

Building the New Anti-Capitalist Global Movement: Characteristics and Dynamics of the New Social Movements

By Walden Bello*

(Expanded version of a speech given at the Conference on Participatory Democracy,
University of the Philippines, January 30-31, 2007.)

Let me begin by saying that from the point of view of a person from the South, things do not look as bleak as they seemed a couple of years ago. The United States is bogged down in Iraq, in an unending war that, as the November 2006 elections demonstrated, has lost the last shreds of legitimacy even among the American people.

The peoples of Latin America are on the move away from neoliberalism, with President Hugo Chavez of Venezuela having a grand time baiting the bear with impunity.

The European Union and the US continue their inexorable drift from each other.

The mighty Israeli war machine has been humbled by a most unexpected source: a few hundred guerrillas in Lebanon.

For us in the South, a significant weakening of the global hegemony of the United States such as that which has occurred since 2003 is a giant step forward, for it gives our societies more breathing space, more freedom of maneuver.

Globalization in Retreat

I have written elsewhere that globalization is in retreat. To what do we owe this momentous development?

I think we can identify six reasons. One is the preference of national capitalist classes for a strategy of shifting the burden of adjusting to the global crisis of overproduction and stagnation and the environmental crisis to each other rather than

forging one common, cooperative response. While cooperation may be the rational strategic choice from the point of view of the system, that may not be the case from the point of view of national capitalist interests.

A second factor has been the corrosive effects of the double standards brazenly displayed by the hegemonic power, the United States. While the Clinton administration did try to move the United States towards free trade, its successor, the Bush administration, has hypocritically preached free trade while practicing protectionism. Indeed, the trade policy of the Bush administration seems to be free trade for the rest of the world and protectionism for the United States.

A third reason is the gap between ideology and reality. There has been too much of a dissonance between the promise of globalization and free trade and the actual results of neoliberal policies, which have been more poverty, more inequality, and stagnation. One of the very few places where poverty diminished over the last 15 years is China, and there, it has not been neoliberal policies but interventionist state policies that managed market forces that were responsible for lifting 120 million Chinese out of poverty. There are, of course, many major problems with China's high-speed growth, but we will return to this issue later.

Another example of great dissonance was that between the prosperity promised by the elimination of capital controls and the actual collapse of the economies that took this policy to heart: The Asian financial crisis and the collapse of the economy of Argentina, which had been among the most doctrinaire practitioner of capital account liberalization, were two decisive moments in reality's revolt against theory.

A fourth factor unraveling the globalist project is its obsession with economic growth. Indeed, unending growth is the centerpiece of globalization, the mainspring of its legitimacy. While the World Bank continues to extol rapid growth as the key to expanding the global middle class, global warming, peak oil, and other environmental events are making it clear to people that the rates and patterns of growth that come with globalization are a surefire prescription for ecological Armageddon.

A fifth factor is the weakening of the coercive capabilities of the empire. A crisis of legitimacy intersecting with a crisis of coercive capability on the part of the hegemon that protects the system has very damaging implications for the global structures of capitalism. The US state is today suffering a crisis of overextension that has made it weaker than it was before March 2003, that is, before the invasion of Iraq. There is, however, a view, recently expressed by Josef Joffe in an essay in *Time*, that a “decoupling of the world economy from world politics” is in progress. That is, the processes of globalization are proceeding just fine, even as the hegemon is suffering reverses military and politically. This is an illusion. Without their protective politico-military canopy, global economic structures eventually, to borrow a Pentagon term, degrade. Just take a look at Latin America. With the US tied up in Iraq, it cannot stem developments that erode or evade the rules of capitalism. Nestor Kirchner tells his creditors he will only pay 25 cents for every dollar he owes them, and he gets away with it. Hugo Chavez is busy creating an alternative trading bloc, ALBA, or the Bolivarian Alternative for the Americas (ALBA), whose rules, which include huge discounts on the price of Venezuelan oil for poor Caribbean countries and barter—that is Argentinian heifers or Bolivian soybeans for Venezuelan oil—go “beyond the logic of capitalism,” as

Chavez puts it. Such actions would have invited determined US-supported destabilization in the past, as Jacobo Arbenz found out when his agrarian reform policies were seen as a threat to United Fruit interests in Guatemala in 1954 and Salvador Allende discovered when he nationalized the Kennecott and Anaconda mining corporations in 1971.

