

# 1<sup>st</sup> ICCONSS: “Crisis and the Social Sciences: New Challenges and Perspectives”

Rethymno, June 10-12, 2016

## “An interdisciplinary Political Economy Approach for a transformative social Mobilization”

**George Liodakis**

Technical University of Crete

73100 Chania, Greece

E-mail: [liod@science.tuc.gr](mailto:liod@science.tuc.gr)

### **Abstract**

Based on an interdisciplinary Political Economy approach, on the accumulated knowledge, and the evidence available, this paper intends to challenge (a) the dominant, narrow-minded and restrictive theoretical approach associated with mainstream economics and economism more broadly, (b) the dominant capitalist mode of production (CMP) due to its destructive socio-ecological implications, (c) the nation-state and supra-national state apparatuses such as the E.U. as bourgeois mechanisms of social authority and exploitation, and (d) the existing institutions and organizational forms concerning the social and class struggle mainly of the working class. Challenging the dominant CMP, we will focus on its implications in certain crucial areas, including the economic and social inequality and lack of democracy, the uneven development and socio-spatial polarization, the exploitation and appropriation of human and non-human natures, the inherent competition and cost shifting, the exclusion of the right to work and hence the inadequate satisfaction of basic social needs, the destructive socio-ecological implications of the growth imperative of capitalism, and the inherent contradictions between its parts and the whole. Regarding the struggle and the transformative social mobilization to supersede capitalism, we will focus on the current dilemma between partial or interstitial initiatives and a more total confrontation and fundamental transformation of capitalism. Finally, pointing to some of the inherent weaknesses or incapacities of the existing socio-political agencies, we will risk some thoughts towards a novel organizational form for a new social initiative from below.

**Keywords:** political economy, capitalism, social movement, transformation, labour union, party

## 1. Introduction

Although economic research, within the context of mainstream economics dominated by a neoclassical approach, has in the last hundred and fifty years produced some useful knowledge in certain respects, it has at the same time side-lined a more relevant political economy approach. Moreover, the utterly abstract character of this type of theory and the ideological bias of the relevant research have largely depoliticized and decontextualized economic and social research, rendering it rather irrelevant in coping with real social problems. This incapacity to cope with the most pressing social problems, a pointless mathematization of economic modelling, and an academic sterility of the greatest part of relevant research have led to a growing delegitimation of the field, rendering it a rather apologetic discourse serving the ideological domination of capitalism. For all these reasons, there have been occasional protests against mathematization and academic sterility, against the methodological monism of neoclassical economics, or against 'economism' more generally, which has expanded more or less to all fields of social science (see Norgaard 2015).

Mainstream economics is completely abstracting from the prevalent capitalist mode of production (CMP), considering it as a natural and eternal condition, while contributing to a broad acceptance of economic growth as a panacea for tackling all social problems, despite its deep and destructive socio-ecological implications. This ideological domination of capitalism and the prevalence of bourgeois economics have resulted to a condition that most people would easier accept the likelihood of a world catastrophe than the collapse and supersession of capitalism. Mainstream economics and social science more generally have also fetishized and naturalized state institutions, leading thus to their de-politicization and missing the crucial dialectic between the state and the development of capitalism itself. It is also important to stress that mainstream economics, but also several approaches of political economy, remain attached to a Cartesian divide between society (or economy) and nature. Thus, they remain blind to the dialectic of capital within nature, failing to understand the most important aspects of the currently evolving economic recession and socio-ecological crisis, the coevolution of capital and nature, and the historical limits of capitalism (see Liodakis 2013, Moore 2015).

