting enough common forms of alienation (as a rule, co respondent with global problems): the person and the nature, the man and the woman, various age groups, etc. *The Second*-actually class problems of struggle against the capital.

103. Naturally, these two lines are closele connected: global hegemony of the capital “is responsible” for present acuteness of global problems, class struggle is nowadays impossible without struggle for rights of women, youth, etc. However the contrast here is easily seen – interclassship and interideologyness of alter globalization, stressed dispassionateness of significant part of participants of the movement from anticapitalist, socialist orientation contradicts the anticapitalist contents of actions of these organizations and anticapitalist essence of the movement (struggle against alienation in our movement should struggle with social force of alienation historically dominating nowadays-the capital).

104. This contrast is caused *by a duality of a social base* of our movement and is shown in numerous oppositions of modern “all-democratic” and class struggle. Limitation of actions concerns the number of such ways (some kind of “*neo reformism*”) a significant part of movements and NGOs, participating in alter globalization movement, in particular. And the mentioned above “external” contradiction causing connection of parts of the movement with institutes of the global capitalist system, in particular, by the states, funds,



structures of the United Nations, the UNESCO, the EU, etc., financing participation in the movement of NGOs here makes. The latter in this sense lose in sequence and adequacy of essence of the movement of its radical part where the Left-wing parties are in the lead. However these “neo reformist” NGOs (for example, the mentioned above ATTAK network) involve the greatest number of people previously not involved in oppositional activity, creating networks which, actually, have received a name of “anti globalization”.

105. Democratic left political parties (not neo Stalinist and-or sectarian organizations), participating in the movement (for example, the Refondazione Comunista in Italy, Revolutionary communist league in France, the Party of democratic socialism in Germany and etc), as a rule, connect the so-called “all-democratic” purposes and the purposes of struggle for socialism more consistently. However, they are limited to the fixed membership, the program, history, conflicts and splits etc.; they could not overcome these frameworks during decades of domination of neo liberalism and begin qualitatively new force what arising alter globalization movement can become.

106. At the same time *the movements, parties and NGO s in alter globalization are already connected*-by mass actions, social forums, parties’ activity, active workers in movements and NGOs (one of most vivid examples, well familiar to the author, Eric Toussent's activity, C.Agiton’s and many others “radical left” in the organizations struggling for cancellation of duties of the third world in ATTAK, etc.), Whereas in NGOs there are many leaders (such as S.Amin or Francois Utar), being more consecutive fighters for socialism, than other leaders of Communist Parties...

107. That is why *dialogue and cooperation in many respects opposite “neo reformist” NGOs, movements and democratic Left-wing parties constitutes one of the bases of the real pluralism and progress in alter globalization movements.*

108. However *the threat of split, divergence of the movement* into subordinated to global players “neo reformists” (as a matter of fact, in this case they betray movement) and marginalized again left (which in this case “will drop out” of movement) *is latent also*, that will result-and it is the main threat-to leaving from movement of the majority of the “ordinary” active workers participating in it just because connection of NGOs and Left-wing parties in alter globalization has led to occurrence of new quality, has caused the mighty social pulse similar to connection under pressure of two nonaggressive substances, resulting to explosion and liberation of the latent energy.

109. To prevent split and divergence alter globalization can not only by preserving of dialogue of parties and movements, but also, first of all, by development of special system quality of alter globalization as the new social movement which are essentially not reduced to interaction of Left-wing parties and NGOs. Among ways of progress to this new quality we shall allocate also further development of mass *actions-acts*, social *dialogues*, information networks, and meanwhile I accent development of pluralistic, but coordinated positive *program of movement*, and development *of the theory of alter globalization*, that can determine new practical steps of our movement.

### 3.3. ALTER GLOBALIZATION AND LEFT-WING PARTIES: A ROLE AND A PLACE IN STRUGGLE FOR SOCIAL LIBERATION; PROBLEMS AND PROSPECTS OF THE MOVEMENT.

110. Research of principles and contradictions of our movement as a matter of fact has already given the answer to the questions born in heading of this subitem. Alter globalization became the successor of long, tragical and heroic struggle for the social liberation, born in all most powerful expressions—from the Commune of Paris through the Great October socialist revolution, a series of other socialist and anti-colonial revolutions of XX century and May, 1968 – from below, as the mass, associated activity. *Alter globalization does not supersede, but, on the contrary, unites various earlier existing forms and directions of social-emancipating activity*, keeping in dialogue and practical discussion the diversified structures assisting self-organizing and creation of the other world. Thus the accent of our movement on variety of alternatives makes (no less than all its other distinctive features) both strength, and weakness of this new form. Strength—for we do not thrust any of the participating organizations of a certain uniform; for participation in movement the variety of the original organizations, their dissimilarity is necessary. Weakness—for movement reminds a hand with the spread wide fingers and to punch a wall of corporate hegemony of the capital, the fist is necessary.

111. In this contradiction *the objective challenge addressed first of all to Left-wing parties*, pretending to be the most conscious and organized forces, in my opinion, is latent within the framework of opposition to present global capitalist system: they can and should change the configuration, principles of construction, the form and methods of work, so that in practice (and not just in declarations) be the center of alter globalization activity. I stress: not « organizing and directing » structure, avant garde in old sense of this word, but the motor working not only it is the most active, but also strategically and tactically adequately to those real conditions in which our movement is situated, and also to internal contradictions which are inherent in the movement. The task of the left – is not so much to criticize alter globalization that it does not correspond to an ideal of anticapitalist opposition and to challenge it to but to comprehend real problems and lacks of movement, its limitation and to operate so that to remove them, so that to use its advantages, its force, *promoting theoretically verified and practically effective removal of its external and internal contradictions.*

112. For such activity the left require, new principles, methods of life activity. In my opinion, it should be *the post party form of the organization of the left*, adequate for interaction with new social movements. There is a jump in the form of political life activity of the left and, in my opinion, the analogy between, on the one hand, transition from “preparty” (we shall name them so) forms of activity of narodniki (populists) to « a party of new type », caused by the genesis of precise class opposition of proletariat and bourgeoisie in Russia in the beginning of XX century and, on the other hand, movement from classical Left-wing parties to the postparty forms caused by complication of social structure of a society in conditions of global hegemony of the capital of new century.

113. Hundred years ago in Russia the proletariat party as well as organizations (trade unions, other “old” social organizations) have objectively been demanded as the most effective tool of mobilization on struggle of a class of hired workers, and. It was inevitable in conditions of precise class antagonisms when it strategy of narodniki groups

of intelligency, « going in people », creating circles or even giving the lives, going on acts of terrorism became obsolete and therefore reactionary. As nowadays, hundred years later in the world began (NB! *Only began!*) process of “*obsolescence*” of traditional vanguard (and parliamentary!) Parties in that level in what arises and gets paramount value inter class struggle against system of alienation as a whole. Here again new, *postparty forms will be most adequate for mobilization of associations of social creators and interaction with new social movements*, including (and it is possible, and first of all) alter globalists. And in that level (I stress: here the level is important!) in what these changes objectively become determining struggle against « the empire of necessity », there rises a question: whether it is time to us, a century after the well-known phrase of young man Uljanov again to tell: « *we shall go in other way* ». Not renouncing, but dialectically inheriting experience of socialists and communists of XX century just as they inherited experience of decembrists and narodniki?