But perhaps the most critical factor has been resistance, people's resistance. The battles of Seattle in 1999, Prague in 2000, Genoa in 2001, the massive global anti-war march in Feb. 15, 2003, when the anti-globalization movement morphed into the global anti-war movement, Cancun in 2003, and Hong Kong in 2005—these were critical junctures in the decade-long people's counteroffensive that has resulted in the equivalent of a Stalingrad for the neoliberal project. These struggles, it must be emphasized, were merely the tip of the iceberg, the summation of thousands of struggles in thousands of communities throughout the world involving millions of peasants, workers, students, indigenous people and many sectors of the middle class. We should never overestimate our influence, but we must never underestimate ourselves either.

Let me then dwell on some characteristics of this movement, sometimes called the anti-globalization movement, sometimes the global justice movement.

Unlike the movements of the sixties and seventies, the global justice movement was not the product of political parties acting on the basis of a comprehensive theory of liberation. It was the product of concrete struggles that were, in fact, very local, but which in the process of struggle made participants realize that they were struggling against global forces that were creating the same problems for people like them elsewhere. Thus in the process of struggle, in the effort to understand their problems, in

the process of gathering support for their struggles, participants developed an internationalist consciousness.

The Anti-Dam Struggles

One of the best cases of this process was the anti-dam struggles.

In the seventies and eighties, the World Bank became a central actor funding power generation schemes throughout the developing world. These schemes oftentimes meant disruption of the ecology of watersheds, negative impacts on agrarian livelihoods and fisheries, and large-scale resettlement.

Let us look at three key struggles with similar dynamics: the Chico River Dam struggle in the Philippines; the struggle against the Narmada Dam in India; and the struggle against the Pak Mun Dam in Thailand

All three struggles were directed at large-scale hydroelectric projects funded by the World Bank. All three saw opposition emerge initially from the people who were negatively affected, including indigenous people or tribals. All three saw the local groups hook up with urban-based NGO's or political groups—in the case of Chico, with the CPP and NPA--to popularize their campaigns both nationally and internationally. All three used civil disobedience, including, in the case of the Chico River, indigenous women lying in front of bulldozers, to achieve their goals. All three managed to get the World Bank to withdraw from the projects and forced the Bank to reconsider its lending for big dam projects.

These and other anti-dam struggles contributed to the creation of a strong anti-big-dam Network internationally, both in the North and in the South. The International

Rivers Network is one of the most effective of these networks. In response to pressure from these groups, the Bank was forced to set up a commission to reassess its lending for hydroelectric dams, which conceded that the critics were right in some of their charges about the negative impact of big dams.

The Zapatistas

Indigenous people's struggles took off in the eighties and nineties throughout Asia and Latin America. Some of them were connected with land struggles, with struggles for water, with struggles against transnational corporations for resources, with struggles against dams.

Perhaps the most dramatic struggle for indigenous peoples rights' was that which emerged in the jungles of the state of Chiapas, Mexico, led by the EZLN, better known as the Zapatistas.

The Zapatistas drew world attention when they staged an uprising on January 1, 1994, at which they proclaimed their goal of ending the exploitation of indigenous peoples in Chiapas and their opposition to the North American Free Trade Area and to globalization. In other words, they were seeing themselves not only as a force to liberate indigenous peoples in Chiapas but also as a force seeking to spark a regional movement against NAFTA, which included Mexico, and a global movement against globalization.

The Zapatistas thus articulated what was to become the trademark of the new global movement, which was the articulation of a struggle that was to be carried out at three levels simultaneously: the local, the national, and the global.

What was also interesting about the Zapatistas was their deliberate effort to distance themselves from previous national liberation movements.

They said they were not a vanguard but simply a force to release pent-up demands, after which the process would take its natural course.

They said they were not interested in seizing power but in creating the conditions for exposing and opposing power.

As Subcomandante Marcos put it, "...the movement has no future if its future is military. If the EZLN perpetuates itself as an armed military structure, it is headed for failure. Failure as an alternative set of ideas, an alternative attitude to the world. The worst that could happen to it apart from that, would be for it to come to power and install itself there as a revolutionary army."

Then, differentiating the Zapatistas from previous national liberation movements, he said "What would be a success for the politico-military organizations of the sixties or seventies would be a fiasco for us. We have seen that such victories proved in the end to be failures, or defeats, hidden behind the mask of success."