To overcome the incapacity or irrelevance of scientific research, we have to challenge academic formalism and the ideological indoctrination of the mainstream by tackling the most important contemporary problems, without obscuring their class dimensions or their political implications. Following a dialectical materialist methodology and an interdisciplinary Marxist approach focusing mainly in political economy, we will undertake this task in the following section, where we examine the main implications from the development and dominance of the CMP. Subsequently we briefly analyse and challenge the broadly accepted view regarding the neutral character of state institutions. To face the currently exacerbated socio-ecological crisis, we need to challenge both the dominant CMP and the existing state institutions on a national and supranational level. The strategy to do that is examined in the fourth

section, while the final section briefly explores the organizational forms of the struggle aiming at a social mobilization towards a transformation beyond capitalism.

## **2. The character and implications of the CMP**

In this section we will point out the main implications from the development and domination of the CMP in order to demonstrate its historical demise and the need for its supersession. As is well known, capitalism is based on the exploitation of labour within the process of commodity production aiming at a maximum accumulation of profit.

The underlying property relations, the class structure, and the exploitative character of capitalism imply a growing economic and social inequality. Today, there is ample evidence showing an extensive and increasing inequality within any particular country, but also between countries. These growing inequalities are further amplified with the rapid globalization of recent decades and the prevalence of neoliberal policies. Along with the competitive concentration of capital, these inequalities also imply a growing concentration of social and political power, which is partly exercised and further extended through state institutions on a national and transnational level. The growing concentration of power and related authoritarian practices imply, in turn, the demise of parliamentary institutions, the rapid shrinkage of democratic control, and an increasing salience of authoritarian or totalitarian practices (Liodakis 2010). The current negotiations for a Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP), the growing democratic deficiency within the E.U., and the role of troika in Greece constitute just a few, even if dramatic, expressions of this tendency.

The uneven development of capitalism and its geographical and social polarization constitute another important characteristic. This uneven development and polarization, which again is further intensified with globalization and neoliberal policies, is essentially determined by the internal dynamics of capitalist accumulation. It is free trade itself which mainly leads to uneven development, within and between countries, while the transnational transfers of value associated with the global operation of the law of value and the prevalence of monopolistic relations tend to amplify this unevenness of capitalism even further (see Shaikh 1979-80). Besides this uneven development, global capitalism has also a combined character as it tends to integrate various countries at different stages of development and appropriate extensive resources from various non-capitalist spheres of production.

The increasing exploitation of wage labour within the sphere of commodity production, along with an increasing appropriation of un-commodified labour and un-capitalized nature (see Moore 2015), tend to undermine the fundamental sources of production of all social wealth, namely labour and nature (Marx 1967 I: 506-507, 645), and thus limit the potential of social welfare. At the same time, these processes tend to destroy the conditions of ecological sustainability. There are several reasons therefore, indicating that, contrary to a widely accepted promise of an increasing abundance, capitalism in fact leads to a growing scarcity (Liodakis forthcoming).

The competitive and individualistic character of capitalism implies further, particularly in periods of intensive crisis, an extensive cost-shifting, that is, extensive negative externalities, which tend to increase the average social cost of production while undermining also the conditions of ecological sustainability. All attempts to tinker with these failures of the market system have so far failed, and all state policies aiming at an ecological re-regulation cannot promise anything better.

Ecological degradation and the exacerbated socio-ecological crisis may be largely attributed to the rapid growth of capitalist production necessitated again by the imperative of competition (Lioukakis 2013). While some researchers suggest that a de-growth of capitalist production or a steady-state economy would be a condition for facing ecological crisis (see Daly 1996, Kallis et al. 2012 ), they fail to recognize that economic growth is an inherent necessity characterizing the CMP (see Smith 2010) and that capitalist production, at whatever level, associated with the utilization of the relevant capitalist technology, will generally imply a degradation of social and ecological conditions.

The competitive pressure induces capital to mechanize and automate production in order to reduce cost and increase profitability. This tendency may be rational and makes sense from the standpoint of any individual capital. When generalized, however, by displacing living labour as the single source of surplus value and profit, it leads to over accumulation of capital and a falling average profitability. Apart from their cyclical recurrence, such accumulation crises, if not completely resolved, may have a cumulative impact and intimately intertwined with ecological crisis may lead to an exacerbated socio-ecological crisis, as the one we are currently facing on a global level. Such crises may have a structural or developmental character, but may also lead to a systemic or epochal crisis threatening the very foundations of the CMP (see Robinson 2014, Moore 2015).