114. The latter again returns us to a problem of a ratio of alter globalization activity and struggle for socialism; in particular, to problems of wide social structure and a revolutionary class, movements and parties. The author has already depicted the position on last question above. Developing these reasons, I shall allow myself empirically and theoretically proved assumption: *alter globalization movement can become one of bases for formation internal “rigid nucleus” – of new international democratic socialist and communist confederation.*

115. In this connection I should state paradoxical judgement: a rule of exception of political parties existing nowadays from possible organizers of social forums-on the one hand; objectively significant role of many of Left-wing parties in the organization as forums, and, especially, protest actions (I would mention once again PT in Brazil, the Party of communist updating of Italy, etc.)-on the other, can play a role of catalysts for occurrence of the confederation named above. Its prototype already became joint international interactions of Left-wing parties during actions in Genoa and other cities of the world. The following step could become, say, ***the International socialist political forum*** or, probably, a network of the coordinated forums of various groups of the Left-wing parties organized by the same principles of an open international network, as World Social Forums. Accordingly, the basic forms and directions of activity of both this confederation, and this forum (forums) could be subordinated for the beginning to the decision of one, but cardinally important task-the coordinated *international and inter-party support of various forms of social creativity*, diverse (NB! It is essentially important) social alternatives to global hegemony of the capital.

116. Participation in alter globalization movement has already taught many parties in practice (1) to abstract from ideological disagreements not to overlook them, and to use distinctions for the decision of various tasks, but the coordinated opposition to the capital and as to see the purpose in achievement (2) unities not in similarity of programs, but in the coordination of actions (in particular, works on activization alter globalization movements and other social-creative initiatives directed on the decision of problems of liberation of labour, emancipation of person).

117. Certainly, on this way and Left-wing parties, and social movements, and NGOs, and alter globalization as a whole will face powerful contradictions and the most

complicated problems including that has already been mentioned above,-but road will be mastered by a going!

118. Some challenges for us are connected with what was outlined already now on the part of the global capital (the states, the basic parties , corporations and their funds, over national institutes, etc.) the tendency “*suffocations alter globalization in embraces* “. “Help” and, first of all,-payoff (money, the status, incorporation in establishment) of leaders and the most powerful structures, provocations of splits and conflicts, discredit (already now we are accused that we are agents both global stalinism, and the global capital, and the reformists distracting workers from class struggle, and super-radicals-terrorists...)-These known means of struggle against any real oppositional movements are widely used against us. It is a different case, that at alter globalization have a certain advantage: due to the flexibility and the network organization we are less vulnerable for frontal attack: we do not have “leaders”, we have too many “centers” and leaders so that they could be bought easily, our structures are so diverse and different, that they cannot be discredited all... In this sense we can borrow principles of the Japanese hand combats (they say, that peasants have elaborated them for struggle against the armed professionals Samurais) and to use force of the enemy against it , for its defeat, and own weakness – for our victory.

119. Finally, *one of the major threats* for alter globalization (unfortunately, with our nickname-“anti globalization”) is the growing all over the world and especially dangerous in Russia *nationalism*. The latter is denying of globalization as well, but the denying going from the past, aimed on destruction of the valid achievements of internationalization and consequently reactionary. This theme, however, on the one hand, is too complex for short notes, and on the other – there repeatedly have been made comments. Therefore here I shall be limited only to statement of this problem.

120. Summarizing, I shall notice: the valid place and role of alter globalization in the world of oppositional social creativity is characterized in the best way by practical activities of our movement in which, as a matter of fact, has already developed various pluralistic, but already clear enough positive program of alter globalization. However, before offering the reader author's vision of this positive, I would like to stop on a problem of a social base of our movement.

#### **IV. THE POSITIVE PROGRAM ALTER GLOBALIZATION**

121. Alternatives of global authority of the capital develop objectively and we can only study them and, having studied intensify positive processes of liberation, not passing the line after which the subjective factor of [progress] degenerates in subjectivity [provoking recourse]. These given and well-known alternatives are should be divided into a double sort processes.

122. First, it is attempts of an isolationism, “leaving” globalization; second, creation of new forms of the internationalization being a practical and theoretical antithesis to globalization.

123. As to *the first tendency* it is realized mainly due to strengthening of a role of national state formations and protectionism created by it, a course to independence and protection of interstate economy, culture, etc. from influence of global hegemony. This

tendency is directly connected to ambivalent (in many respects reactionary) struggle for independence and a special way of development in the 3-d (for example, religious fundamentalism) and the 2-nd (for example, the Russian great-power chauvinism) the worlds. In a potentiality this way can lead to creation of the large blocks resisting to hegemony of the global capital with reactionary pre bourgeois positions.

124. At the rectilinear-historical approach this way of protection against global hegemony of the capital looks unequivocally reactionary (counteraction to objective processes of internationalization of manufacture, attempt of replacement of late-capitalist forms of alienation by early-capitalist and even pre bourgeois, restriction of cultural dialogue and revival of religious obscurantism and nationalism). However the dialectic, taking into account real “turbulence” of social and economic time sight demands the account of real ambivalence of this way of counter globalization.

125. In the certain conditions (about them is lower) *time* national-state “fencing”, protection against influences of “a field of suppression” (economic, political, ideological-cultural) on the part of global players can be allowable and even necessary (from the point of view of “superproblem”(“supertask”) of removal of alienation) method of struggle against global hegemony.

126. Besides the temporary protectionism can be one of necessary preconditions of realization by a number of communities (countries, regions, sometimes-separate sectors of economy) of the third world of strategy *of catching up development*. Its purpose has been (and remains) a break in the second (or the third-considering the midst developed countries of Europe, etc.) echelon of the corporate capital and inclusion on supporting parts in struggle for repartition of a pie of global hegemony on the basis of intensive exploitation of workers, assistance to creation of “their own” global players, etc.

127. For a number of the countries of the 3-rd world (the so-called new industrial countries) this strategy happened to be accessible, but as a whole it has not led to essential change of balance of forces: they have remained in a rank of the subsystems dependent on global players. However it is even more essential that these countries (as well as all the world) are divided by a barrier of hegemony of the capital: the overwhelming majority of the citizens of New Industrial Countries (as against a society of 2/3 in the North, the truth, evolving in a society of 1/3) remained inhabitants of the 3-rd world and only very limited minority was included as supporting parts in a circle of “nomenclature” of the global capital. In this sense the end of XX century has shown, that catching up modernization does not solve the problem of overcoming of global hegemony of the capital, but alters a little bit the geopolitic and geoeconomic configuration of the world.

128. The beginning of XXI century can open and a new way of overcoming of monopoly of the “big seven” for socio dimensional center of hegemony: the superlarge and quickly growing states of the 3-rd world (first of all, China and India) due to concentration of resources in spheres of break receive a chance of creation of the powerful (private-state) global players, capable to undermine monopoly of present owners of the world in the field of postindustrial development. But also this scenario even if it is realized, will not change essence of existing relations – hegemony of large corporative-capitalist structures. Geopolitic and geoeconomic motions in balance of power will only add a new type of TNC (it is possible to name their “peripheral”) to existing types.