This outlook is what drew so much global support for the Zapatistas and led some authors to mark them as the first "post modern" national liberation movement. Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri, in their book *Multitude*, have this to say of the Zapatistas' strategy: "The paradoxical Zapatista motto 'command obeying,' for example, is aimed at inverting the traditional relationships of hierarchy within the organization. Leadership positions are rotated, and there seems to be vacuum of authority at the center. Marcos, the primary spokesperson and quasi-mythical icon of the Zapatistas, has the rank of subcomandante to emphasize his relative subordination. Furthermore, their goal has never been to defeat the state and claim sovereign authority but rather to change the world without seizing power."

It has also been noted how the Zapatistas were the first resistance movement to intensively use the internet to spread their ideas. Indeed, rather than achieve power, what they were most interested in doing was achieving moral authority and using the most advanced telecommunications techniques to do this. Moral authority, they realized, was a more durable form of power than political power, and they were right.

Nonetheless, the use of the internet is also a means of defense. The government and army of Mexico would find it hard to attack and destroy a force that has so much support internationally and “while the whole world is watching.”

Peasants and Farmers Unite

Like indigenous peoples, small farmers have been threatened by the ideologies of modernization, both on the right and the left.

Highly mechanized large-scale agriculture was seen as the wave of the future both by the corporations and the socialist states in the fifties and sixties. There was no room for small farmers in these schemes. They were seen as a class that belonged to the past.

By the seventies, however, these notions were being questioned. E.E. Schumacher was arguing that in fact small scale enterprises, among them farms, were more ecologically sustainable. Frances Moore Lappe and Joe Collins, in *Food First*, argued for land reform, saying that in fact smaller farms were more productive than giant farms. Others argued that small farming was more hospitable to organic methods of agriculture, and that while organic agriculture could not be as productive in the narrow sense that corporate agriculture, the gains in terms of health and ecological sustainability more than outweighed efficiency considerations.

It was, however, the Agreement on Agriculture (AOA) agreed upon at the Uruguay Round that also established the WTO, that catalyzed small farmers' groups to begin to organize and link up internationally.

Prior to the AOA and WTO, there were already farmers' groups struggling for land reform or engaging in land occupation, such as the MST or Movement of the Landless in Brazil. However, the AOA and WTO contributed significantly to small farmer mobilization owing to two threats it carried:

- the institutionalization of dumping of subsidized agricultural goods from the EU and US on developing country farmers, thus driving many of them from the soil;

- the Trade Related Intellectual Property Rights Agreement that would allow corporations such as Monsanto to control the distribution of the seeds they would create through genetic modification. Thus the natural process by which farmers would save seeds in order to farm the next season would be rendered obsolete by imperative of TNC profitability that was driving the new technologies.

Both farmers in the South and the North were negatively affected by these trends. Small farmers in the North began to realize that the main beneficiaries of the dumping of EU or US goods on developing countries were not them but a small number of highly subsidized corporate farmers. In France, there was also a sense that traditional culinary arts were part and parcel of a culture based on small farmer cultivation and that the institutionalization of large-scale, transnational production and distribution networks by TNC's like McDonald's would lead to culinary deterioration.

These motivations--survival of the small farmer; opposition to genetic modification and its destructive impact on the property rights of small farms; preservation of a local culinary culture intimately associated with small farming--led to Jose Bove's celebrated dismantling of a McDonald's restaurant in his hometown in Millau in 1999.

As Bove recounted the action:

“When we said we would protest by dismantling the half-built McDonald's in our town, everybody understood why—the symbolism was so strong. It was for proper food against *malbouffe*, agricultural workers against multinationals... The extreme right and other nationalists tried to make out it was anti-Americanism, but the vast majority knew it was no such thing. It was a protest against a form of production that wants to dominate the world.”

Bove and others formed the international organization Via Campesina. Via Campesina has three key demands:

- food sovereignty, or the ability of a country to preserve its local agriculture and farmers from imports;
- food safety, meaning protecting the population from potentially or actually dangerous processes of food production, such as those employing GMO's;
- and opposition to seed patenting and other forms of biopiracy.

In its few years of existence, Via Campesina has gained the reputation of being one of the most militant and effective mass movements against corporate-driven globalization. In Cancun, Mexico, in September 2003, the suicide of Korean farmer Lee Kyung Hae contributed to derailing the fifth ministerial of the World Trade Organization.