The contradictory character of capitalism noted above, between individual firms and capital as a whole, may be also manifested more generally, as in the case of the so-called Jevon's Paradox, where, even a resource efficient technological/organizational innovation, when generalized under capitalist conditions, may very likely lead to a depletion of the relevant resource and to environmental degradation.

Capitalism, by its very nature, does not guaranty the right to work (social inclusion), but is rather based on an extensive unemployment of labour (reserve army) and continually renders a considerable part of social labour superfluous. Economic growth may temporarily or spatially displace this problem, but the overall increase of unemployment, particularly in periods of exacerbated accumulation or socio-ecological crisis, as with the recently aggravated crisis, implies an increasing poverty and social misery. At the same time, the inherently expansive character of capitalism implies imperialist interventions and wars, social destabilization in many areas, ecological exploitation and degradation, and increasing currents of desperate refugees. War and social oppression, along with ecological degradation and economic crisis, further fuel religious and extreme-right obscurantist ideologies to make the world a nightmare and the worst place we could ever imagine.

The implications from the development and crisis of capitalism outlined above are not, by any means, independent. They are rather closely intertwined and derive from the essence itself and the very core of the CMP. All these implications and the social maladies briefly mentioned above are manifested with particular intensity in the currently emergent new stage of transnational or totalitarian capitalism (see Robinson 2004, Lioukakis 2010) and make it imperative to struggle towards superseding capitalism. No socio-ecological reform, de-growth policy, even if implemented, or radical redistribution of income and wealth could possibly ensure the overcoming of the currently unfolding crisis and a sustainable development of capitalism in so far as the CMP remains dominant (cf. Robinson 2014). This is partly because distribution is always closely patterned according to the prevailing relations of production (Marx 1967 III: 878, 883-84). It is for these reasons that a great number of struggles and social movements around the world are directed beyond capitalism and towards a better society.

### **3. The Capital – State relation and its implications**

Mainstream theories, failing to conceive the capital – state dialectic, consider the state simply as a regulative and balancing mechanism aiming to ensure social cohesion. As such, the state is assumed to be socially neutral, serving social welfare in general. On the contrary, Marxist theories correctly focus on the dialectic and the mutual determination of capital and the state, considering that the state has an essentially class character serving primarily the interests of the ruling capitalist class, the reproduction of the dominant relations of production, and the valorisation/profitability of capital. In this sense, the state is not socially neutral, but rather an oppressive and exploitative mechanism functioning in the interest of the ruling class. It is for this reason that Marx stressed the need that proletarian revolutions should not seek to merely reform states or seize state power, but rather dismantle and radically transform the bourgeois state apparatus, replacing it with alternative institutions of democratic control and social coordination (Marx 1968).

While most state theorizing has so far focused on nation-states, in the current stage of transnational or totalitarian capitalism, the conditions concerning the accumulation of capital and political circumstances have substantially changed, on both the national and the global level. A distinctive characteristic of the emergent new stage of capitalism concerns the transnational expansion of the production process itself and the transnational integration of both the productive and financial capital. This tendency, in turn, gives rise to a second crucial characteristic regarding the rise of a transnational capitalist class (TCC) and a transnational formation of social classes in general. Processes of class exploitation and the concomitant class contradictions increasingly expand beyond any particular nation-state. These developments give rise to a transnational state (TNS) constituted by international and transnational organizations, powerful national states, and various capitalist groupings, functioning to organize transnational accumulation and serve the interests of transnational capital

(see Robinson 2004). Clearly, any social movement seeking to go beyond capitalism would, by necessity, need to confront and radically dismantle/transform this TNS.