129. Thus before us there is a problem of search of essentially alternative ways of internationalization and the forces, capable to execute them. Differently, we should “see” in the modern world (having used as “microscope” results of our research of global capitalism) seeds of **democratic, socially and humanitarially focused model of the internationalization** being one transitive forms on a way to the empire of freedom:

130. Connection of the above empirical material with theoretical research of global hegemony of the capital allows to plan contours of long-term **strategy of alter globalization, counter-hegemonies**. This program can be realized on the several interconnected channels.

131. We will trace objectively possible alternatives to the basic components of neo liberal models of capitalist globalization such as, first of all, (1) neo privatization (and not only in direct forms, reductions public and growth of a private property, but also as redistribution of the property rights, authority in economy from a society to the global capitalist nomenclature); (2) neo marketization and market fundamentalism, de socialization of economic and public life; (3) growth of power of « global players » and attack on democratic rights of citizens; (4) growth of a social and economic inequality of the countries of 1-st and 3-rd worlds, growth of global « ghetto of backwardness ».

132. As alternatives to these processes we very shortly can allocate the following directions of change of this world, having limited in this text some kind as of a **program-minimum**, requirements of socialization and democratization of this system (they, in turn, can and should become a prologue to program-maximum).

**133. First**, removing from under the private control and transfer to public conducting such public utilities as:

134. • natural resources;

135. • public infrastructure;

136. • the cultural benefits, knowledge and means of their reception.

137. It can be made at least – by development of international, ecological, social, humanitarian norms; in an ideal as a maximum, at presence of originally democratic state, *-nationalization*, and movement to international regulation of uniform access to use by citizens and institutes of the natural utilities or, for knowledge and in the long term it is necessary, to their full and equal general availability.

138. The special comment is deserved by a problem of overcoming of a private property on knowledge. Genesis of postindustrial technologies makes it especially important direction of counteraction of globalization promotion and realization of new principles of the organization of information space and development of culture. The tasks of (1) *free, popular* (supposing only indemnification of costs, the lowest at the big number of users) *the distribution of the cultural benefits* based on **elimination of private property on knowledge**, (2) developments of means of their use (popular *free-of-charge information networks plus a computerization accessible to all*) and (3) **popular free-of-charge education** at public support of trainees from poor families, become the key elements in struggle against global hegemony of the capital in information era. *General availability of knowledge and education becomes the base democratic, based on progress of culture, integration of peoples.*

139. In realization of these requirements us the essence of well known alter globalization slogan « *the World–is not for sale* »

140. Besides in the frameworks of alter globalization program-minimum the activity directed on “removing” from under authority of *the corporate capital of certain “oases” of economic, social and cultural life* and realization of tactics “*globalizations from below*” is possible also. Such “oases” integrated from below could become networks of cooperative societies together with institutions of local government, ecological, etc. the unions focused on realization in the practical work of some limited circle of “rules” new (humanitarianly, ecologically, socially focused) models of integration. Under condition of creation of the system of international institutes (and bases for this purpose are there are alliances of cooperative societies, etc.), similar in their role to “not sacred Trinity” and focused on over national regulation, these “liliputians” (cooperative societies, etc.) can become a serious challenge (though also not the competitor) for global players.

141. However these islands of “globalizations from below” can become appreciable phenomenon of counter hegemony provided that, **second**, will be developed in parallel *echelonised programs of international alter globalization social actions* of mass democratic movements and the nongovernmental organizations directed on struggle against neo-marketization and de socialization of economic and public life.

142. The paramount role here (and it is easy for showing, proceeding from research of the contradiction of the global organized capital and the disorganized, dismembered labor) should belong to *international movement of hired workers* reviving on a new qualitative basis. Its strategic slogans should become requirements:

143. • alignments of payment of workers of similar qualification worldwide (including by the international norms of the minimal salary at a level that is not lower than living standards in the given region), first of all due to redistribution of means of fictitious sector (financial gamble, military charges ...);
144. • realizations and expansions international-recognized standards of social protection and a labor safety, the rights of workers in the field of participation in management, etc.;
145. • the international examination of national legislations in the field of work down to use of sanctions against the countries (and TNC!), workers breaking right (even on a sample of sanctions concerning those who breaks human rights);
146. • *the democratic based on the international solidarity, solution of problems of migration of labor;*

147. At the same time for all sectors of alter globalization social movements and NGOs the following tasks could become key crucial:

148. • at least tax, normative, etc. restrictions of fictitious sector of global economy (financial gamble, militarism, bureaucracy, mass-culture, etc.) and redistributions of the money spent in this sector, on the decision of social, ecological and other global problems;
149. • support of globalization from below;
150. • radical democratization of the institutes regulating global political, economic and humanitarian processes.

151. Undoubtedly, that these both blocks of requirements can become and become a uniform platform for the left political organizations. Many of these requirements are supported by the broad audience of mass democratic movements.

**152. Thirdly**, our task is development of positive alternative to absolute power of global players and realization of system of requirements *of radical socialization and democratization of system of regulation of processes of internationalization* (such requirements have already started to be put forward during mass “anti globalization” actions). They are:

- 153. • automatic cancellation of all regulating acts and regulations adopted by separate above-state institutes (whether it be IMF, WTO or similar to them) in case they break democratically adopted national norms. The international norms can have superiority over national only under condition of their ratification by democratic institutes of states;
- 154. • democratic (even as the European Parliament or, at least, by election of representatives in the international bodies at sessions of national parliaments) formation of the institutes determining key parameters of the international cooperation in the field of economy and finance, labour, education, wildlife management, science and culture;
- 155. • developments on maximum democratic basis of the specifications limiting activity TNC;
- 156. • dissolution of military blocks at parallel increase the role of the international forces of security (even, as a palliative, armed forces of the United Nations) ...

157. Such list of requirements is easy for continuing, for they are put forward already by the public forces struggling against global hegemony of the capital. Certainly, all of them will not be realized until we become strong enough. However constant promotion of these requirements (“Carthago should be destroyed! “), shows, that alternatives of capitalist globalization are, and that it not an isolationism, and even more full and progressive integration: « *Other World is possible!* » Struggle for these requirements is extremely important; and even in themselves they represent mobilizing force.

**158. Fourthly**, the task of alignment of levels of development of the 1-st and 3-rd worlds not due to deterioration of a life in 1-st, but due to change of system world economic relations becomes truly international. It is well-known, that incomes of several hundreds of the richest families of the world exceed incomes of quarter of citizens of the Earth, living below international level of poverty, that military charges of the countries of the NATO, and first of all – the USA, exceed the sum of the means necessary for maintenance of transition of the world to model of steady development of the Person and the Nature ...-this list is easy for continuing. But the main thing is in formation of the new social relations providing orientation of economic on the purpose of uniform maintenance of social priorities, refusal of militarism, financial gambling, standards of “consumer society”.