And it was Via Campesina, with its shock troops of Korean farmers, that nearly brought down the 6th Ministerial in Hong Kong in December 2005. One might say that Via Campesina, Bove, and the MST represent a kind of post-modern “peasant revolt.”

The Chavez Revolution

The fourth new movement I would like to look at closely is that associated with President Hugo Chavez in Venezuela.

After unsuccessfully trying to topple the corrupt elite democracy in Venezuela in 1992, Chavez ran for the presidency and won in 1998. That began the decade-long process of revolutionary change that Chavez has called the “Bolivarian Revolution,” after Simon Bolivar, the 19th century Venezuelan that freed much of Latin America from Spain.

Chavez’ project, which he has now defined as a movement toward “socialism,” rests on the tremendous support he has among the urban and rural poor. However, the military is the only reliable organized institution he can count on to move things. The press is hostile to him. So is the Church hierarchy. The bureaucracy is slow and riddled with corruption. Political parties are discredited, with Chavez himself leading the attack against them and preferring to keep his supporters organized as a loose mass movement. Given the centrality of the military as a reforming institution, Chavez has created an army of urban military auxiliaries or reservists to support the regular armed forces. Originally known as “Bolivarian Circles,” this reserve force, which is projected to eventually number one million, is becoming instrumental in the organization and delivery of social programs in the shantytowns. These auxiliaries also now participate, alongside the

National Guard, in the expropriation of private land for the accelerated agrarian reform program.

With its central role in the Bolivarian Revolution, many observers are asking the question: is the military up to it?

For Chavez, according to political analyst Edgardo Lander, the military is reliable because it is not corrupt and is more efficient than other institutions in delivering results. Lander questions this. “I don’t think there is anything inherent in the military that somehow makes it less susceptible to corruption than other institutions.” As for military efficiency, this is, he says, a half-truth: “Yes, the military may be effective when deployed to solve immediate problems like building schoolhouses or clinics staffed by Cuban doctors. But it is not a long-term solution. You need to institutionalize these solutions, and that’s where this revolution is weak. You have a proliferation of ad hoc solutions that remain ad hoc.”

Yet there is no doubt that among Chavez and his generation of officers, there is a reforming zeal that will fuel the revolution for some time to come. It is a zeal borne out of a tremendous sense of frustration, one which Chavez expressed to Gott in an interview a few years ago: “Over many years the Venezuelan military were eunuchs: we were not allowed to speak; we had to look on in silence while we watched the disaster caused by corrupt and incompetent governments. Our senior officers were stealing, our troops were eating almost nothing, and we had to remain under tight discipline. But what kind of discipline is that? We were made complicit with the disaster.”

Many explanations have been advanced for the behavior of Venezuela’s military. Edgardo Lander says that one reason could be that compared to other Latin American

armies, there is a much higher proportion of “people of humble origins in the Venezuelan officer corps.” Unlike in many other Latin American countries, he contends, “the upper classes have really looked at a military career with scorn here.”

Richard Gott, one of the leading authorities on the American left, adds another factor, the mingling of officers with civilians in the country’s educational system. “Beginning in the seventies, under a government program called the Andres Bello program, officers were sent to the universities in significant numbers, and there they rubbed elbows with other students studying, say, economics or political science.” Officers were exposed to progressive ideas at a time that “the left dominated the universities.” Two, it resulted in a deeper integration of the officer corps with civilian society than in most other countries in Latin America.

Probably also critical, says Gott was that, for some reason, Venezuela appears to have sent far fewer officers than many other Latin American countries to the US Army-run School of the Americas in Fort Benning, Georgia, which is the main conduit of counterinsurgency training to the western hemisphere’s military forces.

Now, these conditions may have contributed to making the Venezuelan Army less reactionary than others in Latin America, but they do not explain why it would be one of the spearheads of what is today the most radical social transformation taking place in the hemisphere. Gott, Lander, and other Venezuela specialists concur in one thing: the absolutely central role of Hugo Chavez.

Today, Chavez has become the leader of the radical opposition to the United States in Latin America. While Lula of Brazil and Nestor Kirchner of Argentina are to

the right of Chavez, his pressure often is important in making them adopt left-wing positions.

Acting with Kirchner, Lula, and other leaders, Chavez has derailed the Bush plan for hemispheric economic integration under the hegemony of the US: the Free Trade of the Americas. Venezuela has also played a role in bringing the World Trade Organization negotiations to a standstill.