Regional integrations such as the E.U. are part and parcel of the more general process of transnational integration, aiming at more favourable conditions for the accumulation of capital and the promotion of the interests, primarily, of the capital originating or operating within the European context. This is clearly confirmed by the neoliberal policies inbuilt within the basic institutional and economic apparatus of the Union, the specific operation of the Eurozone, the relevant policies to cope with the current accumulation crisis, and the multiple restrictions of democratic control. Unable to face the exacerbated crisis, the E.U. has given free play to market forces and has facilitated the domination of neoliberal policies. Under these conditions, however, the increasingly uneven development of capitalism within the E.U. has led to extreme development polarities and a growing indebtedness of the less developed countries or regions.

In the least privileged countries of the European periphery, such as Greece, the competitive market pressures emanating from trade liberalization and the integration within the E.U. have led to a progressive disruption of economic and social structures, while the growing indebtedness has implied the imposition of extreme austerity policies resulting in a devastating humanitarian crisis, as well as an intensified ecological stress. It is for these impacts and the more general implications expected from this integration that several researchers and political activists have for long opposed such integration and stressed the need for the country's disentanglement from the E.U. framework (see Liodakis 2000). This exit from the E.U., however, and not merely from the Eurozone, has not been meant as an option for an independent capitalist development of the country, as it may be the case for nationalist political platforms associated either with the extreme-right or some parts of the Left. It is rather meant as a working class movement challenging both the supranational state apparatus of the E.U. and the CMP more broadly, seeking a far-reaching socialist transformation based on transnational solidarity and an expectation that other countries would simultaneously move in the same direction. Undoubtedly, such a broader project seeking to supersede capitalism would have to be based on even broader social alliances and common action on a, more or less, global level.

#### **4. Challenging capitalism to overcome its crisis**

As becomes clear from above, the currently transnational domination of capitalism and the exacerbated socio-ecological crisis it has generated do not allow a decent and sustainable human development, while opening the prospect for new 'dark ages' for humanity and/or a planetary ecological collapse. To overcome this socio-ecological and civilizational crisis, as well as its dismal implications, we have to challenge the prevailing CMP and the associated relations of power and domination, and predominantly the state institutions at all levels.

An effective challenge of capitalism and its state institutions needs to be based on a correct understanding of the current condition and the evolving dynamics of global

capitalism. For such an understanding, we have to abandon mainstream economics, taking from it only some minor pieces of knowledge, while critically reworking alternative theoretical approaches and mainly an interdisciplinary Marxist framework in order to properly understand the current developments of world capitalism. But to understand the world is not, of course, a sufficient condition for changing it. One crucial point from such a theoretical framework should be to understand that, despite the greatly exacerbated crisis, capitalism should not be expected to automatically collapse. It rather needs to be overthrown before it destroys the conditions for a more peaceful, prosperous, and ecologically compatible development of humanity within nature. Undoubtedly, there is a need to mobilize great social forces to bring such a radical change about. We will deal with the subjective conditions and the organizational forms of such a mobilization in the next and final section. In the present section we focus on some of the main forms that such a revolutionary challenge of capitalism might take on both a national and transnational level.

Presently, a great number of class or social struggles and a variety of social movements are in several respects challenging the normality and the conditions for the reproduction of a still dominant capitalism. Some of these struggles or movements aim at certain distributional changes or a partial reform of existing capitalism, while others seek to overthrow the existing state institutions, to radically transform capitalism, and eventually supersede the CMP. In the latter case, there is a bifurcation and a great dilemma concerning the struggles and the strategy to face the current crisis and supersede capitalism. On the one hand, some struggles and movements, influenced more from an anti-authoritarian or anarchic theorization, focus mainly on local or thematic issues, aiming at social survival and environmental protection in the context of the current crisis, and a practical pre-configuration of alternative forms of social organization. They have a more interstitial character and invest in the belief that the proliferation and extension of such projects of endeavours could lead to a supersession of capitalism. Such struggles or strategies usually emphasize horizontal coordination and encourage cooperative self-management practices. However, by ignoring or downplaying vertical relations and the need to confront capitalist state power, they often fail to develop a sufficiently workable horizontal or confederative coordination, running the risk of a symbiotic assimilation within the existing capitalism. On the other hand, some movements or strategies, influenced more by a traditional Marxist theorization, take a critical stance on such interstitial strategies and focus on a more holistic confrontation of capitalism and often on the seizure of political power (see Sharzer 2012, Fuentes-Ramírez 2014). But apart from their state-centrism, these strategies often ignore the necessity that any struggle for social change must emanate from within capitalism, based on its internal dynamics, and starting from today instead of awaiting for the ripening of objective and subjective conditions for a social transformation.