159. To the listed above proposals of the program-minimum we shall add known requirements as:



- 160. • cancellation of duties of 3-rd world;
- 161. • introduction of the unified international, ecological, social and humanitarian specifications (for example, already mentioned requirements of the minimal salary at the level not lower than living standards, obligatory initial, and for the majority of the countries – secondary education, etc.), provided due to the international payments (for example, for the account of considerably reduced military budgets of the NATO countries, etc.);
- 162. • maintenance of priority of the United Nations in the decision of questions of global geopolitics, etc.

163. On a question *who* will solve these problems, we as a matter of fact have already started to answer. It, first of all, growing *forces of international alter globalization*.

164. However there are many other potential participants of this activity. At all contradictions, the forces resisting to hegemony of the capital, can become (as we have told above, *under certain conditions*) the states which have appeared in “a ghetto of backwardness “. On the basis of previous reflections we can assume, that *some countries of 3-rd world can become subjects of counter hegemonic actions*, if they are ready for realization of some steps supposing at least:

- 165. • the coordinated carrying out of a policy of self-defense from hegemony;
- 166. • openness of their countries for cultural, educational, ecological, etc. dialogue in spheres non aligned human relations;
- 167. • creations of the international unions based on new type of the international cooperation of the countries with different level of development;
- 168. • the international cooperation with anti hegemony forces in the countries of “gold billion “.

169. It is obvious enough, that isolated-fundamentalist (whatever this fundamentalism is-Islamic, orthodox, “communist”) modes of the countries of the third world are unable to execute such steps. Hence, within the framework of these countries there is “supertask” of struggle for reorientation of their counter hegemony actions.

170. Besides we shall not forget, that among these states there is also such country as *Cuba*, which under certain conditions can become the center of crystallization (Native land) for counter hegemony forces uniting all named above (and many not mentioned by the author) directions of practical counteraction of global hegemony of the corporate capital.

171. At last, *fifthly*, there is also “supertask” of development of complex *theoretical model* (and, accordingly, programs of actions) *counter-hegemonies* for, as is known, social creativity, as well as any other, begins with creation of an ideal image of the future actions.

172. And if realization of named above practical steps have a lot of objective and subjective obstacles on the way of theoretical development there are less obstacles, but and necessity of it is not less than for practical steps.

173. In summary again I will stress: that this is – no more than the program minimum, which realization will help to reform only present system, to provide significant

(but not qualitative!) motion aside the greater socialization, humanitarization and ecologicalization of the global capital. However even for this « global reform » we have to fight seriously and for a long time. And only in process of cultivation *in this struggle* not only anti globalization, but also anticapitalist forces – international and comparable in power with the global capital – we not only can, but also we shall be obliged to put into agenda tasks of qualitative change of all world of alienation.

\*\*\*

174. Yes, nowadays our alternatives still seem poorly realistic, and our forces – insignificant in comparison with power of global players. However half-century ago struggle against colonialism so seemed so romantic, and nowadays this shame of 1-st world prefer not to be recollected at all. And if we manage to be resolute, active and talented in the programs and actions we will manage to prove in practice, that other world is possible.

# **TO THE THEORY OF SOCIAL BASIS AND FORCES OF MOVEMENT TOWARDS “REALM OF FREEDOM”: THE ROLE OF SOCIAL MOVEMENTS**

## **(Theses for Discussion)**

175. Main goal of this text is brief description of the theoretical foundations for the elaboration of the new forms of the left movements in the epoch of global hegemony of capital. This text is summary of the A.Buzgalin and A.Kolganov chapter in the book “Critical Marxism”, published in Russian in Moscow in 2001.

## **I. THE METHODOLOGY OF SOCIO-ECONOMIC RESEARCH (INSTEAD OF INTRODUCTION)**

176. The most contentious methodological question of our time is the relationship between the systematic dialectical materialist method on the one hand, and on the other, the positivism that is traditional for present-day social research and the post-modernism that flows from it.

177. In our view, the dialectical method is as before entirely adequate for researching the strategic, qualitative shifts undergone by modern society in general and by socialism as a material and intellectual phenomenon in particular. As is well known, the dialectical method is based on:

- 178. • research of the social processes through their dialectical contradiction as the only way to understand their essence and development of the forms;
- 179. • a recognition of the historicism of social systems and similar phenomena;
- 180. • the possibility of subjecting them to theoretical and practical criticism, and the need to do this;
- 181. • the need to replace them, with the help of an understanding of the laws of development of the particular social subject (equipped with theory and organized social force).

182. All this well-known “elements” of dialectical method will be used in our shot paper as essential instrument for the elaboration of conception.

183. In present circumstances, the development of the systematic dialectical materialist method cannot follow the path of integration with “omnivorous” post-modernism. What is required is dialogue with the now-prevalent methods. This latter signifies a recognition of the validity of each of the methods in its field of research, and their dialectical, contradictory interrelationship, proceeding from the legitimacy of bracketing together the realities which these methods are used to research. Post-modernism, for example, is adequate for describing the forms of society and social consciousness that predominate in contemporary reality, forms which are alienated from human beings and which are based on a crisis of earlier institutions, ideologies and so forth. However, this

method is absolutely inadequate for studying the possibilities of overcoming these distorted forms, this alienation, or the transforming of this alienated world (naturally, these transformations proceed from objective tendencies to progress in the world).

## **II. THE MATERIAL PRECONDITIONS FOR THE BIRTH OF A NEW SOCIETY: NEGATION OF THE WHOLE WORLD OF ALIENATION, NOT ONLY CAPITALISM**

184. Within the context of this problem, overcoming two limited approaches to the analysis of such preconditions takes on fundamental importance. Analyses of the society of the future as “anti-capitalism” (Stalinism) and as a reformed capitalism have both outlived their usefulness. At the same time, both these approaches contain positive aspects. Capitalism needs to be removed through the unity of a qualitative, revolutionary negation (of exploitation and so forth), and of succession (of material and intellectual culture).

185. The new approach, which has made its effects felt in full measure during the second half of the twentieth century, and which can be discerned in the manuscripts of Marx, presupposes an analysis of the new society not only as post-capitalist, but also as characterised by the removal of the whole world of alienation (“prehistory”, “the realm of economic necessity”). Capitalism in general, and present-day post-classical capitalism in particular, can in this case be seen only as the highest phase of development of the “realm of necessity”. From this stems a conclusion which is rarely stressed even by modern Marxism: *the left is faced with the task of doing away (through the methods of reform or revolution) not only with capitalism, but also with the whole society of alienation, and with all the forms and mechanisms of alienation.*

### **2.1 THE PRECONDITIONS FOR A NEW SOCIETY**

186. The preconditions for such a new society (“the realm of freedom”, the post-economic world, “communism”), extend far beyond the processes of the socialisation of production and the development of the class of hired workers. The minimum requirements include:

187. • the shift to the predominance of creative activity and post-industrial technologies; the creation of a world of culture, and the consigning of material production to a secondary level; and the shift to a dialogue with nature and to a “noosphere” type of development;
188. • the development of various forms of association of workers and citizens; the development of their capacities for social creativity, and of their experience of transforming the prevalent social relations (their experience in the struggle for their rights, for self-organization and so forth, for the development of their “social muscle”);
189. • the accumulation and mastering by working people of the wealth of human culture, without which creative activity in general and social creativity in particular are impossible (this thesis, which was already stressed by Lenin, has only a very pale reflection in present-day Marxism, which often forgets this question).