Chavez has also played offered a different plan of regional integration, one that he says is not based on the “logic of capitalism”: the “Bolivarian Alternative for the Americas.”

Under this plan, Venezuelan oil gives 14 Caribbean countries 40 per cent discount off the international market price of oil. Also Bolivia exchanges soybeans and Argentina trades cattle for Venezuelan oil. There is also a plan to build a 1000 km long natural gas pipeline from Venezuela to the south, to Argentina and Brazil. It is expected to create 1 million jobs in terms of industries that would be spring up along the pipeline. However, this has elicited protests from environmentalists.

What is Chavez’ long-term project? Perhaps it is best to let him speak for himself. At the 6th World Social Forum held in Caracas in January of this year, Chavez unhesitatingly jumped into the debate, mincing no words when he declared that the alternative he was constructing in Venezuela was “socialism.” This did not exactly resonate with many delegates whose notion of socialism was the system that prevailed in the old Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. And it did not help matters when he claimed that Marx and Rosa Luxemburg said “Socialism or Death,” which they did not. On the other hand, Chavez seemed to be distancing his project from that of his close friend Fidel

Castro when he claimed that “socialism was one of the great failures of the 20th century,” and when he referred to his enterprise as a mélange of “authentic socialism,” “Christian socialism,” and the “socialism of Latin America’s indigenous peoples.”

Hugo Chavez is very controversial. But there is consensus that:

- he is Washington’s enemy no 1 in Latin America
- his project of Latin American independence from the US is very attractive throughout the continent
- he is at the cutting edge of a social revolution whose mass base is the poor.

Seattle: the New Movement in Action

Let me move from the national level to the international, to the moments when a myriad national or subnational struggles came together at the global level. Seattle in 1999 was the most dramatic of these instances.

Seattle was not one action but a series of parallel activities. There were teach-ins. There were marches. There were civil disobedience actions, the main one being the effort to prevent the delegates from entering the Sheraton Convention Center on the opening day of the ministerial.

Seattle was the new movement in action:

First, there was no coordinated central command, and yet actions were conducted in an orderly and very cooperative way.

Second, key decisions—such as the decision to block delegates from coming into the Sheraton Convention Center—were decided directly by people in mass meetings where everyone had the right to speak. This was direct democracy.

Third, people came pushing different issues—some to protest against the WTO’s impact on the environment, some focused on development issues, some on agriculture. A number of groups, in fact, were on opposite sides on some issues. But they all decided to set differences aside, tolerate different slogans and positions, so long as they were united on one thing: stopping the WTO ministerial.

Seattle’s lasting significance was that it turned “factoids” into facts. For over a decade before Seattle, the United Nations Development Program and other agencies had been publishing data showing the negative impact of structural adjustment programs, neoliberal reforms, and corporate-driven globalization. However, they were largely ignored by the media, the academy, and policymakers that held on to assumptions about the beneficial impact of these measures and processes. Seattle, by bringing the message to the protestors so forcefully to world attention, forced many influential actors to reconsider, then to backtrack on their assumptions. In other words, to break through to world consciousness, truth needed the help of a world-historical event like Seattle. It is doubtful if people like the Nobel Prize-winner Joseph Stiglitz or the star economist Jeffrey Sachs would have begun to criticize globalization had Seattle not occurred. Paradoxically, Seattle made anti-globalization opinions respectable. We were no longer Luddites, that is, those people who broke machines during the Industrial Revolution in England.

The World Social Forum

A new stage in the evolution of the global justice movement was the holding of the World Social Forum (WSF) in Porto Alegre, Brazil, in January 2001.

The WSF was the brainchild of the social movements connected with the Workers' Party (PT) in Brazil, with the central figure being Chico Whitaker, a close adviser of Lula, or Luis Inacio da Silva, who was later to be president of Brazil. Strong support for the idea was given at an early stage by the Attac movement in France, key figures of which were in the newspaper *Le Monde Diplomatique*. In Asia, the Brazilian proposal, floated in June 2000, received the early enthusiastic endorsement of Focus on the Global South based in Bangkok.

Davos, the event in a resort town in the Swiss Alps where the world's most powerful business and political figures congregated annually to spot and assess the latest trends in global affairs. Indeed, the highlight of the first WSF was a televised transcontinental debate between George Soros and other figures in Davos with representatives of social movements gathered in Porto Alegre.