My suggestion is that both these strategies, which may be roughly equated to the relevant strategies for social change from below or from above, may be necessary and need to be dialectically and properly integrated. Emphasizing an initiative and movement from below to ensure both efficacy and social (democratic) control, we

should not ignore that, in a transitional process and under certain conditions, some state or collective institutions may contribute to an effective and viable socio-economic transformation. However, a treatment or deployment of existing state institutions as a driver for a socialist transformation, even assuming a working class seizure of state power, will most likely end up with failure, a political compromise within the existing system, and serious ideological and political setback (see Petkas 2015). The specific articulation of a strategy from below with some initiatives or potential action from above should always depend upon historical circumstances, the existing social structures in each particular case, and the broader geopolitical conditions. At any rate, this dilemma and the relevant strategic articulation deserves to be one of the main issues to be focused upon by useful research work of those convinced that an effective facing of the current crisis can only be ensured through an overcoming of capitalism.

Another crucial aspect of the struggle to supersede capitalism concerns its national or transnational scope. Although traditional revolutionary strategies have usually focused on a potential transformation in particular countries, targeting mainly the relevant national-state power, the transnational development and integration in the current stage of capitalism and the concomitant development of a TCC and TNS make it imperative that an effective strategy heading beyond capitalism should have a transnational scope, based essentially on transnational solidarity and a common working class action across national borders (Liodakis 2012).

## **5. Reorganizing the struggle against capitalism**

There is no question that a revolutionary challenge of capitalism and the prospect of its historical supersession require the mobilization of great and well-organized social forces, as well as a sufficiently conscious social/political agency. It is often argued, however, that the subjective conditions (in terms of consciousness) are not presently favourable for such an endeavour and that there is no clear vision of future society or communism. Such assessments may have a point. Nevertheless, it can be argued that class and revolutionary consciousness may only develop in the course of an unfolding ‘revolutionary practice’, and that a detailed configuration of future society may come out of specific historical circumstances as a result of the struggle of the social forces involved, taking of course into account some basic principles which are already available. The non-linearity of historical evolution might also give rise to rapid and largely unexpected developments. It should further be noted that, the extreme exacerbation of the current crisis should not be considered as a drawback, but rather a favourable condition and an opportunity for challenging the existing mode of production and social organization.

The crucial question here concerns the organizational forms and the characteristics of the social or political agents which may play an important role in the social mobilization and guidance of the struggle to overcome capitalism. A more specific question concerns whether social movements are sufficient for the guidance and implementation of the transformations needed, or if a specific political party is



necessary for this task, and in that case what the organizational principles of such a party should be. There is an extensive debate on this issue (see Harman 1969, Nilsen 2009, Roggero 2010, Zibechi 2010, MacVeigh 2013), and there is also plenty of evidence indicating that centrally organized parties tend to a bureaucratic structure, alienated from popular forces and undermining internal democratic control. As such, they tend to be integrated or assimilated within state structures, contribute to a reproduction of capitalist relations, and eventually lead to distractive ideological and political setbacks. Classic and contemporary critics of this type of centralized parties have often proposed workers' councils or soviets as an alternative organizational form (see Luxemburg, 1904, Petkas 2015), which allows an autonomous and democratic development from below, and a confederative coordination at a more aggregate social level. Pointing out a putative inefficacy of workers' councils, some advocates of centralized parties argue that, 'The abolition of capitalism depends on the organization of the class as a party, a solidary political association that cuts across workplace, sector, region, and nation. ... The party is necessary because class struggle is not simply economic struggle; it's political struggle' (Dean 2015a: 338). As argued more specifically,