190. The key parameter and measure of development of the new society is becoming not the replacement of the private ownership by the state, but *the process of association (the self-organization of citizens and their self-management), and their social creativity* in the whole diversity of its forms (from innovations by a trade union activist or teacher, through the activity of mass democratic organizations, to the revolutionary transformation of society). So, **social associated creativity** is the only real way of *dialectical negation of the “realm of necessity” and alienation as general form of its existence.*

## 2.2. THE MAIN OBJECTIVE “SUPER-TASKS” OF THE NEW SOCIETY.

191. As it proceeds, *the birth of a new society encounters the need to resolve the following objective “super-tasks”* (for the most part these were unknown to the “old” Marxism, and represent new perceptions by the modern creative Marxism).

192. *First, it is necessary to overcome the hegemony of corporate capital*, whose power permeates all spheres of individual and social activity, shaping a particular type of technological progress and of the organization of economic life, political authority, ideology, child-raising and education, culture and so forth. This hegemony synthesizes all the most modern and developed mechanisms of alienation:

193. • the power of the market transfers to the “*market fundamentalism*”;
194. • monetary fetishism – to the giper-realised threat of the *crisis of virtual fictishes financial capital, dominating over production*;
195. • private property – to the “*privatisation*” of all economic and social life by *nomenklatura of global capital*;
196. • capitalist exploitation of the wage-labor – to the *expropriation of all “human qualities”* by corporate elites through the use of a broad range of legitimate and illegitimate, institutional and spiritual forms of coercion;
197. • democracy – to the “*political technologies*”, that means production of the votes ( in favor of necessary party or leader) from electorate (as “material) through some technological procedures;
198. • pluralist spiritual life – to the *manipulation with the conciseness of the peoples* through dominant mass culture in the atmosphere of psychology of individualism, etc.

199. The social basis for the reproduction of the many-sided hegemony of corporative capital is *conformism* (subordination to the dominant “rules” and institutions of social life as “natural”), which is typical of the workers, customers and “clients” of corporations. Consumer society and the cultivation of the utilitarian values fostered by mass culture are vital mechanisms helping to spread this power and this conformism.

200. *The only form of social energy which workers are able to use to overcome this hegemonism is the energy of their united, common activity (social creativity).* And here not only economic and political struggle is important. The important means of destroying consumerism and mass culture is the development of genuine cultural values and their mastering by the masses. Aiding the accumulation of the potential for social creativity and the progress of genuine culture are consequently among the main tasks of the left forces.

201. *Secondly*, it is necessary to meet the challenge of social problems, setting forward realistic proposals for solving them—something which cannot be achieved by present-day world capital (in a certain sense it can be said that *the need to solve global problems is the main “negative” precondition for communism*). From this flows the need for an alliance between the left movement and organizations struggling to solve global problems; the socialist movement cannot count on success unless it transforms these organizations into its most important allies. How this can be achieved is a special question about which more will be said below.

202. *Thirdly*, the task of overcoming the old world of alienation in the atmosphere of globalization (better to say: global hegemony of the corporate capital) must be tackled as an *international* goal, that is, one for all humanity. It is already clear that this will not be a simultaneous “world revolution”. It is just as clear that the strategy of trying to achieve a “breakthrough” in the course of which corporate capital breaks at its “weak link” inevitably leads to the degeneration of the first attempts at making isolated progress toward the new society. The task, consequently, is as follows: developing and at the same time achieving agreement on the implementation of a single and interrelated (but not uniform) strategy of the *net-work* of social movements and socialist (communist) organizations on the international level (NB! This idea authors formulated 10 years earlier appearance of the anti-globalist movement on the basis of many well-known Marxists works).

203. *This aspects, briefly formulated above, will be used as essential hypothesis for the formulation of the (1) main features of the social forces of liberation and (2) new role of mass democratic movements and “post-party” forms of political organization of the left forces.*

### III. THE THEORY OF SOCIALISM

#### 3.1. SOCIALISM AS THE PROCESS OF NON-LINEAR TRANSFORMATION OF THE “REALM OF NECESSITY” INTO THE “REALM OF FREEDOM”

204. Taking this general approach to the question of the preconditions for the society of the future (communism) and of the tasks which this society has to resolve, socialism may be interpreted not as the first phase of communism and not as “socialized” (“Swedish” and so on) capitalism, but as *an integral (having a single nature) international non-linear and contradictory process of transformation of the world of economic necessity and alienation into the “realm of freedom”*.

205. This process goes forward along three interconnected paths:

206. • the development of the first shoots of the new society in distorted and transitional (that is, combining elements of the “old” and “new”) forms within the framework of contemporary postclassical (late) capitalism (for example, the social and ecological regulating and limiting of the market, social welfare guarantees etc.).
207. • the activity of mass democratic and socialist movements, which constitute the direct moving forces of the socialist transformations, in carrying through reforms and revolutions and developing the initial elements of the new society (in a certain sense these organizations

and the people who are active in them become oases of the future in the world of alienation);

208. • the fostering of the relations of the new society in countries (if they appear), where popular-democratic and socialist revolutions have already created the institutional preconditions for realizing the simplest relations of communist society (naturally, alongside the powerful and only gradually withering heritage of the past).

209. *It is only within the unity of these three mutually interconnected processes that the progressive development of socialism is possible.* The degradation and/or degeneration (“mutation”) of any of them leads to the stagnation and/or crisis of the whole process. Hence the successful development of the first shoots of socialism (or as used to be said, the “victory” of socialism) in particular countries is possible only in unstable transitional forms, and only to the degree that capitalism is socialized and humanized (in the “citadels” of this society, reformism and not conservatism dominates) and that the power and influence of mass left-democratic organizations grows on an international scale. Socialism, consequently, appears as a *non-linear* process encompassing the victories and defeats of numerous revolutions and counterrevolutions, social reforms and counter-reforms, and proceeding as *an international*, integral world process. The role of the mass democratic movements as one of the three interconnected paths of the genesis of socialism can not be overestimated in this contents.

210. As well as stressing the continuity and transitional character of socialism, this characterization makes it possible to advance a relatively simple *criterion for the “socialistness” of the system.* Socialism should ensure a higher degree of economic efficiency and of the free, harmonious development of the individual than capitalism, even “postclassical” capitalism.

211. This approach creates objective basis (*criterion*) for the estimation of the Soviet system in comparison with objective process of transformation of the “realm of necessity” into the “realm of freedom”

### **3.2. SOVIET SYSTEM AS “MUTANT SOCIALISM”**

212. The objective preconditions for and initial steps of the socialist transformations linked with the undermining of the relations of alienation at the end of the second millennium and beginning of the XXI century were substantially changed as a result of the deep internal crisis and later, the collapse of the initial (mutant) shoots of socialism in the USSR and the countries of Eastern Europe.