The World of Davos was contrasted to the World of Porto Alegre, the globalized world versus a liberated world. It was this contrast that gave rise to the very resonant theme "Another world is possible."

There is another important symbolic dimension: while Seattle was the site of the first major victory of the transnational anti-corporate globalization movement, Porto Alegre represented the transfer to the South of the center of gravity of that movement.

Proclaimed as an "open space," the WSF has become a magnet for global networks focused on different issues, from war to globalization to communalism to racism to gender oppression to alternatives.

Regional versions of the WSF were spun off, the most important being the European Social Forum and the African Social Forum; and in scores of cities throughout the world, local social fora were held and institutionalized.

The WSF might be said to perform three functions for global civil society:

First, it represents a space—both physical and temporal—for this diverse movement to meet, network, and, quite simply, to feel and affirm itself.

Second, it is a retreat during which the movement gathers its energies and charts the directions of its continuing drive to confront and roll back the processes, institutions, and structures of global capitalism. Naomi Klein, author of *No Logo*, underlined this function when she told a Porto Alegre audience that the need of the moment was “less civil society and more civil disobedience.”

Third, the WSF provides a site and space for the movement to elaborate, discuss, and debate the vision, values, and institutions of an alternative world order built on a real community of interests. The WSF is, indeed, a macrocosm of so many smaller but equally significant enterprises carried out throughout the world by millions who have told the reformists, the cynics, and the “realists” to move aside because indeed another world is possible. And necessary.

The WSF and its offspring are significant not only as sites of debate but also as direct democracy in action. Agenda and meetings are planned with meticulous attention to democratic process. Through a combination of periodic face-to-face meetings and intense email and internet contact in between, the WSF network was able to pull off events and arrive at consensus decisions. At times, this could be very time-consuming and also frustrating, and when you were at the center of an organizing effort involving

hundreds of organizations, as we at Focus were during the organizing of the 2004 WSF in Mumbai, it could be very frustrating.

But this was direct democracy, and direct democracy is at its best at the WSF.

The WSF has, however, not been exempt from criticism, even from its own ranks. One in particular appears to have merit.

This is the criticism that the WSF as an institution is unanchored in actual global political struggles,^a and this is turning it into an annual festival with limited social impact.

There is, in my view, some truth to this. Many of the founders of the WSF have interpreted the “open space” concept in a liberal fashion, that is, for the WSF not to explicitly endorse any political position or particular struggle, though its constituent groups are free to do so.

Others have disagreed, saying the idea of an “open space” should be interpreted in a partisan fashion, as explicitly promoting some views over others and as explicitly taking sides in key global struggles. In this view, the WSF is under an illusion that it can stand above the fray, and this will lead to its becoming some sort of neutral forum, where discussion will increasingly be isolated from action. The energy of civil society networks lies in their being engaged in political struggles, say proponents of this view. The reason that the WSF was so exciting in its early years was because of its affective impact: it provided an opportunity to recreate and reaffirm solidarity against injustice, against war, and for a world that was not subjected to the rule of empire and capital. The WSF’s not taking a stand on the Iraq War and on the WTO is said to be making it less relevant and less inspiring to many of the networks it had brought together.

This is why the 6th WSF held in Caracas in January 2006 was so bracing and reinvigorating: it inserted some 50,000 delegates into the storm center of an ongoing struggle against empire, where they mingled with militant Venezuelans, mostly the poor, engaged in a process of social transformation, while observing other Venezuelans, mostly the elite and middle class, engaged in bitter opposition. President Hugo Chavez himself warned delegates about the danger of the WSF becoming simply a forum of ideas with no agenda for action. He also told participants that they had to address the question of power. “We must have a strategy of ‘counter-power.’ We, the social movements and political movements, must be able to move into spaces of power at the local, national, and regional level.”

Let me end by saying that the new social movements are very diverse, and this diversity has been a key source of their strength. For the most part, they have been non-doctrinaire, basing their appeal on values rather than theoretical formulations, though they have drawn strength from analysis influenced by Marxism and other theoretical critiques of developmentalism and neoliberalism. They are essentially anti-capitalist but they cannot be said to have a socialist vision in the classical sense. They struggle for a world free of oppression and injustice and domination but see the contours of this end goal as emerging in the process of a common struggle, not at the beginning. #

*Executive Director of Focus on the Global South.