To insist on a politics focused on isolating and archiving singular micropractices abstracted from their global capitalist context obscures the workings of state and economy as a capitalist system, hinders the identification of this system as the site of ongoing harm (exploitation, expropriation, and injustice), and disperses political energies that could be more effective if concentrated. (Dean 2015b: 398-99)

Although there is some merit to this argument, it should be stressed that strength and effectiveness of political mobilization may exist only where there is an unreserved trust and solidarity, and an unmitigated democratic control and active political engagement. The experience of centralized and bureaucratic parties, however, shows extensive authoritarian practices, disillusionment, disempowerment, and demobilization. For these reasons, the traditional centralized parties may have to be abandoned together with bourgeois parliamentarism and the practices of political delegation.

We cannot offer here any novel form of political organization. It should be pointed out, however, that the unfolding restructuring of capitalist production and the associated technological developments give rise to a continually changing configuration of class relations and contradictions, which constitute the material basis for new struggles and social movements. These social struggles or movements should be the point of departure and it is on this basis that political parties should perhaps develop, as a temporary form of coordination and collective guidance, without a historical permanence and any practices of class substitution, and without taking precedence over social movements. But whatever form such parties might take, it should be beyond dispute that a periodic shift in the agents of representation and all checks and balances necessary should ensure a democratic control and that the basic determination runs from the class basis of a social movement to the corresponding party and not vice versa. At any rate, it is to be stressed that this is clearly an open

crucial issue that should become one of the hot points for current theoretical debate and political activism.

Another form of collective social action concerns labour or trade unions. Labour unions have traditionally focused on demands related to wage increases, social security and working conditions, without posing broader questions concerning political power and the prospects of transforming society beyond capitalism. At the same time, they often pose demands that capitalism cannot afford. During recent decades, labour unions, especially on a second or third level of aggregation, have been characterized by expensive corruption and become increasingly bureaucratic. Thus, detached from the daily concerns of working people and their impulsive energies, they have largely ended up as a conveyor belt of capital and state power, ensuring labour discipline and social pacification. Despite the extreme impact of the current crisis, most struggles organized by such unions have proved to be completely ineffective. There is, therefore, an urgent need for a radical reorganization of labour unions or associations, with an initiative from below. Under these conditions, the traditional distinction between labour unions and political parties needs to be reconsidered and openly debated. The new organizational forms of working class agencies and social movements need to clearly move from narrow economic concerns to a broader scope encompassing issues of political power and processes of socio-economic transformation. It should further be noted that, traditional labour unions have been usually organized within a narrowly national context. In the current context, however, the transnational development and globalization of capital renders such labour unions completely ineffective and largely outdated. While several researchers have pointed out an emergent transnational working class ‘in itself’, it is often stressed that it does not presently function as a ‘class for itself’. But to function as such (largely a matter of consciousness) presupposes extensive common struggle. Without a corresponding reorganization of working class forces on a transnational level, based on transnational solidarity, class struggles cannot effectively undo the fundamental characteristics of social production and the priorities of global capital (see Liodakis 2012, Bieler 2012, 2014), nor could they effectively challenge or dismantle the emerging TNS to open the way towards a socialist/communist transformation of society worldwide.

As for social science, its best task under present conditions would be to consolidate and further develop a theoretical and methodological framework based on Marxist political economy and encompassing, not only all areas of social science, but also ecology and some essential bridges with natural science. Such a framework would greatly contribute to an adequate conceptualization and understanding of current conditions and the processes of socio-ecological change. Thus, it would significantly contribute to a transformation towards a just, peaceful, and harmonious society within a world-ecological context.