213. The reason for this was the very nature of this “socialism”. The essence of the former system might be summed up briefly as “*mutant socialism*” (by this is understood the historical dead-end represented by this variant of the social system located at the beginning of the worldwide period of transition from capitalism to communism-this social system going beyond the framework of capitalism, but not forming a stable model serving as the basis for a subsequent movement to communism).

214. This new “socialist” world, which appeared as a consequence of the worldwide tendency to the socialization of the economy, and as a product of the profound contradictions of imperialism which emerged during the First World War, proved sickly

and deformed (mutant) from birth. This system should be characterized as “mutant” not by comparison with an abstract theoretical ideal, but by comparison with the real tendency to the socialization outlined in part 1.

215. *The reasons for the mutant nature of this “socialism”* (and together with this, the reasons for the rise and historically rapid defeat of this system) are not limited to the factors traditionally noted by researchers, such as Russia's low level of industrial development, the small numbers of workers and so forth. The essence of the problem lies deeper-in what has been called *the “trap of the twentieth century”*: the world as a whole was ready (by virtue of the depth of the contradictions involved) to destroy the existing system (particularly where it was really rotten), but *it was not ready for the conscious creation of a qualitatively new society through the social creativity of the masses*, not by stalinist “constructing” from above; the potential of social creativity (experience and strength of self-organization, level of culture, development of grass-root democracy etc.) was too low for grows of pure forms of “realm of freedom”.

216. As a result of this historical “trap of the twentieth century”, there appeared various palliative forms for resolving the contradiction between the need to make changes to the world imperialist system and the inadequate potential of the reformist forces. One of these forms was mutant socialism. The worldwide tendency to socialization (the conscious regulating of social development, its orientation toward the free development of the personality, social justice, collectivism and the mass striving of the workers to establish a new society-in Soviet parlance, “enthusiasm”) appeared in the world for the first time on a mass scale, but took the form of bureaucratic mutants (the command economy, the suppression of personal rights and freedoms, universal statisation, “levelling” and so forth).

217. That’s why we can say, that main decisions of our soviet past were not economic grows or state property, but real elements of social creativity of the masses. *We had terribly intensive contradiction between Stalinism* (bureaucratic mutations of socialism) *and social creativity of the masses (that is pure socialism), so called “enthusiasm” of the millions of people*, mainly young, who created by their own hands new cities, factories, poems, theories, new forms of social organization (mainly not known in the west) in the spheres of production, communal life, education, sport and so on, which are and will be example of the potential of social creativity.

218. In some aspects, our mutant socialism can be compared with Renésans period as first attempt to move to the capitalism in inadequate conditions: Italy was the country with terrible inquisition, bloody civil wars, immoral behavior of the pops and so on, finally defeated by feudalism, but... But for us Renésans is period of the first and beautiful attempts to liberated personality from feudal oppression; may be for the future generations Soviet system also will be the world of the Maykovsky, Gagarin and enthusiasm of the millions, but not (mainly) the world of GULAGs (about which we also must remember).

### **3.3. STAGES OF THE GENESIS OF SOCIALISM IN THE XX-XXI CENTURY**

219. In spite of the fact, that USSR was collapsed, the socialism as an integral (having a single nature) international non-linear and contradictory process of transformation of the world of economic necessity and alienation into the “realm of freedom” is not finished. The whole epoch – epoch of genesis of socialism,-started in 1917, is continuing. Dialectical method of the contradictory interrelation of logical and historical



analysis of the reality shows that stages of historical evolution can become (through the process of dialectical negation) elements of the structure of the present system. That's why the history of the modern epoch, which shows us that in the course of its development socialism passes at a minimum through the following three stages, can help us to find main elements of the internal structure of the modern socialist movement.

220. *The first* stage is linked with the possibility of beginning socialist transformations in the conditions of a developed industrial state-monopoly capitalism. The contradictions of this stage of capitalism have led to a series of socialist and national liberation revolutions, led by industrial proletariat and its party. But for a number of objective reasons these revolutions have culminated in the genesis of a *mutant socialism*.

221. This type of the socio-political struggle for the socialism is past, but in the same time, many features of it can be dialectically (on the new stage) reproduced in the third world, where contradictions of capitalism and preconditions for socialism are in some aspects similar. So, the consequences can be also similar and we can receive new model of the mutant socialism in the case of the victory of the left forces in this countries, if they will not make some conclusions from the "lessons" of the past. What kind of "lessons" – we'll think later.

222. *The second* stage, marked by the crisis of the world capitalist economy during the first half of the twentieth century (the great depression, fascism, and the Second World War), has been associated with the impact of the new preconditions of socialism, and above all with the objective need for the socialization and humanization (and not merely state regulation) of the market economy and capitalism as a whole. The responses to this challenge of the twentieth century have included social democratic reforms and the transition to the "society of the two-thirds" in the developed countries following the collapse first of the efforts to resolve these contradictions by means of fascisation rather than socialization, and then the collapse of the colonial system. This type of the rode towards new society also came to the crisis (and this is common place now) because of the decline of social creativity (enthusiasm) of the peoples (if you want-diffusion of the spirit of 1968), collapse of the mutant socialism, globalization and other consequences of the new wave in the technological revolution and inspired by it new forms of late capitalism.

223. *The third* stage is associated with situation, mentioned above. Postclassical capitalism has reacted to this with the rebirth of the tradition of liberalism, along with the simultaneous strengthening of the power of the largest international corporations and institutions (the International Monetary Fund, NATO and so forth). This has in fact been an irrational reaction, employing the achievements of the scientific-technical revolution primarily in the transactional (fictitious) sector (finances, management and so forth), and yielding only insignificant progress even in the field of the growth of consumption, not to speak of culture.

224. Mutant socialism has made a number of efforts at selfreform. "Perestroika", with its attempts to carry through a transition to a model of "humane" and "democratic" socialism with the help of reforms from above (a sort of "bureaucratic reform of bureaucratic power") proved a failure, since the decay of the system had proceeded so far that the potential for social creativity by the late 1980s had perished all but definitively.

225. The "lessons" of this stages are not so evident, but we can propose hypothesis, that *social democracy (and its Alter Ego-old forms of "real socialism") itself can not lead*

*not only to the “realm of freedom”, but even to the stable “improvement” (socialization) of capitalism. We need to have new (adequate to the new system of technological, economic and socio-political relations of late capitalism) forms of social creativity and global resistance to the capitalist globalization. Will and can modern anti-globalist movement play this role in the future – big question and big challenge for us.*

### **3.4. SOCIALISM AND THE MARKET**

226. But may be old and well-known, but not realized in practice model of market socialism can help us to solve contradictions of previous stages of socialist evolution?