## References

- Bieler, A. (2012) “‘Workers of the World, Unite’”? Globalisation and the Quest for Transnational Solidarity’ *Globalizations*, 9(3): 365-378.
- (2014) ‘Transnational Labour Solidarity in (the) Crisis’ *Global Labour Journal*, 5(2): 114-133.
- Daly, H. (1996) *Beyond Growth: The Economics of Sustainable Development*, Boston MA: Beacon.
- Dean, J. (2015a) ‘The Party and Communist Solidarity’ *Rethinking Marxism*, 27(3): 332-342.
- (2015b) ‘Red, Black, and Green’ *Rethinking Marxism*, 27(3): 396-404.
- Fuentes-Ramírez, R. (2014) ‘Marxist Perspectives on Twenty-first Century Transition to Socialism’ *Socialism and Democracy*, 28(1): 123-142.
- Harman, Ch. (1969) ‘Party and Class’ *International Socialism*, no.35 (Winter 1968-69).
- Kallis, G. et al. (2012) ‘The economics of degrowth’ *Ecological Economics*, 84: 172-180.
- Liodakis, G. (2000) ‘The new stage of totalitarian capitalism and the European integration’ *UTOPIA*, No 39. [in Greek]
- (2005) ‘The New Stage of Capitalist Development and the Prospects of Globalization’ *Science & Society*, 69(3): 341-366.
- (2010) *Totalitarian Capitalism and Beyond*, Surrey UK: Ashgate.
- (2012) ‘Crisis, the emerging new stage of capitalism, and the need of a transnational class strategy for social emancipation’ *International Critical Thought*, 2(1): 7-22.
- (2013) ‘Considering (Economic and Ecological) Crisis from a Communist Perspective’ *Perspectives on Global Development and Technology*, 12(1-2): 194-218.
- (2016) ‘An Exploration of Scarcity in Historical Perspective’ *Science & Society*, 80(2): 221-247.
- Luxemburg, R. (1904) *Organizational Questions of the Russian Social Democracy*, (www.masxists.org).
- MacVeigh, T. (2013) ‘Their Democracy and Ours: the transformative potential of the workers’ council’ *Irish Marxist Review*, 2(8): 57-65.
- Marx, K. (1967) *Capital I-III*, New York: International Publishers.
- (1968) ‘The civil war in France’, in *Selected Works*, by K. Marx and F. Engels, New York: International Publishers.
- Moore, W.J. (2015) *Capitalism in the Web of Life: Ecology and the Accumulation of Capital*, London: Verso.
- Nilsen, A.G. (2009) “‘The authors and the actors of their own drama’”: Towards a Marxist theory of social movements’ *Capital & Class*, no.9.
- Norgaard, R. (2015) ‘The Church of Economism and Its Discontents’ *The Great*

- Transition Initiative, December 2015. ([www.greattransition.org](http://www.greattransition.org))
- Petkas, P. (2015) ““Victorious” political and ethical disaster!’ *UTOPIA*, No.113.
- Robinson, W. (2004) *A Theory of Global Capitalism: Production, class, and state in a transnational world*, Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press.
- (2014) *Global Capitalism and the Crisis of Humanity*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Roggero, G. (2010) ‘Organized Spontaneity: Class Struggle, Workers’ Autonomy, and Soviets in Italy’ *The Journal of Labor and Society*, 13(2): 201-212.
- Shaikh, A. (1979–80), ‘Foreign Trade and the Law of Value’ *Science & Society* 43(3): 281–302 and 44(1): 27–57.
- Sharzer, G. (2012) *No Local: Why Small-scale Alternatives Won’t Change the World*, Alresford UK: Zero Books.
- Smith, R. (2010) ‘Beyond growth or beyond capitalism?’ *real-world economics review*, no.53.
- Zibechi, R. (2010) ‘Governments and Movements: Autonomy or New Forms of Domination?’ *Socialism and Democracy*, 24(2): 1-7.