227. As is quite widely understood, the analysis of socialism as a variety of the market system in practice ignores the fact that the market is a form of commodity productive relations which give birth to the corresponding mechanisms of alienation (in particular, commodity fetishism and competition) and to a particular personality type (the egoistical homo economicus), and which by force of its internal contradictions develops into capitalism. Moreover, in the late twentieth century the market as a ruling system cannot exist without the whole totality of attributes characteristic of “late capitalism” (in particular, the giant superstructure of the transactional sector, consisting of exchanges, banks and so forth, and consuming as much as half of the available resources). On the other hand, “non-market” socialism until now has existed either as a bureaucratic “economy of shortages”, or as the theoretical construct of a virtual system of relations of democratic planning and self-management.

228. Resolving this dilemma is possible through a dynamic analysis of socialism as a process of transition to communism as a society lying “on the other side” both of material production and of the market. Consequently, *socialism is characterized by the process of the withering away of the market* (or more precisely, of the economic forms and mechanisms characteristic of “late capitalism”) *as more efficient and progressive (in the economic, social, environmental and other senses) post-market relations of management, cost accounting etc. are developed* (their distorted and transitional forms are derived in many ways from the practice both of capitalism and of “socialism”; a minimal task is to cleanse these forms of these deformations).

## **IV. THE SOCIAL BASE OF SOCIALIST TRANSFORMATIONS. NEW SOCIAL MOVEMENTS AND THE LEFT**

### **4.1. THE SOCIAL STRUCTURE OF THE CONTEMPORARY WORLD COMMUNITY**

229. Developments on the threshold of the twenty-first century have significantly altered *the social structure of the contemporary world community*.

230. *The class of hired workers* in the developed countries does not consist mainly of the industrial proletariat, but of workers in the sphere of services (where there are a lot of hand and primitive industrial labor), and the transactional (fictitious) sector. In the developing countries, meanwhile, industrial labor predominates, manual labor remains a massive phenomenon, and pre-economic forms of exploitation has not been eliminated in many spheres.

231. In exactly the same way *the bourgeois class* has on the one hand been extensively changed by the process of mutual “diffusion” between this layer and the higher layers of white collar workers; on the other hand, a further concentration of real economic and political power is occurring in the hands of a narrow circle of the corporate capitalist elites – “*nomenklatura of global capital*”.

232. In this new conditions the earlier thesis about the industrial proletariat as the only consistently revolutionary force with an interest in the transformation of society now requires corrections as a result of the above-mentioned changes which are characteristic of the period around the end of the century. *For the understanding of basic features of modern social structure we must take into the account not only “sunset” of late capitalism, but also more general process: the beginning of the transition from “realm of necessity” to the “realm of freedom”.*

233. The fundamental shifts described above are bringing about a situation on the threshold of the twenty-first century in which the “classic” contradiction between hired labor and capital is developing (without being eliminated) into a *new social-class contradiction of post-classic capitalism*.

234. At one pole of this contradiction is personified international corporate-organized capital (“*nomenklatura of global capital*”).

235. At the other pole of the contradiction are those workers (representing hired and free labor) who are capable in practical terms of resisting this power. Such workers are the subjects of social creativity, capable of self-organization, self-defense, and the purposeful creation of new social relations in economic, political and cultural life.

236. As a result, society is not divided simply into owners of capital and hired workers. Another division is arising, cutting across the traditional class pyramid as if diagonally. This is an extremely mobile boundary-*the contradiction between conformists (from the milieu both of the owners and of the “slaves” of corporative capital), and those who are capable of joint social creativity*.

237. The conclusion can readily be drawn that the division of society into conformists and social creators is conditioned at a fundamental level by the *contradiction between the hegemony of corporative capital* (the highest present-day form of alienation) *and social creativity*. This division, which is described here in a somewhat conditional manner, can be illustrated by a scheme [see bellow] (which is, naturally, considerably simpler than the actual relationships) showing the “superimposition” and interconditionality between the socio-class divisions of society (in which the poles are capitalists and hired workers, with a multitude of “layers” in between), and the socio-creative divisions (the distinction between conformists and subjects of social creativity).

238. The stress on the internal contradictions within the milieu of the workers and on the “diffusion” of the bourgeois class, on the questions of internationalization and globalization, requires a critical reappraisal of previous concepts of *the historical mission of the working class*.

## The Social Structure of Modern Post-Classical Capitalism

### CONFORMISTS

(Subjects of Hegemonism)

-----  
The corporative-capitalist elite (the subject  
of the hegemonism of corporate capital)

-----  
The middle bourgeoisie, higher managers, the “elite”  
intelligentsia and other individuals directly “realising”  
the hegemonism of corporative capital

-----  
The petty bourgeoisie, farmers

-----  
Senior white-collar workers in the transactional sector

-----  
Subjects of free creative labor

-----  
Associated workers/co-owners

SUBJECTS OF  
ASSOCIATED  
SOCIAL  
CREATIVITY

-----  
Hired workers engaged in creative  
labor (including the “rank and  
file intelligentsia”)

-----  
Hired workers engaged  
in reproductive industrial or manual labor

-----  
Workers bound not only by economic  
but also by extra-economic compulsion,  
patriarchal traditions etc.

-----  
Paupers, lumpens etc.  
-----

### CONFORMISTS

(Objects of hegemonism)

#### 4.2. SOCIAL CREATIVITY, FREE ASSOCIATION AND MASS DEMOCRATIC MOVEMENTS

239. As we said above, social creativity of the masses is main alternative to the world of alienation. Now, after very short analysis of social forces of liberation, we can and have to concretizes the subject of social creativity. On the philosophical language we can say, that it is *subject of transformation of alienated relations into the forms of practical liberation*, positive freedom (not only freedom from, but also freedom to change the world according to its laws of development).

240. On more practical level of definitions we can conclude, that this force should be:

- 241. • critical force, which is oriented on the dialectical negation of the all forms of alienation (not only, but firstly – modern forms of capitalist hegemony, exploitation);
- 242. • constructive force, which has potential and experience of positive creation of new social relations;
- 243. • cultural force, which has intellectual potential (that means capacities to use in practice main decisions of human culture) of creation of new social relations;
- 244. • force, which has potential and experience of self-organization.

245. Only such social organization can give adequate answer on the challenges of the modern epoch of “sunset” of “real of freedom” and global hegemony of corporate capital.

246. *Material basis for this new type of social organization is creating by the development of “net-work society”, where system of non-hierarchical informal grass-root interconnections between peoples can be created from bellow.*

247. *Form of this organization is creating by socialization of both – production and human relations: that is the model of free working association (the objective necessity and opportunity of which showed K.Marx through analysis of contradictions of alienation in its capitalist form).*

248. • This association is: *voluntary and free* integration of the personalities (not alienated social actors, who are operating only via the alienated social forms, such as “capitalist”, “wage labor”, “customer” and so on);

249. • integration on the basis of their *practical activity (work)*, not money or formal bureaucratic status; this activity mainly is *voluntary* (not paid) *work*; motivated by practical interests of the members (clean water or defense of human rights...);

250. • *open union*, which is changing its forms and configurations every time, when real activity and interests of participants is changing; real unity of interests and common work for such association is more important, then formal unity of the program and existing bureaucratic structures (apparatus).

251. This is, of course, theoretical construction. But if we analyze practice of so called “new social movements” (see writings of F.Houtart, A.Scott, M.Supalak, Ageton and so on) we can find many features similar with mentioned above. Let’s compare of material basis of social creativity and principles of existential principles of subject of social creativity, including principles of free association (1) and features of new social movements (2) [see table 1].

**Table 1.**

1	2
Net-work structure of material basis	net-work forms of organization
Essence of social creativity and free association as	their cultural nature, oriented on the elimination of different forms

nature and form of existence of “realm of freedom”	of alienation
Form of free association of the individuals	location in civil society and inter-class structure
Voluntary integration of the peoples on the basis of their common practical interests	Based on the common interests of members
Self-management and self-organization as principles of formation of subject of social creativity	Grass-root democracy
Integration of voluntary work	Mobilization on voluntary basis
Open union with flexible forms	Open creating from bellow movement structures with unstable forms

252. This similarity is not an accident: goals and principles of organization of new social movements are inspired by objective process of genesis of “realm of freedom”, or more precisely, by the contradictions of late capitalism (global hegemony of capital), which inevitably require and creates *social creativity of the people and forms of free association* as their alternative.

253. In the same time, this two phenomena has very important difference, interconnected with *internal contradiction of new social movement*. in spite of the fact, that their goals and principles of organization are directly interconnected with “post-alienated” relations, real strategy and means of its realization are [*mainly*] reformist and far from the orientation on practical (that means also *political*) destruction of the relations of alienation, which have now form of the hegemony of global capital and without dialectical negation of this relations real alternative movement is impossible.

254. In this case so called “old social movements” (labor, socialist, communist and so on) are more adequate to the task of revolutionary negation of the past and jump beyond “realm of necessity”. From other side (and this is *internal contradiction of the “old social movements”*), they are (according to their origins and in their nature, forms of organization) more anti-capitalist (oriented on the economic and political struggle of the classes), than post-capitalist and stands relatively far from the “ideals” of the “realm of freedom” (voluntary association of the personalities, based on the integration of social work, i.e. post-economic and post-political union).

255. In some aspects we can say, that future struggle for the transformation towards “realm of freedom” will dialectically negate (and in the same time integrate) features of the anti-capitalist and “new” social movements. In what forms and how – this is until now open question. but we can see in practice some tendencies, which show us the direction to this future forms of the alternative movements:

256. cooperation via net-work structures of the different types of the movement on the new principal basis – *difference of forms and ways of the struggle for realization of the common strategic tasks (for example – struggle against capitalist globalization)* instead of formal unity of the forces inside one or another for form and program (communist, social-democratic or another organization);

257. radicalization of the movements via practical common critique of the global hegemony of capital (using forms of *political* struggle against subjects of alienation, for example – against “global players”, as it was in Seattle, Prague, Genoa and so on);

258. integration of the new social movements with democratic left political forces on the basis of *grass-root democracy* and transformation of the old parties towards new “*post-party*” forms of the left, more similar with form of free association, then “classical” political party..

#### **4.3. GRASS-ROOT DEMOCRACY AND POST-PARTY FORMS OF ORGANIZATION OF THE LEFT**

259. Interpreting socialism as a transitional process whose main “energising potential” is the *social creativity* associated with it, makes possible a further confirmation of the thesis of the dying away of political forms (in particular, of parties, of the state, and in general of the principle of representative democracy), and *the development of grass-roots democracy* and self-management as trends characteristic of all three currents of socialism (socialist-oriented reforms in the “countries of capital”, socialist movements, and socialist societies). The basis for this process is not only development of social creativity, but also more deep changes in material basis of our life – genesis of post-industrial and post-economic forms, i.e. of the preconditions of the “realm of freedom”.

260. The elements of *grass-roots democracy as adequate (transitional from political to post-political) form of social creativity* include:

261. • the full and consistent realization of all internationally recognized human rights and freedoms (freedom of speech, conscience and association, the right to form political and social organizations etc.);
262. • the general development of productive (to differing degrees depending on the property forms in particular enterprises) and territorial self-management as basic forms of association of the population;
263. • the transforming of mass democratic organizations and movements into fully valid subjects of the process of regulating of economic and social life;
264. • the formation of a legislative power according to the principle of representation by deputies from base-level associations (organs of self-management) with an imperative mandate (the right of recall, replacement and so on); subordination of the executive (the government) to the legislative power; the election of an independent judicial authority without the involvement of presidential or analogous institutions;

- 265. • creation of post-party forms through the activity of political parties (representing the dying classes) through mass democratic organizations, organs of self-management and so forth.

266. Main features of *post-party forms of organization of the left* now can be shown only as more or less feasible tendencies, abstracted from the practice of some successful left organizations and conclusions, based on the theoretical view of the future free association. So, main *principles* of such post-party organizations are (we want to remind: this is only thesis's, hypnotizes) can be shown as prolongation of the main features of social creativity (in its implication to the political sphere):

- 267. • activity in and via mass social movement (post-party organization [mainly] as a form of assistant to the Social movements, “radicalizer” and progressor” of them, but not [mainly] vanguard of the class);
  - 268. • all main functions of post-party organization can be realized only on the basis of self-organization of the peoples, not via bureaucratic apparatus or money;
  - 269. • “personalization” of the activity and responsibility: social creativity is form of activity, which has the author by all means; talents (not money or power) will be main “deficit” for such organizations (compare: “human qualities” as main form of capital in XXI century);
  - 270. • self-management as main form of internal organization.
271. Main *functions* of such organization can be (and this is evident):
- 272. • assistance to the growth, strengthening, and integration of the new social movements as main form of struggle against not only alienation and hegemony of capital, but also conformism, passive, petty-bourgeois life of the peoples as “parpets” of the global capital;
  - 273. • radicalization of the new social movements, elimination of the influence of the global capital on them, and creation of the basis for transformation of this movements to the one of the main forms of the future grass-root democracy;
  - 274. • assistance to the development of independent culture and education as one of the main forms (together with practical social activity) of the struggle against ideological manipulation and spiritual alienation;
  - 275. • “catching up development” of the theory of social transformation towards “realm of freedom”.

\* \* \*

276. Of course, we are now only in the beginning of the genesis of new social movements and post-party forms of political (partly – post-political) struggle. During many decades we (especially in third and second worlds) will be in the situation, where and when “old” forms of social (class) struggle and “traditional” forms of the left parties will be absolutely important for the struggle against capital. But globalization of the capital, deepening of the global problems and internalization of the resistance are creating new challenges and only new forms of our struggle and organizations will give adequate responds to this challenges of new epoch.



\* \* \*

277. *These theses have already been the topic of wide debate within the international association “Scholars for Democracy and Socialism”, and in the pages of the journal Alternatives. All of them arise from a single key premise: the new society is coming into being as the negation of the whole epoch of alienation, which at the end of its lifespan is giving birth to the means for its negation-associated social creativity. All the remaining theses are the result of the dialectical development of the initial premise using the method of proceeding from the abstract to the concrete, together with the constant juxtaposition of theoretical conclusions and practice, and resting on an understanding of the fact that this process is dialectical and non-linear, developing **via contradictions** as dialectical (saving all decisions of the past) negation of negation.*